

Stanislav Byshok
Alexey Kochetkov

NEONAZIS & EUROMAIDAN

From democracy
to dictatorship

[Second edition]

2014

Stanislav Byshok, Alexey Kochetkov

NEONAZIS & EUROMAIDAN. From democracy to dictatorship. [Second edition].

“Whoever is not jumping is a Moskal” is a chant that women and men of different ages who took to Kiev Independence Square in winter 2013-2014 repeated trying to get warm. They kept jumping and laughing, for nobody in the ‘brave new world’ of the Ukrainian revolution under Stepan Bandera’s banner fancied gaining the character of a staunch enemy of Ukrainian statehood.

Mass demonstrations of “angry citizens” in Ukraine had objective reasons. This was a protest against ineffective and corrupt government, against police and bureaucratic abuse of power, against unclear and dead-end policies of the President and the Government.

All national liberation movements use the popular ideas and political sentiments that dominate the society as their positive manifesto. Thus, exclusively left-wing ideologies were mainstream in the Russian Empire in 1917, radical Islamism was most popular in Arab countries during the Arab spring of 2012, whereas nationalism, also radical, turned mainstream in the Ukraine of 2013-2014.

The book describes the development of Ukraine’s nationalist groups since 1991 until present day. It focuses on the history of the parliamentary right-wing radical Svoboda party and the non-parliamentary Right Sector movement. The authors study the ideology, psychology and methods of political struggle of these structures. The experts seek to answer the question: how did the radical neo-Nazi groups manage to become the key driving force behind the Ukrainian revolution?

www.kmbook.ru

ISBN

© Stanislav Byshok, Alexey Kochetkov, 2014

© Alexei Semenov, 2014

Translation

Anna E. Nikiforova, PhD in political science

CONTENTS

Preface. Split Ukraine

Foreword to the Second Edition

Social-National Party of Ukraine in the 1990s

- Independent Ukraine
- From SNPU to Svoboda: a brief history
- Internship in Chechnya
- International connections of the SNPU
- Radical racism
- Eurointegration “for Whites only”

The SNPU transformation into Svoboda

- Fundamental Russophobia
- Final solution to the Russian question
- Language Myth
- War Myth
- Gender Mythology
- Anti-Semitism

Crimea and Tatar Allies of Svoboda

Svoboda crosses The Dnieper River

- “Party of Power” Special Project
- National Socialism from Krupp to Kolomoyskyi
- Pulp Fiction Made in Galicia

**Ukrainian Neo-Nazism
against “Moscow” Orthodox Church**

Nationalists in the Ukrainian Parliament

- Russian, Language of Occupants
- The European Parliament
Denounces Ukrainian Neo-Nazis
- Ukrainian Nationalists Deny the Genocide
against the Polish
- Fire at City Councils!
- The Svoboda Party Takes Part in Blocking Up the Rada

**Tyahnibok vs Yanukovich:
Failed Plan of the Party of Regions**

Stepan Bandera’s Euromaidan

- New Year with Old Bandera
- Bloody February

The Right Sector

- Ukrainian Tyler Durden
- Stepan Bandera Tryzub
- The Patriots of Ukraine organization
- Ties between Neo-Nazi
and Secret Services of Ukraine
- The UNA-UPSD
- The White Hammer

EuroNazis on the Euromaidan

The Odessa massacre

- Trade-Unions Building on Fire
- “Bravo to the murderers!”
- Historical Parallels

The Psychology of Ukrainian Neo-Nazism

- Men Among the Ruins
- Free-Floating Anxiety
- Ritualism
- What is Good and What is Bad?
- “It Is Not Us – It Is Life”
- The Sleep of Reason Produces Monsters
- Collectivism as Way Out of Individualism
- Necessary Roughness
- Mythology Yet Another Time
- Stockholm Syndrome a la Ukraine
- Freedom from What and Freedom to What?

Conclusion

Appendix

- Manifesto of the Social National Assembly – Patriots of Ukraine
- The Program of Implementation of Ukrainian National Idea in the Nation-Building of the Stepan Bandera Tryzub All-Ukrainian organization (*summary*)
- *Alexei Semenov*
“Chronicle of the Crimes Committed by the Right-Wing Radical in Ukraine in February-March 2014”

Few traits of totalitarian regimes are at the same time so confusing to the superficial observer and yet so characteristic of the whole intellectual climate as the complete perversion of language, the change of meaning of the words by which the ideals of the new regimes are expressed.

The worst sufferer in this respect is, of course, the word liberty.

Friedrich A. von Hayek,
the economist and philosopher

Our enemy has always been the Moscow nation itself as well as the current regime, whether Tsarist or Bolshevik, and the state and social system.

Stepan Bandera,
the leader of Ukrainian nationalism

Preface. Split Ukraine

“Whoever is not jumping is a Moskal¹” is a chant that women and men of different ages who took to Kiev Maidan Nezalezhnosti (Independence Square) in winter 2013-2014 repeated trying to get warm. They kept jumping and laughing, for nobody in the ‘brave new world’ of the Ukrainian revolution under Stepan Bandera’s banner fancied gaining the character of a staunch enemy of Ukrainian statehood.

The dictionary of the contemporary Ukrainian language and slang “*Mislovo*” calls Euromaidan the word of 2013. The word “maidan” (square) that became popular ten years before and seemed to have acquired a clear European implication. If anything, the EU and US officials welcomed mass demonstrations of citizens in the center of Kiev calling them nothing but a manifestation of a conscious pro-European choice of the Ukrainian people. However, the first shots were heard afterwards and the first blood of the future “holy hundred” was shed.

Mass demonstrations of “angry citizens” in Ukraine had objective reasons. This was a protest against ineffective and corrupt gov-

1. Moskals (stems from a “Muscovite”) is a derogatory and pejorative label used by Ukrainians to talk about Russians.

ernment, against police and bureaucratic abuse of power, against unclear and dead-end policies of the President and the Government. The draconian crackdown by Berkut police unit on a few hundreds of students who took to Maidan who were unhappy that the President had not signed the Ukraine-European Union Association Agreement became merely the last straw, the trigger. Rage accumulated over the years, if not decades, flooded out. “We can’t live this way” decided the people of Ukrainian metropolises. But how can you live?

All national liberation movements, and this is exactly the way participants and sympathizers of the Euromaidan view their strivings, use the popular ideas and political sentiments that dominate the society (or at least its most active part) as their positive manifesto, along with liberation itself from “external” or “internal occupation”. Thus, exclusively left-wing and left-wing radical ideologies were mainstream in the Russian Empire in 1917, radical Islamism was most popular in Arab countries during the Arab spring of 2012, whereas nationalism, also radical, challenging liberal and people’s democratic “deviations” turned mainstream in the Ukraine of 2013-2014.

Getting used to the “velvet revolutions” of the late 1980s, the civilized world stayed confident that other forms of abrupt regime change with violence and slaughter were impossible in Europe. That is why when the confrontation in the center of Kiev in February 2014 entered a “hot” phase many experts started to talk about an external force behind the bloodshed. Traditionally this force has been embodied by either the Russian Federation or the European Union or the United States. Everything has depended solely on an expert’s perspective and bias.

British Prime Minister Winston Churchill is quoted as saying: “People should be told the truth, but there is no need to tell all the truth entirely”. Unfortunately, this is such half-truth, if not blatant fact spinning that provides the basis for the media picture from which people in Russia and countries of the West, let alone

Ukraine, draw their conclusions about what has been happening in Ukraine. Therefore, the maximum task the authors of this research have set for themselves is to overcome one-sided and biased interpretations of Euromaidan and to bring readers nearer to objective assessment of the reasons for and consequences of the new Ukrainian revolution. The revolution that, after its “victory”, has degenerated from uniting all the society in the face of dysfunctional government to relying on repression police machine into strongest polarizing factor. And the strength of this factor is difficult to overestimate.

Ukrainian nationalism has been a political and historical mainstream since 1991 when the country gained independence. It was nationalists – rather than people on the left like in many other countries – who became the major “street” riot force long before Maidan. Mass demonstrations organized by united Ukrainian opposition nationalist parties, Svoboda above all, were only to demonstrate ideologically motivated activists in the flesh ready for violent clashes. By contrast, liberal democratic parties could only overwhelm by mere force – numerous “maidanarbiters”¹ of preretirement and retirement age who were given emblems before riots and who afterwards lined in front of a “foreman” for earned money. Given disastrously low salaries in Ukraine, let alone retirement benefits, nobody blames them.

When democratic Euromaidan all over the country entered its “hot” stage maidanarbiters and common “angry citizens” constituting the main body of protesters were not suitable for clashes with the police, armory seizure or attacking municipal administrations. That was when neo-Nazi militants under disguise of the Right Sector that upon closer examination turned out to be a union of previously known right-wing radical paramilitary units took the stage. The red and black flag of the Right Sector unequivocally indicated

1. A term used in Ukraine to signify representatives of paid-out crowds at political demonstrations. Introduced into use during the “Orange Revolution” of 2003-2004.

continuity with the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists of Stepan Bandera.

When the first blood was shed and Bandera banners started to dominate Maidan, many of those who previously fully supported the Euromaidan gave it more thought. Both the West and the East of Ukraine equally wanted positive changes in society, higher standards of living, rule of law and order – under the auspices of the European Union or without it. However, what the Euromaidan, as well as the government that took over the country after the collapse of the Yanukovich regime, degenerated into fell short of this European dream. Stability and corruption gave place to devastation and ... corruption multiplied by actual paralysis of law enforcement authorities and rampant neo-Nazi gangs that “in the name of revolution” commit banditry and vigilante justice.

Against the background of the streets, the new “revolutionary” government consisting mainly of representatives of the Batkivshchyna neoliberal party led by Yulia Tymoshenko marks a shocking contrast. However, Ukrainian neoliberals who gained maximum profit from bloody civil unrest have easily adopted the typical “hate speech” of neo-Nazi and respective rhetoric. Considering the overall ideological and political climate of the country, such a merger of liberalism with radical nationalism and xenophobia could have far-reaching consequences.

The famous Gene Sharp’s *From Dictatorship to Democracy* was published two decades ago and has become the bible for coup d’état masterminds all over the world – from Europe and the Arab world to South America. The year 2014 is apparently high time to write a different book. The book about how “democratic” revolutions bring to power political forces that are far less democratic and peaceful than the just toppled dictators.

It is impossible to understand the consequences without understanding the reasons. It is also impossible to foresee how the situation in Ukraine will develop further without understanding the platform and organizational basis of modern Ukrainian politi-

cal nationalism that came to be the only striking force of the Euro-maidan. This work describes how Ukrainian nationalist gangs have developed since 1991 to present day, with the focus on the history of the parliamentary Svoboda (Freedom) party (Social-National Party of Ukraine until 2004) and the non-parliamentary “Right Sector”, and analyses the ideologies, psychologies and methods of political action of these structures. The Appendix contains key platform documents of the studied organizations as well as a digest of the most significant crimes that took place during Ukrainian rule of anarchy of February-March 2014.

Being member of no rival party of the Ukrainian revolution (or coup d'état, if you like) but unconditionally sympathizing with the people of Ukraine, authors sincerely hope that the work presented for the reader would become a small brick in building a truly democratic society based on respect for oneself and the people around rather than hatred and xenophobic myths.

*Stanislav Byshok and Alexey Kochetkov,
April 2014*

Foreword to the Second Edition

Russia, whether in the form of an Orthodox monarchy of the country of soviets, has never been a colonial empire, like Spain, France or Great Britain. Russia did not exploit its provinces, but rather tried to develop them economically and culturally to the level of the central-Russian “heartland” or even higher. This makes the “post-colonial guilt complex” typical of a significant part of the post-Soviet intelligentsia and creative class so astonishing. It has been most glaring in the light of the tragic events in Ukraine in 2013-2014.

Ranging from “the Maidan has nothing to do with Russophobia” and “individual manifestations of anti-Russian sentiments in Ukraine mean nothing – we have many idiots too” to “never will we be brothers” and “they have every right to hate us for all we did to Ukraine”. The attitude based on an irrational feeling of guilt could be explained by media propaganda, but for a very significant “but”. There are a plethora of available sources of information nowadays, and everyone who has access to the Internet (that is to say any resident of any Russian city) can choose if they want to watch the government-run First Channel or the liberal oppositional Dozhd, the Russia Today or BBC and CNN, the Russian

LifeNews or Ukrainian Inter. A freedom of choice is obviously predetermined by an internal or/and external framework.

As Hitler of Goebbels rightfully mentioned, the bigger the lie, the more people believe it. Especially when a big lie is promoted by those who are assumed to be competent experts on the issue involved. So it happens that people believe such “qualitative” judgments as:

“Members of the Right Sector and other ultra-nationalist activists comprise only a small portion of the total Euromaidan Self-Defense forces – dozens of various “hundreds” that jointly mounted violent opposition to Yanukovich attempting to clamp down on the protesters. Nevertheless, it is largely the right radicals who have been shown and are being discussed in the Kremlin’s large-scale international information campaign against the new government in Kiev. Russian officials, leading diplomats, pseudo-journalists and lobbyists in the West have widely used hyperboles, half-correct reports, fakes and alarmist statements towards radical-right activists of Ukraine in order to discredit the pro-European revolution in Ukraine as at least partly fascist”¹.

This short but very illustrative “expert” opinion has both a big lie and an underlying appeal to the irrational guilt feeling of a certain segment of the Russian society. Apolitical residents of Kiev constituted a vast majority during the protests on the Independence Square at the turn of 2013-2014. On the other hand, it was only radical ideologically-motivated Ukrainian nationalists equipped and managed from a consolidated center who took part in the violent confrontations with the police, takeovers of administrative buildings and set-up of the Maidan Self-Defense and the Right Sector. It is only the dispersal of the first student Euromaidan on the night of November 30, 2013 that could be called a confrontation of the totalitarian Berkut and liberal democratic hipsters who shielded themselves from watchdogs of the regime

1. Umland A., Shehkovtsov A. Ukraine’s right radicals, Eurointegration and neo-Fascist threat. URL: <http://www.polit.ru/article/2014/05/21/ukraine/>

with the last model of iPad. What happened later is a completely different story, with a confrontation of completely different forces and resources.

Even after the Maidan Self-Defense burned alive dozens of unarmed people in Odessa on May 2, even after the National Guard made up of radical nationalists shot at the peaceful demonstration in Mariupol on May 9, the voices blaming Russia have become just a little quieter. However, few are willing to answer the question: “who is to blame?” the “civilizational” gloss of the Euromaidan is too powerful for many, while the antagonism between “bad” Russia and the “good” West associated with post-revolutionary Ukraine is too well-established. The emperor proved to not only have no clothes, but also to be a sadist and a serial killer.

One has to agree with Dmitry Galkovsky, a modern Russian philosopher, who described the events in Ukraine in 2013-2014 saying that “when cultists in Lviv chanted “Guillotine Moskals”, easily amused Orthodox Ukrainians with a sense of humor giggled. For residents of Kiev, “beheading a Moskal” or “burning a Moskal alive” was an ironical exaggeration of an everyday enmity and a political chant, like the popular “the ref needs glasses!” But when cultists chant such things, they are actually going to put the glasses on the ref. Unless somebody stops them”.

*Stanislav Byshok and Alexey Kochetkov,
June 2014*

Social-National Party of Ukraine in the 1990s

Independent Ukraine

The sweetest dream of all Ukrainian nationalists came true on August 24 1991 when the Supreme Rada of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic declared state independence of Ukraine from the USSR. The 1st of December 1991 saw an All-Ukrainian referendum, with the ballot paper including the question: “Do you confirm the act of declaring independence of Ukraine?” the referendum turnout all over the republic was 84,18%, with 90,32% saying “yes, I do”, while 7,58% “No, I do not”.

On the 8th of December 1991 Leonid Kravchuk (Ukraine), Boris Yeltsin (Russia) and Stanislav Shushkevich (Byelorussia), the Presidents of three founding members of the USSR, signed the Belavezha Accords declaring the USSR dissolved.

Considering what was happening in Ukraine, Mykola Plaviuk, both the last president of the Ukrainian People’s Republic (UPR, or UNR – Ukrayins’ka Naronda Respublyka)¹ in exile and leader

1. The Ukrainian People’s Republic, UPR (used since November 7 (20), 1917), is the name of “autonomous” Ukraine that was declared on June 10 (23), 1917 at first as part of Russia but proclaimed its independence on January 9 (22), 1918. Since Janu-

of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN)¹, expressed confidence that State center of the OUN should conduct preparations for delegation of its power to independent Ukraine. Plaviuk, as the last president of UPR in exile, delegated his authorities and historical attributes of power to Ukraine's President Leonid Kravchuk as well as the positions of President of the Supreme Rada and Prime Minister of Ukraine at a ceremonial session of the Supreme Rada of Ukraine in Kiev in August 1992. Thus, Plaviuk confirmed that Ukrainian independent state declared a year ago is the legal successor of UPR.

In the early 1990s "old" nationalists started to return to newly independent Ukraine when they had not been seen for half a decade. In 1929 the goal was set at the first convention of OUN to establish a sovereign Ukrainian inclusive state was reached in

ary 22, 1919, the UPR was formally joined with the West Ukrainian People's Republic (WUPR) that included the territories of the former Austro-Hungarian Empire. It de facto ceased to exist as a result of the summer offensive of the Red Army in 1920. In 1921, the Treaty of Riga divided the territory of the Republic between the Second Polish Republic (Poland) and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR).

1. The Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) (Ukrainian: Організація Українських Націоналістів, Orhanizatsiya Ukrayins'kykh Natsionalistiv) was a Ukrainian political organization created in 1929 in Western Ukraine (at the time interwar Poland). The OUN emerged as a union between the Ukrainian Military Organization, smaller radical right-wing groups, and right-wing Ukrainian nationalists and intellectuals represented by Dmytro Dontsov, Yevhen Konovalets, Mykola Stsyborsky and other figures.

The OUN sought to infiltrate legal political parties, universities and other political structures and institutions. As revolutionary ultra-nationalists the OUN have been characterized by some historians as "fascist". The OUN's strategy to achieve Ukrainian independence included violence and terrorism against perceived foreign and domestic enemies, particularly Poland, Czechoslovakia and Russia, which controlled territory inhabited by ethnic Ukrainians. One of the OUN's stated goals was to protect the Ukrainian population from repression and establish a Ukrainian state.

In 1940, the OUN split into two parts. The older, more moderate members, supported Andriy Melnyk (OUN-M) while the younger and more radical members supported Stepan Bandera (OUN-B). The OUN-B declared an independent Ukrainian state in June 1941, while the region was under the control of Nazi Germany.

In October of 1942 OUN-B established the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA). In 1943 UPA military units carried out large-scale ethnic cleansing against Polish and Jewish populations.

After the war, the UPA fought against Soviet military forces as well as against pro-Soviet civilians.

During the Cold War, the OUN was covertly supported by western intelligence agencies, including the CIA.

1992. However, it was reached through a “simple” general election rather than a “national revolution” as they initially wanted. There was clearly nothing for Ukrainian nationalists but to blend into civil life and take part in peaceful state-building. This is what representatives of the older generations started to do.

On the other hand, a new generation of nationalists have grown up in the West of Ukraine who thought Stepan Bandera’s mission far from accomplished.

From SNPU to Svoboda: a brief history

On October 13, 1991, a number of right-wing civil society organizations united in Lvov to establish the SNPU – the Social-National Party of Ukraine. They included “Varta Ruha”¹, Lviv “Student Brotherhood”, Organization of Ukrainian Youth “Nasledie” (“Heritage”) and Organization of Afghan Veterans of Ukraine.

Three politicians, namely Yaroslav Andrushkiv, Andriy Parubiy and Oleh Tyahnibok, were originators of the SNPU. The latter two still play a significant role in Ukrainian politics, including what has been happening at Euromaidan.

The manifesto of the party says: “SNPU is an uncompromising opponent of communist ideology as well as political parties and social movements that propagate and implement it... All other political forces are viewed by the SNPU as either national-collaborationists – traitors to Ukrainian revolution, or national-romantics – barren flowers of Ukrainian revolution”.

The party became somewhat famous in the fall of 1993 when it announced establishing within the “Committee of Nation and Motherland Salvation” so called “national units” whose task was

1. People Rukh of Ukraine (also Ukrainian People’s Party “Rukh”) is a nationalist political party set up in 1989 with the name “People’s Movement of Ukraine for Reconstruction (i.e. Perestroika)”. The book tends to talk about youth structures of “Rukh”, above all security service (“varta”) of the party.

“available sabotage”. This mean blocking rail roads, motorways, taking over oil and gas pipes, etc. as the revolution may require.

The dress code of a party member evolved from steel colored shirts and chevrons with symbols recalling the aesthetics of the Third Reich to more traditional Ukrainian embroideries and presentable suits. The original dress-code of the SNPU and later on its youth structure represented by “Patriot Ukrainy” (“Ukrainian Patriot”) was made up of dark trousers, a steel grey shirt, tie and chevron with “Ideya Natsii” (“Nation Idea”).

The symbol of “Ideya Natsii”, which is the SNPU symbol, reminds of a runic Wolfsangel. It was used by German SS division “Das Reich” and Dutch SS division “Landstorm Nederland” during World War II as well as by a number of European neo-Nazi organizations after 1945. Thus, Wolfsangel is applied by followers of different German-Scandinavian neo-pagan cults (“Asatru” and the like) both in their rituals and as identification mark. What is more, the symbol is used by extreme right-wing political organizations such as “Aryan Nations”, “White Aryan Resistance” (“Vitt Ariskt Motstånd”), Wiking Jugend, etc.

According to some reports, Wolfsangel used to be one of the emblems of Adolf Hitler’s National-Socialist German Workers’ Party (NSDAP) at its early stages. Simplified version of Wolfsangel used to be the emblem of the Dutch Nazi Party operating during World War II in the Netherlands occupied by Germany. At the same time the official position of SNPU members implied exclusively Ukrainian origins of the monogram and lack of any genetic ties with the Nazi symbols.

When reviewing the Social National Party of Ukraine (SNPU) for registration, the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine submitted the party’s symbol to the committee on heraldry which traced... no connection with the Nazi symbols.

The second convention of the Party took place on September 9, 1995 and as soon as October 16 the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine registered Social-National Party of Ukraine.

The main task the NPU leadership set for itself at first was to come to the Galicia level¹. The search for youth target groups started to support the party, with skinheads who emerged at that time and later football hooligans began to stand out.

The Party at the time was trying to adopt the patterns of self-organization based on Adolf Hitler's NSDAP experience, with the first attempts to patrol the streets. It was in the mid-1990s that the foundation of the SNPU as the most "street" party of Ukraine was laid. Social-nationalists took part in skirmishes and confrontations with criminal elements and political opponents at marches in remembrance of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA)² and on anniversaries of the October Socialist Revolution of 1917, organized torchlight parades and fighting against ideological opponents represented by the communists and socialists.

So called "Bylozyr case" came to reverberate most and brought the Party to the national Ukrainian forefront. Igor Bylozyr, a regionally famous composer and performing musician, head of the band "Vatra", died on May 28, 2000 in Lviv as a result of a fight. Despite the domestic nature of the conflict that led to the death, the SNPU made everything to give the incident a national political character.

1. Galicia also Galichina is a historical region loosely matching the territory of modern Ivano-Frankivsk, Lviv and Western part of Ternopil regions of Ukraine, Subcarpathian and most part of Lesser Poland Voivodeships. It is historically divided into Eastern Galicia traditionally inhabited largely by Ukrainians and Western Galicia where, besides the Poles, Ukrainian ethnic groups, such as Lemkos and Boykos, have been living. Galichina refers only to Eastern Galicia.

2. The Ukrainian Insurgent Army (Ukrainian: Українська Повстанська Армія, УПА, Ukrayins'ka Povstans'ka Armiya, UPA) was a Ukrainian nationalist paramilitary and later partisan army that engaged in a series of guerrilla conflicts during World War II against the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, the Polish civilian population of German-occupied western Ukraine, and both Underground and Communist Poland. The group was the military wing of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists – Bandera faction (the OUN-B).

During its existence, the Ukrainian Insurgent Army fought against the Poles and the Soviets as their primary opponents. The UPA and Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists-B (OUN-B) also cooperated with Nazi German forces against the Soviets and Poles in the hope of creating an independent Ukrainian state. The army also played a substantial role in ethnic cleansing of the Polish population of Volhynia and East Galicia.

That resulted in unprecedented rise in tensions and hatred between Ukrainian speaking majority and Russian-speaking population of Lviv. Without distinction, all Russian pop-music came to be perceived by many Lviv residents as a conductor of criminal subculture propaganda. The Lviv municipal council issued a resolution to ban Russian songs in the city. The conflict reached its peak at Bylozyr's funeral which saw the participation of 100 to 150 thousand people according to various estimates.

Some media, including the SNPU party paper called "Social-nationalist", reiterated the ethnic background of the accused (Russians Dmitry Voronov and Yuri Kalinin). Party members picketed outside the Lviv public prosecutor's office during investigation and trial.

Bylozyr's death came to serve as an excuse to step up criticism of incumbent authorities from the opposition. The authorities were criticized for the failure to counteract criminals, the support for Russian expansion into Ukrainian information space, delay in search for the accused and attempts to shelter them from punishment, corruption, impoverishment of the Ukrainian people, hiding trustworthy information from the public, indifference to the fate of Ukrainian culture and even connivance to masons.

The wave of discontent in the West of Ukraine in May and June of 2000 could have also been related with resentment against difficult economic situation, particularly unemployment. Search for a scapegoat is typical of economic crises with foreigners, ethnic Russians in this case, perfectly fitting this role. It was easy to give them an image of enemy, agent of a foreign state, criminal lord and fan of dirty pop music of the criminal world who schemed to artfully kill the Ukrainian composer.

Internship in Chechnya

Developments at the Euromaidan of 2013-2014 and the Crimea crisis aggravating Russia-Ukraine relations have surfaced a num-

ber of details about unknown pages in Ukrainian nationalist leaders' biographies. In March 2014 Oleh Tyahnibok, head of Svoboda party, and some of his fellow party members became involved in a criminal case. To be frank, it was the investigative authorities of Russia rather than Ukraine that filed a case against them.

According to Vladimir Markin, the spokesperson of the Russian Investigation Committee, in the 1990s he would be leader of Svoboda Oleh Tyahnibok fought against federal forces of Russia on the side of Chechen separatists. Members of UNA-UPSD¹ Igor Mazur, Valeriy Bobrovich, Dmytro Korchytsky, Andriy Tyahnibok (Oleh Tyahnibok's brother), Dmytro Yarosh, Vladimir Mamalyga, Olexandr Muzychko and others fought with him.

Their gang took part in military actions against federal forces of Russia in 1994-1995 on the side of paramilitary factions led by warlords Shamil Basayev and Khattab. Mazur, Bobrovich, Korchytsky and others were gang leaders with the Tyahnibok brothers, Yarosh, Mamalyga and other unidentified people its members. "The investigation have collected enough evidence that allow giving a ruling before long to name these people as defendants, imposing in absentia pre-trial restraints in the form of imprisonment and putting on a wanted list", said Markin.

Before setting out for Chechnya, Bandera's successors had been trained at the training base of the Ukrainian National Assembly – Ukrainian People's Self-Defense in Ivano-Frankivsk (West Ukraine). Young nationalists studied weapons and hand-to-hand combat there, while leaders of the organization, for example, Oleksandr Muzychko, were in charge of ideological indoctrination of recruits.

In Chechnya, Ukrainian nationalists were notorious for savagely torturing and killing Russian prisoners of war as well as combat qualities. For instance, above-mentioned Muzychko "broke officers' fingers, gouged their eyes out with different objects, pulled out their nails and teeth with Lineman's pliers, cut their

1. Ukrainian National Assembly – Ukrainian People's Self-Defense

throat and shot some”. It must be for these merits that Muzychko was awarded the Nation’s Hero, the highest award of the self-proclaimed Chechen Republic of Ichkeria.

“It is now becoming clear that many radical Ukrainian activists are calling for elimination of Russian citizens and simply Russians have rich experience not only calling but also torturing and murdering Russian citizens also on the territory of Russia”, says the statement on the website of the Investigation Committee.

Oleh Tyahnibok has never refuted the statement.

International connections of the SNPU

The SNPU has been blamed from the very beginning for having contacts not only with Muslim terrorists but also with Western nationalist organizations. A permanent column – “EUROnationalism” studying the experience of nationalists in Germany, France, Italy, Great Britain and other countries – has even been created in the “Orientiry” (“Orientations”) magazine, intellectual bullhorn of the social-nationalists. Interestingly, most problems addressed there had little to do with Ukrainian reality. Thus immigration into Ukraine from the third world has never been so massive as to threaten the well-being and safety, let alone the racial and national identity of Ukrainians.

The SNPU has been participating since 2000 in Euronat, an organization of European nationalist political parties originally established at the convention of the French “National Front” in Strasburg on March 30, 1997.

Jean-Marie Le Pen, the then leader of the “National Front” even paid a visit to Ukraine at the invitation of the SNPU and took part in the 4th Convention of the Party that took place in Lviv on May 21, 2000¹.

1. Marine Le Pen, Jean-Marie Le Pen’s daughter and political successor, the current president of the far-right Front National, on the contrary, is now holding a staunch

After a rebranding, the Party has also been member of the Alliance of European Nationalist Movements (AENM), an association of political parties set up in Budapest on October 24, 2009 by nationalist and radical right-wing parties of the EU countries.

The founding members of the Alliance are Jobbik, the Movement for a Better Hungary (founded at the 6th convention of the Jobbik), as well as the “National Front” (France), “The Tricolour Flame Social Movement” (Italy), “National Democratic Party” (Sweden) and “National Front” (Belgium). Later the “British National Party” joined the Alliance.

The main goals of the organization are highlighted in the political declaration of the Alliance:

- Conscious of common responsibility for the European peoples and the diversity of cultures and languages they represent,
- Mindful of the inalienable values of Christianity, natural law, peace and freedom in Europe,
- Bearing in mind the numerous threats that powerful forces of globalization pose to this priceless heritage.

In the spring of 2013, the Svoboda Party was expelled from the Alliance for marches and violent actions against representative of Hungarian community of Uzhhorod and Berehove (Transcarpathia)¹.

Late at night on March 29, 2013 followers of the Svoboda marched in Berehove in Transcarpathia mostly inhabited by ethnic Hungarians shouting slogans: “Hungarians are swines!”, “Hungarians, get out of Transcarpathia!”, “Death to Magyars”.

pro-Russian position and supports the aspirations of Russians and Russian-speaking regions of Ukraine for independence or reintegration with Russia.

1. It was not the first time Ukrainian nationalists openly showed their hatred of Transcarpathia Hungarians. Thus, Oleh Kutsyn, president of the Transcarpathia Svoboda branch; Ruslan Polivka, deputy head of the Svoboda regional organization, as well as Tomash Lelekach, president of Uzhhorod-city Svoboda organization, stood trial in April, 2011. They were found guilty of arson of the monument called Memorial of the Hungarian conquest of the Carpathian Basin at the Verecke Pass (also known as Veretsky Pass).

“Berehove was celebrating a national holiday that attracted Hungarian folklore ensembles. Also buses came with activists of the Svoboda party who started to beat participants in the celebration, above all, teenagers”, said journalists knowing the situation to one of the authors of this book. They hit everybody who was wearing a strip with the colors of the Hungarian national flag.

Béla Kovács, Member of the European Parliament and the Hungarian nationalist Jobbik – Movement for a Better Hungary, appealed in an open letter to Oleh Tyahnybok, leader of the Svoboda All-Ukrainian Union, and expressed his resentment at the anti-Hungarian campaign in Transcarpathia.

“I learnt with deep resentment that your party has organized rallies and violent campaigns in Uzhhorod and Berehove against the Hungarian community”, says the letter published in the media.

“It is absolutely impermissible that members of the Svoboda party feel such deep and intense hatred towards the Transcarpathian Hungarian community. They seek to expel the community that consists of not immigrants who have no roots in the region, but rather of the population of Transcarpathian villages and towns founded by their ancestors a thousand years ago. They are trying to represent them as enemies of Ukraine. However, members of this minority live by farming rather than on benefits or allowances”, stressed the Member of the European Parliament from the Jobbik.

Kovács also pointed out that Transcarpathian Hungarians do not hold key positions in either economic or political spheres and, therefore, have no responsibility for the embezzlement of state property, corruption and economic difficulties of Ukraine. He said that the Hungarian community has never supported separatism or questioned legitimacy or territorial integrity of the Ukrainian state. Even more so, they have maintained brotherly ties with Transcarpathian Ukrainians and Rusyns for centuries.

“Therefore, the Svoboda Party hates Transcarpathian Hungarians only because they want to live in their motherland, with

their historical monuments, want to live and work in peace and to preserve their ethnicity by cherishing their material, spiritual and cultural heritage. That is why they chant: “Hungarians, get out of Transcarpathia!” resented Kovács.

The Member of the European Parliament expressed his strong opposition to the Svoboda’s activities that insult human and moral dignity of Transcarpathian Hungarians. He highlighted that “such groups do not fit into a democratic parliament, Europe or the Christian world”.

“In this regard, it is even less acceptable that, in a democratic European country, the rights of a national minority to preserve its own culture, its native language and to live on its native soil guaranteed by Ukraine’s Constitution were questioned by a parliamentary party that in its turn advocates closer relations with the EU and has embarked on the path of the European integration”, said the European Union lawmaker.

“As the Vice-President and Treasurer of the Alliance of European Nationalist Movements, I inform you that we do not want to cooperate in any form with the organization you represent”, wrote Kovács to Tyahnybok.

It is characteristic that it was Béla Kovács and the Jobbik as recently as 2009 conducted intense consultations with Oleh Tyahnybok and the Svoboda party for closer cooperation between European and Ukrainian political nationalists. However, further events remind of the anecdote of a murderer fired from the Gestapo for “excessive cruelty”.

Radical racism

The SNPU for a long time had remained the only political force in Ukrainian nationalism that declared itself nothing less than the “last hope of the White race”.

“In light of the prospects for mass degradation of people, whole peoples, we are the last hope of the White race and humankind in general” declared a presentation of the SNPU on November 19, 1995 in Lviv’s Maria Zankovetskaya theatre. “We need to separate decisively from the Northeastern neighbor. Not only because it is aggressive and capture us, but primarily because it introduces into our life and psychology of our people characteristics different from European values”. European values, however, were understood by the Ukrainian social-nationalists completely different from the way Westerners themselves see them.

The SNPU supported all mainstream ideas of the opposition of the late 1990s and stayed in the forefront of the political scene.

Social-nationalists have repeatedly considered warriors of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army and legionnaires of the Ukrainian Waffen-SS “Galichina” division their historical predecessors.

Much later in May 2010 Oleh Tyahnibok, the leader of the now Svoboda Party, even received from the veterans of the division an honorable Golden cross “for merit to Ukraine”. This way, continuity of traditions was respected.

Social-nationalists demonstrated their adherence to the ideals of Adolf Hitler only when needed to attract the most radical Nazi skinheads. At that time the SNPU maintained close ties with Nazi skinheads helping young people to avoid criminal prosecution for different crimes, largely of vandalism and racist natures. However, the Party chose to cover up such ties. Back then the Nazi skinheads subculture in Ukraine experienced enormous Russian influence. And it was the SNPU that invested much effort to redirect young people from Russia to a pro-Ukrainian and anti-Russian orientation.

The Uncompromising fight against everything more or less connected with Russia and Russian influences laid the foundation of the SNPU ideology. The image of Russia and Russians is the image of eternal enemies of Ukraine threatening for centuries the very existence of the Ukrainian nation. As long as Russia exists,

Ukrainians will not be able to sleep soundly. Hence the anti-communism ideals of the Svoboda. A communist is always a Moskal, the Kremlin agent and enemy of everything Ukrainian.

The presence of radical and resolute youth in the ranks of the SNPU explains why respectable political forces viewed this party as a promising partner, even though its electoral support back then was not very significant. It is the ideologically motivated activists in the flesh that have always distinguished the SNPU and Svoboda from other opposition parties that had to attract a paid crowd with party flags and other symbols for mass demonstration.

The SNPU can be justly called one of the first Ukrainian racist parties and they tried to construct modern myths that would justify Ukrainian chauvinism and racism. For that purpose they used, for example, publication on pseudo-historical topics and at the same time never lost sight of the current agenda remaining in the political and socio-cultural mainstream.

Thus they tried to propagate racism with the help of ... boxers Wladimir and Vitali Klitschko (the latter becoming the leader of the popular UDAR Liberal-Democratic Party). They juxtaposed their conduct of combat style with the style of the representatives of the African race pointing its supposed “lightness of mind” above all. “The following example is very illustrative: the ‘White’ style of boxing by Klitschko differs markedly from rough Afro-American one, a party article reads. Outstanding natural abilities of these Ukrainian athletes are due to good Aryan inheritance (according to the Klitschko brothers themselves, they are descendants of an ancient Cossack family)”.

As may be supposed, these arguments were to instill a special pride in the national sport into Ukrainians. It is noteworthy that Vitali Klitschko now strongly repels social-nationalists due to his clear anti-racist attitude. In view of the changed state of affairs some nationalists spread rumors about possible Jewish background of the famous boxer.

The fight with non-Aryan Russia the people of which “can be called nothing but a pseudo-nation” was the SNPU’s central ideal. This question is dwelt on in the article “Miscellanea”: “There are nations that have created their own states and while there are state systems that have artificially sculpted ‘nations’, it is more accurate to say pseudo-nations or quasi-nations. A true nation is a big family-- a community of people who are blood relatives. The same race, the same blood, the same ancestors. Such nations are Ukrainian, Polish, Slovak, Czech, Swedish, Danish and other peoples, whereas representatives of some other ‘nations’ are people of completely different anthropological types and it makes no sense to take about their full blood kinship. They are united by literature language, culture and common historical myth fabricated by the state. Moreover, not all Europeans could be fully considered White people. For example, the population of southern regions of some European countries are European colored people who resemble in their genetics, say, the Arabs or Caucasians¹. This way Russians are, in fact, a variation of colored Turanian ethnic groups”.

As for the perception of Russia and Russians as eternal enemies of all the European civilization as well as Ukraine, the Ukrainian social nationalists have not been able to get rid of it even after they put on respectable suits and entered the new government when the Euromaidan won. Thus, addressing the session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly on May 30, 2014, Andriy Parubiy, the Secretary of Ukraine’s National Security and Defense Council, called for forming a united front to make Russia stop its aggression against Ukraine. Otherwise, he warned, Russian would become a threat to “not only Europe, but also to all the civilized world”.

1. In both Russian and Ukrainian languages the word “Caucasian” doesn’t mean “White” (as in American English). This word is used to refer to indigenous peoples of the Caucasus region.

Eurointegration “for Whites only”

Until the fall of 2013, when the Euromaidan took place, the Svoboda had often been criticized because it had not been able to decide on the European prospects for Ukraine and at same time expressed provocative anti-liberal idea unacceptable for the current EU. Social-nationalists developed demagoguery about a pro-European choice of Ukraine while interpreting this issue in the most profitable light.

“We should not just come back to Europe but instead we should help Europe return what once made it Europe, to recreate genuine fundamentals of the European. And the desire of some part of Ukrainian people to go back to the choky embrace of Asian Russia seems strange”, said one of the masterminds of the Party at a convention. We all need to fully realize that Europe ends where the Russian language, Russian mentality, Russian so called culture starts. Therefore, Russia as a political, military and alien-cultural phenomenon is the enemy of Ukraine. Thus, communism that is our fifth column of Russia in Ukraine is enemy of Ukraine. Europe is, therefore, the choice of Ukraine.

There is what to ‘save’ modern Europe from. Above all, that clearly implies the influx of migrants. “French” crime-2000 has acquired very noticeable features, one of the party articles ran. But its most distinguishing feature is criminals’ appearance. While 50 years ago an average criminal used to be a White French, he/she is now a foreigner – an Arab or a Black”.

After the rebranding of the Social National Party of Ukraine into the hand-shakable Svoboda party, its leaders’ racial attitudes have remained. For example, in February 2012, Svoboda members condemned the results of the national selection competition for the Eurovision Song Contest where dark-skinned singer Gaitana was to represent Ukraine¹.

1. Gaitana Essami is a Ukrainian singer of Ukrainian and Congolese descent whose music combines elements of jazz, funk, soul and folk music. Gaitana represented Ukraine in the Eurovision Song Contest 2012 in Baku, Azerbaijan.

It should be done as Ruslana¹ did it – showing our Ukrainian culture and performing our song. True, Gaitana sings well, but she does not represent our culture; that is why we will lose once again. The Eurovision must be a contest of national talents. Gaitana is a subnational talent, which erodes the idea of the Eurovision. So it would be better if someone who would represent Ukraine would go to the competition from our country. Otherwise, it seems that we don't want to show our face. And Ukraine will be associated with another continent, with something African”, said then Yury Sirotnyuk, a member of the Svoboda Political Council.

“With this policy, Ukraine will never be accepted in the EU. And such policy is a totally illogical choice. This will happen at every Eurovision pre-selection competition as long as the National TV Company is run by Walid Harfouche² who is far from anything Ukrainian. And millions of people who will watch this show will see that Ukraine is represented by, let's say, a person who does not belong to our race, and an opinion will get established that Ukraine is somewhere in distant Africa”, explained the Svoboda representative his complaint.

1. Ruslana Lyzhychko is a Ukrainian singer, songwriter and producer known as Ruslana. She won the 2004 Eurovision Song Contest for which she was also awarded the title of the People's Artist of Ukraine the same year.

2. A Ukrainian showman of Lebanese descent, founder of the “SOS Racism!” association.

The SNPU transformation into Svoboda

February 14, 2002 saw the 9th Convention of social-nationalists that outlined directions for the new political path of the SNPU and approved a new name of the Party: All-Ukrainian Union “Svoboda”. New head of the organization – Oleh Tyahni-bok, member of Parliament, was also chosen.

There were several reasons for such a course of action. Firstly, it was necessary to raise the prestige and respectability of the Party with a good name since the “social-nationalist” organization was associated with Adolf Hitler’s NSDAP and did not cause warm sentiments among most Ukrainian voters. Secondly, it was done to create a semantic edge for the party brand that would allow the organization to penetrate into the center and the east of the country. This strategy turned out right. The Ukrainian social nationalists apparently borrowed the name “Svoboda” from Austrian national populists from late Jörg Haider’s party, while the idea of a rebranding was suggested, some experts say, by French nationalists from the Front National.

“We ... started to understand that in order to be a success under the current regime, to play a role in the political elite, we need to change both on the inside and outside”, Tyahnybok stated back

then. For, he explained, the name “repels voters”; besides, as early as the 90s democrats gave the SNPU “the image of sort of Nazi-Fascists” – “the Blackshirts with a steel look”. And “then the idea was picked up by the current regime”.

Meetings of Tyahnibok, the leader of the Svoboda, with the public elaborated seven parts of the “Ukrainian Defense Manifesto” that came to be the key ideological document of the new party:

- Genocide of Ukrainian in the 20th century. Overcoming its consequences and restoration of justice;
- OUN-UIA. Recognition and gratitude;
- Language. Protection and diffusion;
- Information space. Liberation from occupation and national security;
- Migration. Right to Motherland;
- Energy. Independence and security;
- Society. Social and national justice.

To implement these provisions of the manifesto, public actions were organized, deputy inquiries were written, respective bills were worked out, in particular, “On lustration”, “On banning communist ideology in Ukraine”, etc. In April 2008, the Svoboda presented a new draft of the National Constitution of Ukraine based on the “Ukrainian Defense Manifesto”.

It is interesting that that some experts suspect that there is an unofficial version of the Party Manifesto that is significantly different from the registered in the Ministry of Justice version.

That idea is mentioned, among others, by Timur Streshnev in the article “Partiya Svoboda. Ariytsy na marche” (“The Svoboda Party. The March of the Aryans”): “According to Tyahnibok himself, the Social-Nationalist Party of Ukraine in its activity was guided by two Manifestos. The first one was official and legal and meant for the Ministry of Justice. It contained general ideas, like hundreds other Ukrainian political parties (I love my motherland, the people, the land, promote democracy, universal human values, want everybody to be well-off and so on). The other one was meant for

the insiders. As “nasosy” (members of the SNPU) said themselves, the document comprised 33 paragraphs. Among other provisions, there were some purely xenophobic ones: only an ethnic Ukrainian can become a member of the SNPU; only the White race can revive Great Europe; all that lies north and east of Ukrainian borders is a barbaric territory; Ukrainians are true pagans and so on”.

However, to be registered by the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine in 1995, the SNPU had to remove some “disputable” positions from its official manifesto, including:

- The Social National Party of Ukraine is aimed at acquiring political power in Ukraine to build a new state and a new society;
- The SNPU regards the Russian state as a cause of all Ukrainian woes;
- Fright against pro-Moscow sentiments and Moscow’s influence in Ukraine is a priority of the SNPU;
- The SNPU is an uncompromising opponent of the Communist ideology as well as political parties and social movements that propagate and implement it;
- All other political forces are viewed by the SNPU as either national collaborationists who betrayed the Ukrainian revolution, or national romantics – barren flowers of Ukrainian revolution who are not capable of anything but mere “revolutionary” rhetoric;
- Ukraine is the geopolitical center of Eurasia. It can only exist as a powerful country. Otherwise, it cannot be an independent state altogether. We have replaced the outdated slogan of “Independent Ukraine” with “Great Ukraine”;
- To achieve its tactical tasks, the SNPU does not constrain itself with any dogmas, but rather is guided by the spur of the moment and keeps its strategic goals in mind.

Although the SNPU removed these ideas from its official platform, the party continues to use the old version “for internal purposes”.

Fundamental Russophobia

“Svoboda’s” leaders have on many occasions argued that the party ideology is based on works by Dmytro Dontsov (1883-1973), one of the classics of Ukrainian nationalists, who since the 1920s developed the concept of integral nationalism.

John Armstrong, a student of Ukrainian nationalism, distinguished such fundamental characteristics of integral nationalism as:

- a nation is believed to be the highest value that subordinates all others; a clear totalitarian concept;
- it refers to a mystically understood idea of a unity of all individuals who form a nation; biological characteristics and the result of historical development are believed to have irrevocably united all individuals into a whole one;
- rational analytical thinking is subject to intuitively true emotions and sensations;
- the will of the nation is revealed through a charismatic leader and a nationally thinking elite united in one party;
- it propagates a proactive approach, war and violence as manifestations of nation’s biological strength.

In his young days Dontsov used to be a social-democrat and energetically fought against “Ukrainian bourgeois nationalism”. Afterwards he started to call bolshevism a merely disguise of ‘Russian Anti-Western imperialism”.

From here Dontsov drew an important conclusion for the present and future Ukrainian politics: “Deep contradiction between two antagonistic civilizations, the conflict between Europe and Russia is the foundation of the great crisis plaguing our continent... This absolute irreconcilability / incompatibility of the two cultures and inevitability of conflict between them that leads to the European crisis now and on the future is what we should bear in mind

when defining the role of Ukraine in this conflict, when defining our policy and the essence of our collective ideal”.

Concluding his idea, Dontsov declares the fight with Russia to be the collective ideal of the national idea of the Ukrainian people. This ideal, in his opinion, “is conditioned by our historic traditions, our geographic position and a special historical role we are destined to play”. Ukraine’s geographic position “made it a theatre of ceaseless fight, both political and cultural, of the two worlds: Byzantine-Tatar-Mongol and Roman-European. It broke away from the latter politically but never culturally”.

“Our centuries-old fight with chaos in the East, the defense of our own statehood and culture – all culture of the West is what lays the foundation of Ukrainian national idea that should become the base for our entire political platform”, – the Russian mastermind of the Ukrainian integral nationalism wrote. In the conclusion of his “Osnovy nashey politiki” (“Fundamentals of our policy”) Dontsov once again reiterated that “our national ideal could only come true through uncompromising fight with Russia”.

Starting in 1923, Dontsov developed his own doctrine of “pro-active nationalism” that was most fully described in the book “Nationalism” (1926). He described relations between nations according to social Darwinism. The social world of people like nature is dominated by the law of the struggle for existence exemplified by the law of competition between nations.

According to Dontsov, only strong nations with healthy instincts and developed will to power have the right to exist, while weak ones have to surrender and disappear. The key task of “pro-active nationalism” is to make Ukrainians a strong nation and to win a decent place under the sun for it. One cannot ignore parallels with Nietzsche’s superman theory and will to power concept who many consider to be an ideological forerunner of German national-socialism.

According to Dontsov, nations never equal each other. What is more, an individual nation cannot and should not be a community

of equal citizens with equal rights. Relations within nations are defined by the fact that nations are divided into castes. An initiative minority that he called “aristocracy” is at top of the hierarchical structure of the nation, while the rest of the people are “masses”, “crowds”, “plebs” and even “cattle” “that goes wherever it is led and does whatever it is said to do”.

Is this ideology fascist? As far back is 1923 Dontsov in his article “Are we fascists?” replied: “Political and moral and psychological spirit that Ukrainian nationalists believe in is no doubt fascism”. John Armstrong, a student of Ukrainian nationalism, in his turn, also points out that Dontsov’s theories and concepts “were very close to fascism and in some regards, especially in repeatedly articulating racial purity, went even further than the original fascist ideas”.

Final solution to the Russian question

“We are not Russophobes at all, for we are not against Russians as the people but against the policy of the Kremlin”, leaders and followers of Ukrainian nationalism have repeated many times. They also say that such attitude to Russian was also typical of the ideological forerunners of the current Ukrainian ultra right-wing: Stepan Bandera’s Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists. The Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UIA) also fought not with the Russian people but with all the occupants of the Ukrainian land, whether it be Russians, Poles or Germans. However, no records of fights of the UIA with the Wehrmacht were found in German archives, but this is a topic for a separate research.

What was the actual attitude of the UIA to the Russian people? To answer this question we would like to cite two passages of post-war articles by Bandera. In the post-war time, Ukrainian nationalist politicians did not have to maneuver to attract, say, swing military of the Red Army of Moskal origins.

Stepan Bandera, the leader of OUN, clearly stated his position on the “Russian question” in his famous article “Ukrainian National Revolution” (1950): “The general line of our liberation policy is based on the fact that a fight for independent Ukrainian state is a fight against Russia, not only bolshevism but against every expansionist Russian imperialism that has been typical of the Russian people. If it is replaced by a different form of a Russian imperialism, it will first of all address all its energy against independent Ukraine to enslave it. The Russian people are bound to bear this imperialism. It will make everything to keep Ukraine enslaved. This is clearly demonstrated in the political thought and sentiments of the Russian mass, of all Russian environments both communist and anti-Bolshevik”.

In the article published two years later with a self-explanatory name “S mokalyamy net obshego yazyka” (“No common language with Moskals”, 1952), Bandera repeated his idea: “History teaches us that Russia, with all its internal transformations, has never changed nor weakened its imperialism – strife for expansion, exploitation and annihilation of other peoples, particularly Ukrainian... Every regime of the Moscow prison of nations accumulated all its power, all its violent means to maintain and strengthen enslavement, predation and annihilation of Ukraine and other peoples. The Moscow people never opposed it; by and large it served as bearer of this imperialism... Every Moscow state, whether it be tsar, democratic or Bolshevik, has always been cunning to Ukraine ... and turned every form of union into most terrible enslavement. Thus, the true enemy of Ukraine has been not only the current regime, tsar or Bolshevik, not only the government and social system but the Moscow nation itself bearing the evils of imperialism and seeking to become larger, stronger and richer, not through internal growth but through enslavement of other peoples and robbing them”.

Has anything changed in this Russophobic rhetoric of the OUN after Bandera died in 1959? Not at all.

The spring of 1968 saw the 4th Great Convention of the OUN that addressed all enslaved nations and their emigrants with an open letter that had a section called “Russians are an enslaver people”. Program documents of the convention also said that “the key enemy of the Ukrainian people as well as other peoples is Russian imperialism and chauvinism embodied by not only the current Russian government but also the Russian people itself”.

The 5th Great Convention of the OUN in the fall of 1974 defined Russian as “stray colonizers” in Ukraine.

The documents of the 6th Great Convention of OUN (the fall of 1981) under the title “Defining the enemy” reads: “Our enemy is not only the current (Soviet, ed.) regime but above all the aggressor nation that is the bearer of imperialism and its defender... The Russian people are the bearer of the Russian imperialism”.

All in all, both theoreticians (Dontsov) and practitioners (Bandera) of Ukrainian nationalism openly admit that it is the Russian people itself, regardless of its ideology, that is the main enemy of Ukraine and Ukrainian people, in their opinion.

Language Myth

On December 10 2006, the then member of the Lviv regional council from the All Ukrainian Union Svoboda Iryna Farion in addressing the Ukrainian community of Lviv at the Lviv cinema called on the citizens to “resist aggressively everything Moskal”.

“Why are so many books translated into Russian rather in Ukrainian published and sold in Lviv and Ukraine? Why are Moskal pop music and Moskal commercials played in our buses? To fight this we have to resist aggressively. And I am asking you to resist everything Moskal... The Russian language in Ukraine cannot be either regional or second state but only occupant”, she said to the audience.

“We have 14 % of Ukrainians who say that their native language is Russian, which is the occupant’s language, resented Farion later.

This demonstrates that a horrible mutation in their conscious. These are 5 million degenerative Ukrainians. They should be saved”.

The official Internet forum Svoboda, where Russian is completely banned even to cite Russian sources is another example of total de-Russification, following the guidelines of Iryna Farion.

However, even back in 2008, the party’s websites occasionally had news stories in Russian that had to do with the activity of the Eastern Ukrainian party cells.

In 2007 the Svoboda party launched a campaign for purify of the Ukrainian language from swear words that, according to the PR managers of the party, came from Russian. The campaign took place on all possible levels and resonated with the society.

Svoboda members thinks that swear words were coming to the Ukrainian territory while its Eastern parts were being settled by Russian “specialists” and the Western parts after repressed Ukrainians returned from labor camps in Russia.

The anti-swear banners promoted by the Svoboda in April 2007 included for example: “Swear words turn you into a Moskal” and others. Such banners, under disguise of social advertisement were distributed in Ukrainian cities free of charge and were used as poster in the cities of the West and the center of Ukraine on trash cans, walls, mail boxes, buses and other public places.

War Myth

“Bandera and Shukhevych are the people’s heroes; they fought for our freedom!” runs a famous radical nationalist chant. However, few people know that the leader of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army and the head of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists were actually awarded the title of the Hero of Ukraine posthumously.

It was done during the Viktor Yushchenko’s presidency. Roman Shukhevych was posthumously conferred the title of Hero

of Ukraine in 2007 “for an outstanding personal contribution to the national liberation fight for freedom and independence of Ukraine and in view of the 100th anniversary of his birth and 65th anniversary of the creation of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army”.

Stepan Bandera was posthumously awarded the title of the Hero of Ukraine in 2010 for “defending national ideas and battling for an independent Ukrainian state”.

Both awards were annulled the Higher Administrative Court of Ukraine in 2011, which caused a roar of indignation of the nationalist segment of the Ukrainian society, including the country’s first President Leonid Kravchuk.

The Ukrainian nationalist environment propagates the idea that Ukraine did not win the war along with other peoples of the USSR because its legitimate (according to the ultra-nationalist interpretations as well as to the modern Ukrainian history school books) representative of the UIA (UPA) were defeated, with the territory of the country remaining occupied by the Soviets, or Russians. Therefore, Ukrainians cannot celebrate May 9, for it is Victory Day of one Ukrainian enemy against another: Eurasian prisons of nations over the Aryan Third Reich. In either case, Ukrainians, as followers of the Svoboda party believe, were destined for a second-rate subsistence in occupation.

2009 saw the peak of the myth, with the words “They defended Ukraine” and the emblem of the Ukrainian Waffen-SS “Galichina” division of volunteers that fought in 1943-1945 within Germany’s armed forces against the Red Army and anti-fascist guerrillas propaganda posted placed around Lviv. The materials were authorized by the Lviv city council as a social advertisement.

May 9, 2011 brought about confrontations between those who for and against celebrating Victory Day.

The bill passed by the Supreme Rada of Ukraine but not yet signed by the President saying that the red Victory flag was to be raised along with the Ukrainian yellow-blue flag provoked negative sentiments among radical nationalists. Svoboda follow-

ers, including members of the local government, insisted that May 9 and the red hammer and sickle flag were exclusively associated in Galicia with the victory of the Soviet regime no more humane than the Nazi one.

Young Svoboda activists coordinated by Yuri Mikhalechishin, the would be Supreme Rada member, attempted to sabotage the celebrations by attacking Great Patriot War veterans in Lviv and young people accompanying the veterans, by swinging and trying to overturn buses with the veterans inside, throwing stones, bottles and smoke grenades at them and the police and demonstratively burning copies of the Victory flag. Svoboda members also removed and treaded a wreath that was to be laid in a military cemetery, vandalized and tore off St. George Ribbons from representatives of the Russian Consulate in Lviv.

In April 2013, Lviv and Ivano-Frankivsk city council took a decision to recognize May 9 as a day of mourning and banned demonstrating on that day any symbols of non-existing states (implying the USSR).

Svoboda leaders and activists have been trying to save national-heroic mythology from deconstruction lionizing controversial heritage of the fighters for Ukrainian independence of the early and mid 20th century. For instance, the Party activists have many times sabotaged events devoted to revealing the role of the UIA, particularly in annihilating the Polish population of Volhynia on 1943 (so called massacres of Poles in Volhynia and Eastern Galicia¹).

1. The massacres of Poles in Volhynia and Eastern Galicia (Polish: rzeź wotyńska, literally: Volhynian slaughter; Ukrainian: Волинська трагедія, Volyn tragedy) were part of an ethnic cleansing operation carried out in Nazi German-occupied Poland by the Ukrainian Insurgent Army's (UPA) North Command in the regions of Volhynia (Reichskommissariat Ukraine) and their South Command in Eastern Galicia (General Government) beginning in March 1943 and lasting until the end of 1944. The peak of the massacres took place in July and August 1943, most of the victims were women and children. The actions of the UPA resulted in 35,000-60,000 Polish deaths in Volhynia and 25,000-40,000 in Eastern Galicia.

The killings were directly linked with the policies of the Bandera faction of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) and its military arm – Ukrainian Insurgent Army, whose goal specified at the Second Conference of the Stepan Bandera faction of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN-B) during 17-23 February 1943, or at

In early 2012 the Svoboda did its best to sabotage a number of public lectures by Grzegorz Rossoliński-Liebe, a Polish-German historian, who interpreted the ideology of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) of the 1930-1940s as fascist. Threats and pressure by the Svoboda resulted in the cancellation of all scheduled lectures. The only presentation of the historian took place in the Embassy of Germany in Kiev and was accompanied by a picket by Svoboda activists who called Rossoliński-Liebe a “deceitful heir of Goebbels”.

On March 14 2013 social-nationalists disrupted a presentation the book by Russian historian Nikolai Starikov “Stalin. Remember together” taking place in Kiev in a “Chitay-Gorod” book store. The hall meant for 50 people was filled with three times as many people.

At the very beginning of the presentation Svoboda activists started chanting “Ganba” (shame) and then took on other chants like “Occupants – all the way to Moscow!” and “Freedom, come and ort out the mess!” Going on with the presentation became impossible. As a result, Starikov had to leave the hall accompanied by two bodyguards and chants: “Go home, Starikov”, “Go away, b..ch!”

Gender Mythology

Apart from cultural and historical questions Svoboda members and followers are also interested in everyday life of the Ukrainian society that they see through very staunch national conservative lenses. In other words, they resent the concept of human rights, so popular among city’s left-wing intelligentsia, that the right-wing strongly associate with gender minorities rights.

least in March 1943 was to purge all non-Ukrainians from the proposed future Ukrainian state. Not limiting their activities to the purging of Polish civilians, the UPA also wanted to erase all traces of sustained Polish, Russian and Jewish presence in the area.

Examples of intolerance to gender minorities are plentiful. Thus, on March 13 2013 Svoboda members and Karpaty football club tried to thwart a campaign for gender equality of men and women that took place in Lviv within the framework of a larger campaign called “Manifa”. Such campaigns normally include movies, concerts and discussions on the role and place of women in Ukraine.

On December 8 2012 representatives of gender minorities were going to hold a campaign in Kiev timed to coincide with the World Human Rights Day. The campaign was dispersed by Svoboda activists and the police.

Anti-Semitism

Anti-Semitism in the Party is easy to trace in the scandals its leaders have been involved in. Two of them stand out. The first one took place in 2004 when “Inter” TV channel showed a few video clips from Oleh Tyahnibok’s presentation on July 17 on mount Yavora (Ivano-Frankivsk region) where a UIA leadership school used to be located. During the speech Tyahnibok employed routine Russophobic and Anti-Semitic phrases. At an event to commemorate one of the UIA leaders Tyahnibok claimed: “They were not afraid, just like we shouldn’t be afraid either. They put guns on and went to those woods, they got ready and fought with Moskals, fought with the Germans, with the Hebes and other evils that wanted to take away our Ukrainian state... It is time to give Ukraine to Ukrainians. These young people and you, the grey-haired, you are the combination that Moskal-Jewish mafia running Ukraine is most scared of”.

As a result the Svoboda leader was expelled from the Parliamentary fraction “Nasha Ukraina”, although he kept his deputy’s seat.

In March 2005 on the air of Channel 5, Tyahnibok said that since his childhood he had never betrayed his views according to

which “Non-Ukrainians never feel loyalty or mercy to Ukrainian land”. He also confirmed that in Ivano-Frankivsk he talking about “those who occupied Ukraine”: “I was talking about Russians, I was talking about Germans, I was talking about Hebes”. On the same day he said he was not going to publicly apologize to the “occupants” for his previous statements¹.

Ukrainian society and authorities, including judicial ones, are very tolerant to xenophobic manifestations unless they have something to do with Ukrainians. That is why there is nothing surprising that Oleh Tyahnibok’s statements, according to the verdicts by judicial bodies of Ukraine, were not viewed as unlawful acts.

Another Anti-Semitic scandal flamed up after Ihor Miroshnichenko, head of Svoboda organization of Sumska oblast, member of the Political Council of the Party, member of the Supreme Rada of Ukraine, sharply responded to the words of Mila Kunis, a Hollywood star, born in Ukrainian Chernivtsi, who talked about Anti-Semitism in Ukraine in an interview, Kunis recollected in terror her childhood in Chernivtsi and called America her motherland.

“She is not Ukrainian, she is a born Hebe. She is proud of it and let her pin a Star of David on her shoulder. But no positive word of the country she was born in has been heard from her. That’s why I can’t bring myself to call her one of us. Let her love her Gaymerica and Israel, and one shouldn’t associate her with Ukraine”, – wrote the Member of Parliament from the Svoboda on his page in Facebook.

Miroshnichenko himself insists on the use of word “Hebe”, traditional for the Ukrainian language, unlike “Jewish”, which is a Russian-Soviet term. Iryna Farida, a scandalous “philologist” from the Svoboda supported her colleague in this regard. She pub-

1. In 6 years, on June 20 2011 during his trip to Ivano-Frankivsk region Yushchenko, already ex-president of Ukraine, called Svoboda an “ultra right-wing party with visible elements of Nazism”. Yushchenko also said that Tyahnibok would not manage to “become a real leader even for a part of the nation”, while Svoboda had no chance to come to “reflect national interests of voters from the Western and Central Ukraine”.

lished an article that said that “the hyperbolic antithesis of friend-enemy / us-them, or Ukrainian – Hebe / German / Moskal turns into a means to impose a certain ideologem, in other words a successful and journalistic device”.

Nationalists are sure that ethnic composition of Ukrainian oligarchs and the share of Russian business in the country’s economy prove the point of Tyahnibok’s who is confident that “Moskal-Hebe Mafia” exists.

Yuri Mikhalchishin is another scandalous Party member. Many justly regard him as the most radical Member of Parliament from the Svoboda. Thus, nachtigal88, his nickname in LiveJournal, is a clear reference to “Nachtigal” battalion that was formed by Abwehr largely from members and followers of Bandera’s OUN to act on the territory of Western Ukraine and that, some researchers think, took part in bloody Jewish massacres in Lviv in June of 1941. Number 88 is a popular ultra right code that corresponds to “h”, the eight letter of Latin alphabet, which means «Heil Hitler».

In 2010 Mikhalchishin published “Social-Nationalism Textbook”, a 420-page collection of translated articles by Goebbels, Mussolini, Röhm, Strasser and other Nazi and Fascist leaders mixed with the text by Mikhalchishin, Ilyenko and others.

The collection, for example, includes an article by Joseph Goebbels, the key propaganda leader of the Third Reich, called “The Little ABCs of a National-Socialism” that repeatedly uses such words as “Hebe”, “Yid” and the like. Mikhalchishin also calls the political and educational structure set up by the Svoboda nothing short of “Joseph Goebbels Political Research Center”.

Crimea and Tatar Allies of Svoboda

In the summer of 2013 authors of this book went to Crimea and Sevastopol. We were driven around the peninsula by a taxi driver, a former Soviet officer. When we started to talk about politics, he surprised us by saying he was happy with the victory of the Svoboda at the parliamentary elections and the rapid spreading of Bandera's ideas in Ukrainian society. "But you are Russian", argued we. "This is exactly why I am so happy. The more Nazi are there in the government, the sooner Ukraine will fall apart", he said not blinking. None of us expected back then that in less than a year the peninsula so unhappy with the nationalist policy of the new revolutionary government would return to Russia.

But let's go back to earlier times. Fully settled in Galicia, the Svoboda never stopped extending its political appetites onto "Non-Bandera" region of Ukraine, even onto the Autonomous Republic of Crimea.

On December 26 2009 the Svoboda intended to march along the streets of Sevastopol protesting against illegal migration (similar marches took place in other cities of the country). The march was to start at the Suvorov square finishing at Nakhimov's square.

But 150 participants in the demonstration did not manage to reach the final destination.

“Official” slogans of the campaign were to include: “To annul the readmission agreement with the EU!”, “Illegal aliens, go home!” and “Ukraine belongs to Ukrainians”. However, young Svoboda activists many of whom were wearing black balaclavas kept chanting: “Commies to impale”, “Suckers” and so on.

Hundreds of activists of Russian and pro-Russian organizations, as well as members of Ukrainian Communist Party and Nataliya Vitrenko socialists blocked the way of Svoboda activists. A police cordon supported by Berkut Special Forces divided them. Smoke grenades, plastic bottles, stones were used, and some of the aggressive Svoboda followers were detained.

In as soon as a week, on January 6 2010 Oleh Tyahnibok, leader of Svoboda and then presidential candidate, paid a visit to Sevastopol.

The guest was met by hundreds (some say thousands) of angry citizens at the main entrance of the Business and Culture Center. The protesters held flags of different parties, banner saying “Fascists will fail in Sevastopol” and Tyahnibok’s caricatures. The leader of Svoboda and his followers convoyed by the police and officers of Security Service of Ukraine entered the building on the sly through the back door.

The previously announced meeting with the voters was urgently called a meeting with the party members. Common Sevastopol city-dwellers were not allowed. The building of the Center was surrounded by a double police cordon. Berkut officers were held ready too.

Around 14.20 protesters managed to get through the cordons and hurried to the back entrance to the building but were stopped by the police. A fight started, with a number of people arrested. The buses brought by Tyahnibok’s party members were hit with stones and one window was broken.

Around 15.35 a special car and a minibus were driven right to the back door of the Business and Culture Center and Oleh Tyah-nibok and his fellow party members were driven away.

After such “hearty” reception leaders of Ukrainian social-nationalists avoided visiting the peninsula. On the other hand, their rhetoric on the status of the regions turned even harsher. Thus, in June 2013 Ihor Shvaika, Deputy Chairman of the Parliamentary Committee on Rules, Ethics and Support to Work of the Supreme Rada of Ukraine, member of “Svoboda, said: “We are demanding the question of annulling the autonomous status of Crimea and special status of Sevastopol be put on for an All-Ukrainian referendum. This is part of our manifesto. We are planning to hold such a referendum”. According to him, Sevastopol “is a stable ground for anti-Ukrainian sentiments”.

In August 2013 Eduard Leonov, one of the followers of Svoboda leader, Member of Parliament, confirmed that the Party still cherished the idea to eliminate Crimean autonomy and turn it into a regular oblast – a Tauric one: “Fundamental goals of Svoboda include annulling Crimean autonomy and the current status of Sevastopol”.

It was only when Crimea got under control of the republic militia Self-Defense Force and announcing the referendum to leave Ukraine and rejoin Russia that new national revolutionary authorities in Kiev changed their rhetoric and agreed on negotiations to give Crimea and Sevastopol greater autonomy. However, that reminded some commentators of frenzied activity by Alfred Rosenberg, Reich Minister for the Occupied Eastern Territories, at the end of war when the territories were no longer under Germany’s control, with such activity solely illusory and declaratory.

The Mejlis of the Crimean Tatar People happened to be the only ally of radical Ukrainian nationalists on the peninsula. While fighting with “Moskal separatists” Svoboda along with other then opposition (now ruling) forces relied on the support of Crimean Tatars promising them ... national autonomy. Thus, rep-

representatives of the Mejlis and Svoboda declared their intentions to seek Crimean Tatar territorial autonomy status for Crimea on May 18 2013 at the All-Ukrainian mourning meeting to commemorate Crimean Tatar Deportations.

The end of radical Ukrainian neo-Nazism in Crimea was ignominious, though. On March 11 2014 the Supreme Council of Crimea banned Svoboda nationalist party and the “Right Sector” whose members took part in unrest in Kiev. The ban extends to organization that a part of the “Right Sector”, such as “Stepan Bandera Tryzub (trident)”, UNA-UPSD, “Patriots of Ukraine”, “Carpathian Sich”, Dmytro Korchynecky “Brotherhood” and other factions. Members of the Crimean Parliament view such structures as “threatening life and safety of the people living in the region”.

“Authorities of the Crimean Autonomous Republic are taking all possible measures to prevent extremists from entering its territory”, – says the explanatory note to the draft resolution.

Svoboda crosses The Dnieper River

In 1998 the Party (back then SNPU) within “Menshe Slov” (fewer words) electoral block gained 0,16% votes at parliamentary elections.

In 2006 Svoboda participated in parliamentary elections separately, winning 0,36% votes (and 0,85% votes from abroad)

At snap elections in 2007 it got 0,76% votes (and 0,28% votes from abroad).

In 2012 – 10,44% (and 23,63%, which is almost a quarter of the of the total number of people who voted abroad).

That gave the Party 25 seats in the Rada. It got 12 seats more in majority constituencies. The rise in electoral support is more than obvious.

The distribution of votes in Ukrainian regions is also impressive. There is a stunning contrast between the first and the last results at the Supreme Rada elections of 2012: 38,02% in Lviv oblast and 1,07% in Crimea.

The party successfully overcame 10% threshold in 7 regions of the country (from 10,84% to 38,02%) and Kiev (17,33%). It is important that the largely Russian-speaking Kiev gave it almost 7% more than one of the Ukrainian-speaking regions (10,84%).

In another 10 oblasts the Party easily overcame 5% threshold (5,19-10,48%), including central areas (Zhytomyr Oblast, Vinnytsia Oblast, Cherkassy, Poltava), north-eastern (Sumskaya, Chernihiv) and eastern (Dnipropetrovsk).

The Party showed unexpectedly good results in the east of the country (except Donbass). No analytics could foresee 3,30% in Odessa and 4,71% in Kherson oblast.

The rapidly rising support for the Party from 2006 to 2012 by Ukrainian citizens living abroad and voting in foreign constituencies also requires analysis. While in 2006 this support was within the margin of error, in 6 years at the parliamentary elections social-nationalists would win abroad, with 23,63%. The Party of Regions gained 23,27% of foreign votes, “UDAR” – 22,11%, “Batkivshchyna” (or the All-Ukrainian Union “Fatherland”) – 19,85%, Ukrainian Communist Party – 3,46% and Yushchenko’s “Nasha Ukraina” (Our Ukraine) – 2,09%.

The analysis of the path of the Svoboda Party to the political top highlights a few factors that cumulatively ensured its success at 2012 Parliamentary Elections. Among them:

- 1) Clear modern ideology, unlike vague positions of other opposition groups;
- 2) Over the 20 years of its existence the Party had little to do with the executive power, which is why, in voters’ perspective, it was not responsible for two disastrous decades for the people and the country;
- 3) The core of the organization is made up of young people who do not remember the USSR and have been brought up by the All-Ukrainian educated system as well as nationalist and Russophobic mythology;
- 4) Growing internal revanchist expectations against a low percent of the establishment is the main idea of the social requirements of the society;
- 5) Gradual adaptation of ideological views to the “situation” and some easing of blatantly racist positions;

- 6) Effective compilation of different PR methods both at mainstream and street level;
- 7) Adaptation of some typical left-wing methods of work with the youth and the larger population;
- 8) Radicalization of social discourse aimed to shape an image of internal almost class enemy (Ukrainian foreign oligarchs);
- 9) Lack of internal factions, determined policy toward unitary party model;
- 10) Diversification of financial sources, establishing independent material resources;
- 11) Regular participation in most protest campaigns, attempts to monopolize social protest;
- 12) Unabated paternalist sentiments of a significant part of Ukrainian society.

Parties similar to the Svoboda have long been seen on the political arena of Europe. Nevertheless, according to Andreas Umland, a famous student of ultra right-wing movements, Svoboda has a number of features distinguishing it from comparable organizations abroad.

For example, Umland points out:

- 1) “Svoboda’s” appeal to imminent (according to the Party’s masterminds) external threat posed by Russia;
- 2) A contradiction between a high concentration of electoral core of the Party in Galicia and All-Ukrainian status as its objective;
- 3) Cooperation with other parties of Ukrainian opposition that regard themselves as democratic;
- 4) Mainly non-ideological support for the Party by some voters.

Just two years before the Euromaidan, one was almost sure that the sanitary cordon, a watershed between political ultra right-

wing and democrats, existing in Europe had almost disappeared (if never fully existed in the beginning) in Ukraine. The position of the Euroliberals is non-cooperation with organizations of the kind. Nevertheless, “Batkvshchyna” with Arseniy Yatsenyuk and “UDAR” with Vitali Klitschko ignore this.

“Party of Power” Special Project

Back in 2003-2004 at the Orange Revolution, flamboyant Oleh Tyahnibok was called the main threat to Viktor Yushchenko’s rising rating in central regions of the country crucial in terms of the outcome of the Presidential elections. Back then Yanukovich staff representatives used radical Tyahnibok with his demonization of the “Moskal-Jewish Mafia” within Yushchenko team as the main straw man for swing voters.

Tyahnibok’s All-Ukrainian Svoboda Union and Yanukovich’s Party of Regions ... There seemed to be no other more different parties on the Ukrainian political landscape until recently. Their contrast is in everything ranging from ideology and history to electoral support regions and attitude to the incumbent authorities. Nevertheless, as soon as the fall of 2009 experts and journalists began to refer to the Svoboda as a successful special project of the Party of Regions.

The idea is simple: to “bite a couple of percent off” Yulia Tymoshenko block’s electorate in the traditionally opposition Western regions. The Party of Regions could not do much there and launching a new party from scratch was too costly, and the result would take too long to wait for. That is why relying on an existing political force whose authenticity was beyond doubts seemed a good alternative.

This is how the idea of a “third power” – that would not be involved in political games of the Orange-Blue party members and,

on the other hand, could provide a relatively new political platform – emerged.

Commenting his attitude to Tyahnibok's party, Vladislav Lukyanov, Member of the Parliament from the Party of Regions, then stated that a likely victory of Svoboda at parliamentary elections should not be regarded as a danger. "You should not be afraid of anything. This is our Ukrainian force... I cannot rule out that it will get into the Supreme Rada... I hope they will have a healthy constructive position... Even if we agree that they are bastards, they are our bastards", – said then the politician.

In October 2010 Taras Stetskiv, Member of the Parliament from the "Narodnaya Samooborona" (People's Self-Defense) said that the Party of Regions would control local authorities in the West of Ukraine with the help of the "Svoboda". According to Stetskiv, Yanukovich's party "is constructing the key and most convenient opponent, which is "Svoboda", that has brought the Ukraine nothing but nationalist rhetoric and ultra radicalism with a touch of hysteria. These are the two leverages that the Party of Regions is going to rely on to control the local authorities in Western Ukraine". In response, Tyahnibok blamed his former fellow member of the national liberation movement for nothing short of betrayal and said he was shocked by such behavior.

As soon as 2011, experts started to say that Oleh Tyahnibok was yet meant to play his key role in the play staged by the Party of Regions. They implied presidential elections due in 2015 where, according to the puppeteers, Yanukovich and Tyahnibok were supposed to compete in the second round. And then the people of Ukraine were to back the incumbent president as the lesser evil in a united anti-Fascist urge. Sociologist Iryna Bekeshkina argued that with criminal cases against Yulia Tymoshenko (Ukraine's PM in 2005 and 2007-2010) and Yuri Lutsenko (home minister of Ukraine in 2005-2006 and 2007-2010) the authorities sought, among other things, to "weaken" them and "drag out Tyahnibok as the key opposition force".

In June 2011, Orest Muts, Member of Parliament and President of Ternopol oblast office of the “Party of Regions”, responded vaguely to the question if his party funded the Svoboda: “We help everybody. We take care of everyone who is poorer than us because we are a strong rich party, a party of professionals. If some party lacks financial support, we help it and are not ashamed of it. And if the politicians we help are ashamed of it, it is their problem”.

At the same time Spiridon Kilinkarov, Member of Parliament from the Communist Party of Ukraine, said that, in his opinion, financing Svoboda by the Party of Regions “takes place considering the Party’s passive reaction to inadequate activity of Svoboda members and followers at times bordering terrorism”. Kilinkarov also expressed an opinion that if Tyahnibok’s party constituted any danger to the Party of Regions, they then would have arguments to stop neo-Fascist methods of this party”.

On the other hand, Mikhail Chechetov, Party of Regions Member of Parliament, was quick to say that his party did not provide any financial support to other political forces. “The Party of Regions has other expenses to worry about, – said Chechetov. – We do not fund some idlers from other political forces”.

In September 2011, Oleksandr Moroz, leader of the Socialist Party of Ukraine, in addressing the party’s 20th anniversary also pointed at the financial support for the Svoboda by the Party of Regions: “Oleh Tyahnibok does not come off TV screens on the money of the “Party of Regions””.

A year passed. During electoral campaign in the fall of 2012 Svoboda speakers came to be frequent and welcome guests on TV, particularly, in popular Ukrainian political talk-shows anchored by Russian Savik Shuster and Evgeniy Kiselyev. The anchors once squeezed out from Russia had little to do with the Ukrainian social-nationalists either in terms of language, or background, or political views. What is more, pretty modest electoral results of Svoboda over its history had little to count for vast coverage of the Party in independent media on the eve of regular Supreme Rada elections.

Nevertheless, Tyahnibok's party was given green light, which is hard to imagine without a sanction from "above". And Svoboda grasped the opportunity quite successfully. For it never suffered from lack of speakers showing the electorate its catchy, clear and simple theses of nationalist and protest nature. The result is well-known.

In March 2013 Pyotr Simonenko, leader of the Communist Party of Ukraine, explicitly expressed his views on Svoboda funding on the air of the "Era-FM radio: "Oligarchs entirely control Svoboda parliamentary group. The Party of Regions fully financed election of the Party into the Parliament, just like other oligarchs had previously financed their elections into Ternopol, Ivano-Frankivsk and Lviv oblast council".

Strangely, "regionals" themselves gradually came to admit their contribution into popularizing "Svoboda". Thus, in April 2013 Igor Markov, the Party of Regions Member of Parliament, also head of the "Rodina" ("Motherland") Party, lamented the "political leadership": "Would you tell me, please, if you know any other non-parliamentary party that would have as much air right before elections as Svoboda did? Even parliamentary parties did not have as much air as it did. I have an impression that some strategists or analysts appeared to have convinced the political leadership to scare the South-East with fascists". Markov also added that, in his opinion, they went too far with Svoboda: "You can longer tell them: Guys, that's enough! We have lost the elections, and your part is done here!"

The gene of social nationalism had been let out of the bottle and it was impossible to put it back with old methods, such as administrative recourse almost fully destroyed by the Euromaidan. Svoboda, whether it has the support of the authorities or not, is an self-sustained party with tested ideology and strong structure. It exists and wins despite rather than due to the current political trends. These trends now imply that the choice between radicalism and stability is not so clear. At least due to lack – after Presi-

dent Yanukovich fled the country – of a political force capable of ensuring such stability, which the bureaucratic Party of Regions somehow managed to do.

In 2011-2012 Oleh Tyahnibok was a leader of a small local party, noisy rather than influential, while now he heads a parliamentary structure enjoying some support in all regions of the country in avant-garde of the united opposition. Stakes are much higher here.

The Party of Regions seems to have forgotten an old Russian saying: curses like chickens come home to roost.

National Socialism from Krupp to Kolomoyskyi

Napoleon Bonaparte is credited as saying: “Waging a war requires three things – money, money and more money”. Nobody would argue with the French emperor. At the same time, Carl von Clausewitz, Prussian officer, Napoleon’s adversary, said that “War is the continuation of politics by other means”. And politics is known to also require money, often a lot.

No political party can survive without financial sources needed to maintain an office, flags, media, agitation, leaders’ trips and so on. Ideally, no party penny sticks to the fingers of leaders. Since Svoboda members have not been recorded to either actively collect dues, or expropriate banks, the question about its funding is valid.

History knows a lot of examples of “strange” financial connections between at first glance completely different people and political forces. Thus, Savva Morozov, a famous Russian entrepreneur and philanthropist, funded social democratic “Iskra” paper and helped to set up the first Bolshevik legal newspapers “Novaya Zhizn” and “Borba”. Morozov illegally brought banned literature and printing type into his factory and hid from the police Nikolay Bauman, one of the Bolshevik leaders in 1905.

Hitler's NSDAP was sponsored at different stages of the struggle for power by not only big German manufacturers and tycoons, namely Gustav Krupp, but also large bankers of Jewish background. For example, researchers name, among Hitler's key sponsors, Max Warburg, Oskar Wasserman, Hans Priwin and even Baron Rothschild. Who has been financing Svoboda activity?

Taras Berezovets, political spin-doctor, was the first to publicly talk about "Svoboda's" sponsors in 2008 in an interview for "Noviy Region" (New Region). Deliberating about the Party prospects he pointed out that "for the moment" Oleh Tyahnibok "has stable financing... The money is coming from Ihor Kolomoyskyi, "Privat Group" owner". At the same time, the spin-doctor clarified that this was just "according to the most popular theory". "Kolomoyskyi is hoping that Tyahnibok will steal Timoshenko's voices, while tensions between "Privat Group" and the PM are no secret", – he said in the interview.

Wikipedia says that Ihor Kolomoyskyi, Ukrainian entrepreneur was born on February 13, 1963 in Dnipropetrovsk. He is a citizen of both Ukraine and Israel, a member of supervisory boards of "Privat-Bank", "Naftochimik Prikarpatya" oil-refining factory and "Ukrnafta" oil-producing company, vice-president of the Football Federation of Ukraine and head of European Jewish Council. Some political scientists think he is one of the most influential people in Ukraine.

It is hard to tell where this most popular theory has come from. However, many have been talking about it since 2008. For example, in March 2009 Pyotr Simonenko, head of the Communist Party of Ukraine, Member of Parliament, said that financing Svoboda electoral campaign to get into Ternopol oblast council was provided by Ihor Kolomoyskyi. "Do you see what was done with the elections in Ternopol? I reminded representatives of this (Jewish, ed.) people that in 1932 they brought Hitler to power, while Kolomoyskyi was the one to finance elections of "Svoboda", – said Simonenko.

He also reminded that before taking its current name the Party was called the Social Nationalist Party of Ukraine and compared it with Hitler's party based on similar ideas: "They first brought Hitler to power, and the Holocaust took place".

The answer to Simonenko was given not by Svoboda or Kolomoyskyi himself but by ... The Jewish Committee of Ukraine. It made a statement that expressed indignation at Simonenko's words. "The Jewish Committee of Ukraine thinks such provocative statements are unacceptable and demands that the Communist leader apologizes to the Jewish community of Ukraine, – says the Jewish Committee note, – by his statement Pyotr Simonenko basically repeated Hitler himself who on many occasions claimed that it was the Jews who brought the Bolsheviks to power and it was the Jews who unleashed the Second World War".

The leader of the Communist Party was by far not the only politician to insist on the "Jewish trace" in financing Svoboda. For example, Sergey Ratushnyak, ex-mayor of Uzhhorod and 2010 presidential candidate, said: "As for Tyahnibok's Svoboda, they are also financed by the Jews. Kolomoyskyi is a Jew. Why would he cry about the Jews, when he is funded by them?... Oligarchs' avarice knows no limits. Neither retirement benefits, nor salaries are raised. It is horrible for both Jews and Ukrainians. In case of food riots, Jews are going to be the first to suffer".

In December 2010 Ihor Kolomoyskyi himself said that Svoboda could come to be the leader in the West and Center of Ukraine. "Judging by what I see on TV, Svoboda appears to have shifted from ultra nationalism closer to the center, to have become more moderate. While their electorate used to be 2-3% of marginalized people, their electoral base has risen now. They might well soon become the leaders of the West and the Center of Ukraine", – he said pointing out that Svoboda was beginning to take a niche left after the "collapse" of the previous leaders of the "Orange movement" – "Nasha Ukraina" and Yulia Tymoshenko's block.

“Hopefully, the bigger base of support it has, the closer it will shift to the center”, – he added.

In late 2010 Viktor Nebozhenko, director of “Ukrainian barometer” sociological agency, confirming financing of Svoboda by Kolomoyskyi, stated that the latter was “repeating the mistake of the German oligarchs who thought that fascism pose no threat”. “Everybody remembers how it all ended. They had to flee”, – reminds Nebozhenko. On the other hand, he added that in his opinion at that point (late 2010) Svoboda was already using different financial sources.

In October 2010 Oleh Tyahnibok, “Svoboda’s” leader, told TBI TV channel in an interview that “nobody can say what can control All-Ukrainian Svoboda union and Oleh Tyahnibok”. “I am officially saying that we do not depend financially on anybody”, – the Party leader said. He also pointed out that social-nationalists were funded by neither the Party of Regions in 2006-2007, nor Ihor Kolomoyskyi in 2007.

But not everyone accepted this answer. Thus, in November 2011 Sergey Khrapov, Communist member of Parliament, said that “In today’s situation on the political arena oligarchs are “putting eggs in different baskets” hoping to see a chicken in at least one. For example, Ihor Kolomoyskyi fixed his eyes on the Western Ukraine where he is financing Svoboda”.

In early September 2012, two months before elections into the Supreme Rada, Ukrainian Forbes published an article about internal kitchen of the All-Ukrainian Svoboda Union. According to the magazine, Svoboda members insisted that the key feature distinguishing them from other political forces was their self-financing. All Svoboda sponsors are members of the so called Economic Council of the Party. It is headed by Ihor Krivetsky, the then former Lviv oblast Council member. He owns the “Fashion Club” casino and a number of other entertainment places in Lviv that are part of Private Joint Stock Company “Fiesta-Fantastika”.

In the fall of 2012 the Economic Council numbered 200 members. “This is an interest club of people who can provide the Party with financial help. They were promised up to 25% of the seats when making the Party candidate list but only 3 members of the Economic Council were given seats”, – said Yuri Sirotiyuk, the Party spokesperson and currently Member of Parliament. According to him, such councils operate in each oblast and municipal party structure, and taken together they form the Economic Council of the Party. Entrepreneurs who are members of the councils monthly transfer volunteer donations as well as membership fees into the party fund.

Andriy Ilyenko, leader of Kiev Svoboda city organization and currently Member of Parliament, says that 15 people from the capital regularly sponsor the Party. They monthly transfer several dozen thousand hryvnias¹ that go to prepare propaganda materials, to buy equipment, to pay for transportation and venues.

After Svoboda got through to the Supreme Rada in October 2012, Ihor Kolomoyskyi, reelected head of United Jewish Community of Ukraine, made a political statement calling on Jews “to not fall into panic”.

Some experts say that relations between social-nationalists and Kolomoyskyi remain. Thus, Taras Chornovyl, a former Member of Parliament and famous politician, said in March 2013 that Kolomoyskyi “had recently been playing some game” with Svoboda leader. According to Chornovyl, with all the gratitude and understanding that they had been helped, Svoboda members will play along at some Rada votes but will simply not be able to act directly. Kolomoyskyi has not been able to put stakes on any less Orthodox than Svoboda; that is why he will actively look for some ways to get to Yanukovich”.

It is hard to tell if Kolomoyskyi has financed or is financing Svoboda. On the other hand, the Party’s caution as regards the “Jewish question” has been noticeable. In fact, fingers of one

1. Hryvnia is the Ukrainian currency. In April 2014: \$1 = 11 hryvnias.

hand are enough to count all the anti-Semitic scandals involving leaders of “Svoboda”. The Yavorina mount speech by Tyahnibok, Facebook post by Miroschnichenko and... That is about it. Is it connected with any Jewish sponsorship or could be with their desire to be “handshakeable” in the West that views Anti-Semitism as a greater sin than Russophobia? Some analysts who the authors spoke with while preparing the book suggested a strict internal party prohibition within Svoboda regarding the “Jewish question”. All the hatred meant for somebody else is channeled against the Kremlin, “Moskals” and “Commies”.

Let’s move back to the present when the Euromaidan wins. Indignation over corruption and oligarchs in power have been at the core of the people’s protests in Kiev and other Ukrainian cities at the turn of 2013-2014. Oleksand Turchynov (“Batkivshchyna”), appointed acting President of Ukraine by the revolutionary Supreme Rada, understood the goals and objectives of the Party in a different way. Firing Dmitry Kolesnikov, head of Dnipropetrovsk oblast administration, he appointed billionaire Ihor Kolomoyskyi, co-owner of “Privat Bank”, second richest person in Ukraine (with \$3,645 billion) and one of the most influential people in the country. Before then Kolomoyskyi use to spend most of the time in Switzerland.

If it is what Kolomoyskyi sought supporting at some stages, as some think, the radical revolutionary Svoboda Party, we will never know.

Pulp Fiction Made in Galicia

After surprisingly high results at 2012 parliamentary elections, “internal kitchen” financial questions of the Svoboda have been raised more often. While the ruling Party of Regions, as many believe, mercilessly robbed the population, what to expect from parliamentary freshmen who have always tried to shun financial

questions? In summer-winter 2013 “Express-Online” published a number of articles under the general name “Grosny Tyahniboka” (Tyahnibok’s Penny) trying to understand where not the richest party and its leader were getting the pennies from.

In as long as 2009 Tyahnibok mentioned in an interview for “Ukrainian Pravda” (Ukrainian Truth) that Andrian Gutnik, “the old member of our party”, was its key sponsor. Gutnik has a construction business, woodworking factories in Ternopol oblast and a water park; he is also a city council member. Ihor Koshulynskiy, head of the campaign office of the Party, confirmed the information as well. However, “Express” journalists doubted the reliability of the information about financial support for Svoboda by Gutnik.

As they found out, the “woodworking factories” never bringing much profit “have long ago rotted and rusted away”. As for the water park nearing bankruptcy, with net assets much lower than the stated capital, Gutnik was only head of the supervisory board. The enterprise took two loans worth 100 million hryvnias but never paid them off. When the media requested to show the tax returns over the last few years to prove the businessman’s financial abilities to provide funding for the Party, Gutnik refused as expected (although the Party had always talked about its “full transparency”). “Write to the Fiscal Authorities”, – he replied knowing that the former cannot help the journalists quoting the law regulating disclosure of private data.

The question where the Party gets money to finance its numerous events, pay for “released” activists as well as followers among the unemployed and students has remained. The Party leader himself lives in a two-story flat in a Lviv building constructed by the Austrians before World War I. He drives a premium class Toyota Sequoia four-by-four. According to Tyahnibok, he has every right to drive such car as head of a parliamentary party. Even more so, Tyahnibok says, the Party decided that he was to have this car.

There is a YouTube video where one can see three almost identical Sequoias coming to party events. In an interview, Tyahnibok said that the car in fact belongs to Ihor Miroshnichenko, his fellow party member. We wonder which car of the three, and who the other two belong to.

“Express” journalists went further and asked where the former sport journalist with the salary of \$1000 got the car worth Miroshnichenko’s eight year salaries. And how in the world was Miroshnichenko able to so easily give away his Sequoia?

The journalists think that the long-haired Svoboda member is a chain of a “grey” scheme of getting money from ... The communists. They publish a sales document of the Svoboda member for a modern office building in Kiev (4 Ananasnaya Street) that used to be a newspaper office of the “Communist Flag” that was later renamed “Kiev Vestnik”. Setting ideology aside one could just say that there is nothing personal, it’s only business. And drop the subject. But for one “but”: the building was sold ten (!) times as cheap as its average market price. Now one has to understand if Ihor Miroshnichenko is in fact a secret communist only pretending to be a Bandera advocate, or if he received the difference in the deal in black cash to evade taxation.

The journalists drew a conclusion that in fact there are two Svoboda parties registered by the Ministry of Justice rather than one. The one is represented by dedicated “dressed-up” party members such as Andriy Ilyenko, Iryna Farion, Yuri Mikhalchishin, Ruslan Koshulinskiy, Leontiy Martynyuk, etc. The other one is only represented by the people with “a special background” who have recently come to Svoboda but have already managed to take on some middle and somewhat top leading roles. In this regard, Ihor Krivetskiy attracted the journalists’ attention. In the late 2000s, the businessman whose family owns Maybach, Bentley, Porsche, Ferrari and a private plane got actively engaged in politics. In 2010 he became member of Lviv oblast council representing Svoboda

(№5 in the Party electoral list). He is also a member of the Economic Council of the Party. At 2012 parliamentary elections he was deputy head of the central campaign office of Svoboda in economic issues, later becoming a Member of the Parliament (№13 in the Party list). He is also the secretary for the Supreme Rada Fiscal and Customs Policy Committee.

To conduct a journalist investigative, “Express” employees went to Mohnatoye village of Turkovskiy area in Lviv oblast, Krivetskiy motherland. “We came up with the first theories as soon as we showed former officers of the Directorate for Combating Organised Crime, – wrote the reporters. – They quickly confirmed that that was the picture of the man who used to be known under the nickname “Pups” (Kewpie doll)”. Krivetskiy, according to the officers, came to inherit criminal funds of Kolya Rokero’s, a big Ukrainian Mafiosi, who died under strange circumstances. Some reports say that Rokero was killed by order of Vova Morda (Wladimir Didukha), another criminal authority; other reports say that Pups himself, who used to be Rokero’s second-in-command, wanted to take control of his patron’s fortune. Either way, according to law enforcement officials, after Rokero died, Pups and Vova Morda got together and have been both involved in racket.

Ukraine learnt about Bova Morda from ... President Viktor Yushchenko. Addressing the grand body of the Ministry for Internal Affairs in 2006 the then President angrily commanded police generals: “How many divisions do you need to eliminate this Morda?”

At some point Krivetskiy and Didukha realized that they had better go into politics; otherwise the law enforcement authorities would take a close look at them. They found no difficulty joining Svoboda – the Party back then was in urgent need for money. Shared hatred for Yushchenko soon made Didukha and Tyahnibok unofficial allies. Morda could not forgive Yushchenko the disgrace, while Tyahnibok held a grudge against him since Yushchenko had

expelled him from “Nasha Ukriana” after his famous speech at Yavorina mount on the eve of 2004 elections.

Did Krivetskiy and Didukha believe that Svoboda would pay off? the answer was given as early as 2010 when the Party of Regions – that put Viktor Yanukovich, its man, in the President’s chair – needed to find a way to cut the ground from under Timoshenko’s feet, its key opponent, with the West of Ukraine its headquarters. According to the reporters, the stakes of Didukha’s (who had close ties with Donetsk criminal world) then proved right – Tyahnibok’s party – had tamed by Krivetskiy financial injections – perfectly played the role designed in the Party of Regions office. Timoshenko’s Batkivshchyna (All-Ukrainian Union “Fatherland”) was artfully banned from taking part in elections through court action, while Tyahnibok stepping over his opposition ally entered local councils in the West of Ukraine, replacing Timoshenko’s people. That was the outcome of the tacit agreement between the criminal worlds of the West and the East. It was at these elections that Krivetskiy first became member of a local council. It was his first benefit in politics.

So, where did the Svoboda party led in financial matters by Krivetskiy start to get money from? the sources described by the “Express” journalists are as follows:

- Bribes for Svoboda members of parliament consenting to sell public property through ambiguous schemes, giving different permissions to rent land, etc.;
- “Kickbacks” from budget “development programs” in local councils controlled by Svoboda;
- Arranging paperwork in the name of phantoms for land and public property followed by a resale or lease;
- Protection racket for sale of smuggled goods and infringing merchandise on the territories run by councils with Svoboda majority, with Svoboda cooperating with corrupt law enforcement bodies;

- Withdrawing cash from economic circulation of public businesses that are run by the Party members appointed with the help of Svoboda;
- Cheating banks through front companies, with the Party protecting participants in the scheme;
- Money from oligarchs and large financial industrial group “for loyalty” on the territories where Svoboda controls local councils;
- Implementing “dirty” political work.

This list, the reporters say, goes on and on. However, even the given data are enough to understand that why Svoboda and Tyahnibok are so sensitive to questions about their financial sources. They have a lot to conceal and to lose. In this regard, it makes sense to ask why the Party dramatically changed its attitude to, say, shale gas production in Western Ukraine or why does it heavily lobby unsafe medicine. This, however, goes beyond our research.

Ukrainian Neo-Nazism against “Moscow” Orthodox Church

Svoboda representatives cherish the history of Zaporizhian Sich regarding Cossack self-government as the forerunner of Ukrainian statehood. Svoboda activists from Kherson even told the authors of the book that heroic Zaporizhian Cossacks were Ukrainian nationalists. Whether it is true or not, we are no judge. On the other hand, it is obvious that Oleh Tyahnibok and most other Svoboda leaders would never be accepted into Sich, if they lived in the times of Cossack freedom. It is that it was exclusively Orthodox believers who were accepted into Sich, while Greek Catholic leaders of the new Ukrainian nationalism have somewhat clouded relationship.

Although Svoboda formally keeps its doors open to both Uniates (or Greek Catholics) and Orthodox, the Party leaders apparently do not get along with the Ukrainian Orthodox Church (Moscow Patriarchate), let alone the Russian Orthodox Church. Thus, in 2006 Svoboda carried out a campaign to recognize UOC activity “unconstitutional”.

The leader of Greek Catholic Svoboda has later many times expressed his far from warm sentiments to the “Moskal” Church.

For example, when in July 2011 Lviv oblast council session addressed the question to thank Igor Vozyakov, a Russian philanthropist who gave a rare icon the “Protection of Our Most Holy Lady” (1560) to the museum of Lviv worth \$350,000, Tyahnibok cried with rage: “You can also kiss Moskals’ asses!”

The scandalous Iryna Farion also characterizes the Ukrainian Orthodox Church (Moscow Patriarchate) unambiguously. Thus, on May 20, 2008 on the air of “Era-FM” radio she said: “I think that the structure that calls itself a Moscow Patriarchate has nothing to do with Christianity. It is one of the greatest threats for independent and self-sustained development of Ukraine. As long as this institution occupies the Kyiv Pechersk Lavra, a Ukrainian will be enslaved”.

On July 13 2010, the Party organized a demonstration against the visit to Ukraine by “Russian citizen Vladimir Gundyayev (Kirill, Patriarch of Moscow and all Rus)” in front of the Ukrainian Presidential Administration building. The protesters held banners saying “Down with Moscow Colonizer Priest”, “Ukrainian Orthodox Church against Moscow Heresy”, “Moscow Patriarchate – Spiritual Occupant” and chanted respective slogans.

On February 7 2012, activists of the Kiev Svoboda city organization carried out a protest against conveyance of the Kyiv Pechersk Lavra to Moscow Patriarchate.

People came to the walls of the Kyiv Pechersk Lavra chanting “Go away, Moscow Occupants!”, “Popov (the then Kiev mayor, ed.), Don’t Cover Moscow Priests” and so on to thwart authorities’ intention to transfer the Lavra to the Moscow Patriarchate.

On May 4 2012, thirty Svoboda activists attacked the Temple of all sacred warriors (UOC) that is located in the “Pobeda” (Victory) park of the Dnieper part of Kiev. According to “Noviy Region” Information Agency, young social nationalists vandalized Orthodox symbols (destroyed the altar, damaged icons, vandalized the Crucifix), broke the Church property, threaten the clergy and

mutilated a dog. They motivated their actions with ... defending the green zone from construction.

On July 26 2012, several dozen activists of the Svoboda Party held a demonstration at the Ukrainian President Administration building protesting against a regular visit by Kirill, Patriarch of Moscow and all Rus. The activists held banners with already known slogans: “Down with Moscow Colonizer Priest!”, “Down with Russian Imperialism!”, “Down with Moscow Occupants!”, “Down with Moskals!” and so on.

On April 23 2013, a group of unknown people carrying flags of the Svoboda Party and “Udar” tried to take over St. Vladimir Cathedral in Novoarchanghelsk of Kirovograd oblast, with the use of violent methods.

According to the Diocese of Kirovograd website, around three hundred aggressive people who came to the capital of the region (with neither any locals or the church parishioners) broke into the territory of the Church. The strangers were led by Svyatoslav Khanenko, Svoboda Member of Parliament. They broke the gates, the doors of the Cathedral, tried to hit the clergy who were in the courtyard of the Church, tore their church attire, insulted the clergy and swore.

Nationalists in the Ukrainian Parliament

As a result of the 2012 Supreme Rada elections that took place on October 28 2012, the Svoboda All-Ukrainian Union gained 10.44% votes. Nationalists created a parliamentary group numbering 37 people, with 12 members winning in majority constituencies. Experts called this result the main surprise of the 2012 elections in Ukraine. Judging by opinion polls before the elections, analysts were not sure if the party would be represented in the Parliament at all. They expected the party to win around 4-4.5%, largely in western regions of the country.

Some experts predicted a decline in the Svoboda radical activity after the nationalists were elected to the Parliament. However, the Svoboda party surprised everybody once again not only failing to settle down but also using its new position of a parliamentary party.

As soon as the elections results were announced, a number of human rights institutions with headquarters in the EU (if not in the larger world) expressed their concerns with regards to the surge of nationalism in Ukraine. Amnesty International is the most famous of them and denounced derogatory statements about gender and ethnic minorities.

At the same time, International Republican Institute of the US (IRI) run by John McCain, a Russophobic Republican senator, said he was planning to cooperate with Svoboda starting from 2013. The cooperation was built around implementing the project called “Elections and Political Process in Ukraine”. The main task of the project was to “support European integration and fight with the communist past in Ukrainian society”.

Since the Euromaidan started, McCain has visited Ukraine many times and made strong statements about President Yanukovich and, following his removal, about President Putin.

Russian, Language of Occupants

Currently Ukrainian is the only state language of Ukraine. However according to a 2004 public opinion poll by the Kyiv International Institute of Sociology, the number of people using Russian language in their homes considerably exceeds the number of those who declared Russian as their native language in the census. According to the survey, Russian is used at home by 43-46% of the population of the country (a similar proportion to Ukrainian) and Russophones make a majority of the population in Eastern and Southern regions of Ukraine: Dnipropetrovsk Oblast – 72% of population use Russian at home, Donetsk Oblast – 93%, Zaporizhia Oblast – 81%, Luhansk Oblast – 89%, Mykolaiv Oblast – 66%, Odessa Oblast – 85%, Kharkiv Oblast – 74%.

83% of Ukrainians responding to a 2008 Gallup poll preferred to use Russian instead of Ukrainian to take the survey.

The number of Russian-teaching schools has been systematically reduced since Ukrainian independence in 1991 and now it is much lower than the proportion of Russophones. Though Russian language dominates in informal communication in the capital of Ukraine, there are only 7 Russian schools and no Russian colleges in Kiev.

Russian provokes such pained reaction that Svoboda Members of Parliament are willing to demand that Russian be banned in Ukrainian schools and a personal Russian-Ukrainian interpreter for themselves. On February 12 2013, the Svoboda website showed a news segment that the Parliament refused to give lawmaker Iryna Farion a Russian-Ukrainian interpreter.

In this regard, Farion filed a lawsuit in the District Administrative Court of Kiev demanding that it recognize the unlawful lack of activity on the part of the Supreme Rada Staff.

The Russian language can turn people truly hysterical. Thus, on March 19 2013, Ihor Miroschnichenko, Svoboda Member of Parliament, caused a scandal in a grocery store in Kiev and called the police because a worker spoke Russian with buyers, thereby “insulting” human dignity of Miroschnichenko’s. The police officers accepted his statement and left the scene.

Miroschnichenko’s hysterical reaction to Russian might have been related to what had happened that day in the Supreme Rada. Ukrainian lawmakers had fought because of Russian.

The conflict started with Alexandr Efremov, Party of Regions parliamentary group leader, giving a speech in Russian. Svoboda nationalists jeered at Efremov, chanting “Speak Ukrainian” and “Shame!” while he was performing and demanding that Efremov speak Ukrainian. The lawmaker did not pay any attention to the cries and kept speaking concluding the presentation with the remark: “I thank all neo-fascists for the accompaniment”.

The floor was then given to Oleh Tyahnibok, Svoboda parliamentary group leader. “Regionals” in their turn jeered at him too, along with communist lawmakers chanting “Fascist”. Tyahnibok, however, also remained calm. While he was performing, Svoboda Members of Parliament blocked the podium so that he could speak undisturbed. Communists came to the podium too, which triggered a fight between lawmakers.

In two days, on March 21, the Svoboda Members of Parliament brought a sound alarm to the convention hall and used it

every time a lawmaker spoke Russian. For example, they turned it on when Alexandr Efremov and Mikhail Chechetov, Party of Regions representatives, and Pyotr Simonenko, the Communist party leader, spoke.

The European Parliament Denounces Ukrainian Neo-Nazis

In December 2012, Svoboda activists picketed the Embassy of Bulgaria in Kiev protesting against an anti-Svoboda clause in the resolution of the European Parliament put forward by Vigenin, a Bulgarian Member of Parliament.

Kristian Vigenin, Member of the European Parliament (the Group of the Progressive Alliance of Socialists & Democrats) proposed to include the following clause into the resolution on Ukraine: “The European Parliament is concerned about the rising nationalistic sentiment in Ukraine, expressed in support for the Svoboda Party, which, as a result, is one of the two new parties to enter the Verkhovna Rada; recalls that racist, anti-Semitic and xenophobic views go against the EU's fundamental values and principles and therefore appeals to pro-democratic parties in the Verkhovna Rada not to associate with, endorse or form coalitions with this party”.

According to Oleh Tyahnibok, the Svoboda leader, it is clear that the European Parliament resolution appealing to other opposition forces in Ukraine not to associate with the Svoboda Party is a “special operation of Moscow”. “It is absolutely clear to us why such resolution came into being. The scenario was developed at Lubyanka, no doubts about that”, – said the nationalist.

Yuri Mikhalchishin, another Svoboda lawmaker, was even more outspoken. He called the European Parliament a “political communal farm”, Vigenin and his colleagues – “perverts” and “homosexual communists”, the resolution on the Svoboda Party – “based on Soviet propaganda”.

On March 22, 2013, Eduard Leonov and Andriy Mokhnikh, Svoboda Members of Parliament, lodged a parliamentary question with Wladimir Rybak, the Supreme Rada Speaker, regarding “the socially important information on the nationality of the 445 Members of Parliament”. The inquiry released at the plenary session of the Parliament provoked a furious reaction of the “regionals”.

Commenting on his question, Mokhnikh said: “Given that our nation suffered from genocide, it is utterly important to know who is who among the people in authority. The candidates for Members of Parliament agreed to disclose their personal information and completed a form with the nationality question. This information must be made public, and the Speaker must provide it. ”

Ukrainian Nationalists Deny the Genocide against the Polish

On January 1, 2013, Ukrainian nationalists celebrated birth anniversary of Stepan Bandera, the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists’ leader. It was their annual tradition to arrange a torchlight parade with over a thousand people participating. They wore banners with slogans like “Bandera will come and sort out the mess” and “Down with Moscow Occupants! Down with Moscow Cads!” and chanted “Time to stop drinking – Time to Fight!”

Making a point of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists and Ukrainian Insurgent Army was bound to provoke Poland, the country where thousands of people fell victim to Ukrainian freedom fighters in the mid-20th century.

On April 11 2013, the Sejm of the Republic of Poland registered a draft resolution on recognizing OUN and UIA as “criminal organizations that committed genocide against the Polish people of “Kresy Wschodnie” in 1939-1947”. Franciszek Stefaniuk, Member of Parliament of the Agrarian Polish Party (Polskie stronnictwo ludowe, PSL) and one of the authors of the draft, said that

the Party initiated the resolution at the request of the families of those who died in “Kresy Wschodnie”¹.

On April 25, the Ivano-Frankivsk city council in its turn passed an address to the President of Ukraine, the Supreme Rada Speaker, Prime Minister, Minister for Foreign Affairs and Members of the Polish Parliament regarding the intentions of the Sejm expressing indignation over the “Anti-Ukrainian resolution”. “Intentions of the Sejm of the Republic of Poland to pass a chauvinist and Anti-Ukrainian resolution recognizing OUN-UIA as “criminal organizations that committed genocide against the Polish people of “Kresy Wschodnie” in 1939-1947” caused a deep indignation of Ivano-Frankivsk nationalists”, – said the city council statement.

The statement of members of the local council also said: “The project shows signs of Polish colonialism and chauvinism, interference in the internal affairs of Ukraine and territorial claims of Ukraine. It is not Ukraine that should apologize for the activities of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army that defended the Ukrainian population and eliminated Polish aggressive intentions towards Ukrainian lands during World War II, but Poland – for the activities of its troops that fought on ethnic Ukrainian territories for the Commonwealth of Poland denying the right of the Ukrainian people to freedom and independence”.

Fire at City Councils!

On December 21 2012, around 100 people led by Pavlo Kyrilenko, Member of Parliament and head of the Odessa Svoboda Party organization, attempted to break into the Odessa Administration where a meeting of the city council was taking place. Activists joined by local entrepreneurs broke a window, broke open

1. Kresy Wschodnie, or Eastern Borderlands, is a Polish name of the former territory of the eastern provinces of the Commonwealth of Poland, Res publica Poloniae, today lying in western Ukraine, western Belarus, as well as eastern Lithuania.

the main entrance door and entered the hallway. Security guard used fire extinguishers against them.

On January 29 2013, Kiev's Maidan saw a mass fighting between members of the Svoboda Party and Berkut Special Forces. Nationalist party activists broke into a session of the public council of the Kiev city administration using fists against the Special Forces.

Around 30 troops held the line for a while against 50-60 Svoboda fighter who was trying to break into the Main Post Office where the meeting of the public council of the Kiev city administration was taking place.

On February 26 2013 in Ternopol, Svoboda representatives disrupted a session of the Oblast State Administration and Regional Economic Reform Committee attended by Alexandr Nefyodov, head of the Government Accountability Office of the Presidential Administration of Ukraine.

After the picket, some Svoboda activists broke into the session with a megaphone carrying out a protest there and demanding that the leaders of oblast and local councils and agencies and law enforcement officers present there should "stop cooperating with criminals, should not suffer humiliation and disgrace on the part of corrupt and bribe-taking officials, should engage in fighting for public interests and restoration of the rule of law".

On March 21 2013, around 300 followers of the Svoboda Party, Batkivshchyna, UDAR and "Front Zmin" broke into Cherkassy Administration building disrupting a city council meeting. Yuri Bodnar, head of the local Svoboda structure, took the podium and demanded that the mayor of the city immediately annul the decision restricting peaceful demonstrations.

On March 28 2013, Svoboda Party activists confronted with followers of the Party of Regions at Khmelnytskyi Oblast State Administration. A few days before Svoboda activists announced a protest at the State Administration against the condition of the roads in the region. However, before the protest a group of about 50 sporty

looking people gathered together at the entrance of the Administration and tried to disrupt the Svoboda demonstration. The former turned out to be followers of the Party of Regions.

A fight broke out between the opponents. It was stopped by about 20 policemen blocking the activists.

Analyzing what happened, it is hard to refrain from calling them a dress rehearsal of the Euromaidan when protesters demonstrating against President Yanukovich took over oblast administration buildings all over Ukraine.

The Svoboda Party Takes Part in Blocking Up the Rada

On January 14 2013, leaders of opposition parliamentary groups Arseniy Yatsenyuk (Batkivshchyna), Vitali Klitschchko (UDAR) and Oleh Tyahnibok (Svoboda) proposed the Supreme Rada introducing criminal responsibility for members of parliament of all levels for violating the voting procedure, i.e. bill №2012. The leaders of opposition parliamentary groups proposed introducing into the Criminal Code clause 351-1 “Violating the voting procedure at a plenary session of the Supreme Rada of Ukraine”.

The clause stipulated that “voting with the electronic system by a member of parliament at a plenary session of the Supreme Rada of Ukraine instead of another member of parliament of Ukraine will be punished by imprisonment for five to eight years with deprivation of the right to occupy determined posts or to engage in a determined activity within three to five years”.

What is more, they proposed a bill according to which “giving a personal member of parliament voting card to another member of parliament who voted with the electronic voting system at a plenary session of the Supreme Rada of Ukraine will be punished by imprisonment for five to eight years with deprivation of the right to occupy determined posts or to engage in a determined activity within three to five years”.

This initiative of the opposition coming to be called “piano voting law” was heavily criticized by the Party of Regions but welcomed by the expert community. Resistance to the bill by the Party of Regions and Communist parliamentary groups became an excuse for a two week blocking of the podium of the Supreme Rada by the Opposition in February 2013. The parliamentary crisis, if it had lasted two weeks longer, could have led to the dissolution of the Supreme Rada and the calling of a new parliamentary election.

While blocking the Parliament, the Svoboda Party launched preparation for a possible snap election. Oleh Tyahnibok announced that the Party started to establish electoral campaign offices all over Ukraine. In his opinion, the government was not willing to resolve the parliamentary conflict and get down to work.

“In this situation, with them (the Party of Regions, ed.) killing time, I don’t know, they could be waiting for the President of Poland or they have some other reasons, we could not care less. We have given orders long ago. For example, I signed a relevant internal instruction to launch oblast campaign offices. We are getting ready for elections. So watch out!” he said.

According to Tyahnibok, the public should have its say on the “deceitful policy of the ruling party”. He also added that the Party of Regions and the Communists were to blame for everything and they were trying then to shift the responsibility on the Opposition. For example, Tyahnibok criticized them for bad roads, low retirement benefits and public-sector pay.

“All the social and economic woes brought about by the Party of Regions and its satellites, the authorities are now trying to put the onus onto the Opposition”, – Tyahnibok said.

Arseniy Yatsenyuk, the leader of the opposition Batkivshchyna, said that his party had never closed its campaign offices. Vitali Klitschchko from the opposition UDAR claimed his party was also ready for an early election.

The ruling Party of Regions had previously said it was ready for a new election as well, with Members of Parliament from the Party supported the idea of holding the next election with the first past the post voting.

While the parliamentary podium was being blocked by the Opposition, Yulia Tymoshenko, the imprisoned former Prime Minister of Ukraine, called on in an interview for French *Politique Internationale* not to believe in the accusations of xenophobia against the Svoboda Party in both Ukraine and the West.

“The Svoboda Party became famous above all because of the policy pursued by the current authorities contrary to the interests of the Ukrainian nation: closing Ukrainian schools, rewriting our history, disrespecting the Ukrainian language”, – said the former Prime Minister.

Moreover, Tymoshenko said that the Svoboda Party, in her opinion, will prove the world that “deceitful accusations against it are no more than dirty propaganda”.

Tyahnibok vs Yanukovich: Failed Plan of the Party of Regions

A large scale opinion poll carried out by the Agency for Strategic Research with OPAL Center for Foreign Policy Research in January-February 2013 suggested that the Svoboda Party was the third most popular party in Ukraine. 12.4% voters were willing to vote for the Social-Nationalists, with 22.5% supporting the Party of Regions and 21% – the Batkivshchyna. Thus, the Svoboda Party came to be number three outplaying the liberal Udar as well as the Communist Part.

Such electoral composition allowed experts to once again view the Svoboda as a special project of the Party of Regions and Tyahnibok as the most convenient sparring partner for Yanukovich. “Getting Oleh Tyahnibok to the second round is the only way for Yanukovich to win the second term in the Presidential office”, – said sociologist Iryna Bekeshina, head of the Democratic Initiatives Fund, in an interview for TSN.

Answering if Yanukovich would lose to any other opposition candidate if the presidential election took place in early 2013, Bekeshina said: “Well, probably, except for Tyahnibok. And to others – he would lose to anyone, including Klitschko, Yatsenyuk,

to the devil (but not as radical as Tyahnibok). But there is a danger that Tyahnibok will be drawn to get in the run-off. It often happens, including at mayor elections. Chernovetskiy¹ gained 30%, for example. And those two – Klitschko and Turchynov – got more taken together. But Chernovetskiy came to be the mayor”, – explained the sociologist.

Bekeshina was certain that Tyahnibok was the only one to lose to Yanukovich, “that is why many are afraid of him”.

Mikhail Chechetov, first deputy head of the Party of Regions parliamentary group, in his turn stated that Oleh Tyahnibok, leader of the Svoboda Party, would be Viktor Yanukovich’s main competitor at the 2015 presidential election.

Chechetov said on the air of the Svoboda radio that Yanukovich would be more than just a candidate and that he would win: “He would win in a fair competition”.

Chechetov highlighted that the Party of Regions had “already known” that Tyahnibok would be Yanukovich’s main rival and they view the Svoboda leaver as a “strong competitor”. On the other hand, “regionals” pinned all their hopes on Yanukovich and were confident about his victory in the second round of the 2015 presidential election.

“After Mikhail Chechetov said that Tyahnibok would be Yanukovich’s main rival at the next presidential elections, there has been a genuine impression that the Party of Regions has been shaping the public opinion in favor of the Svoboda leader as the only opposition candidate. And they have been pretty good at it. But one shouldn’t forget that the Svoboda Party did not just manage to gain a surprisingly high result at the Rada elections but has been consolidating its progress. Their ratings are increasing. And it is far from certain that Yanukovich will be able to beat Tyahnibok in 2015. Competitors underestimate the Svoboda’s potential. The history of Europe knows many examples of political forces that expected to win in the run-off and were overwhelmingly defeated. Ukraine

1. Leonid Chernovetskiy is a flamboyant mayor of Kiev in 2006-2012.

might run into the same trap”, said then one of the authors of this book in an interview.

What happened at the Euromaidan and the overthrow of Yanukovich in February 2014 ruined all the plans for both his opponents and former allies. The opposition leaders were quick to forget about their promises to put forward a single presidential candidate for them, while “regionals” in unison repudiated their former leader and put forward Mikhail Dobkin, Hennadiy Kernes colleague, with no chances to win.

Oleh Tyahnibok might happen to be handy when the released Yulia Timoshenko and Pyotr Poroshenko, head of Roshen confectionery, came to be the main rivals at the early 2014 presidential election. For Tyahnibok’s experience of “diluting” opposition electorate as well as sabotaging Timoshenko’s Batkivshchyna in the West of Ukraine is well known.

Stepan Bandera's Euromaidan

“Whoever is not jumping is a Moskall!” this is a chant that men and women who took to Kiev Maidan Nezalezhnosti (Independence Square) in winter 2013-2014 repeated trying to get warm. They kept jumping and laughing, for nobody in the «brave new world» of the Ukrainian revolution under Stepan Bandera's banner fancied gaining the character of a staunch enemy of Ukrainian statehood.

The dictionary of the contemporary Ukrainian language and slang Mislovo calls Euromaidan the word of 2013. The word “maidan” (square) that became popular ten years before and seemed to have acquired a clear European implication. If anything, the EU and US officials welcomed mass demonstrations of citizens in the center of Kiev calling them nothing but a manifestation of a conscious pro-European choice of the Ukrainian people. However, the first shots were heard afterwards and the first blood of the future “holy hundred” was shed.

While giving Russian a second state language status ensured Viktor Yanukovich support by Southern and Eastern Ukrainian electorate at the 2010 presidential elections, his promise to sign the European Union Association Agreement reconciled Yanukovich with Western Ukrainian voters. The President failed to fulfill

his first promise, the question of signing the Agreement at the Eastern Partnership summit in Vilnius on November 28-29 2013 was an understood thing. Or it seemed so.

The night of November 30 brought about an event which at first seemed unimportant, but caused a chain reaction that has changed the political map of Ukraine as well as its political history. Several hundred (some say thousands) Berkut Special Forces officers cruelly dispersed a relatively small demonstration by advocates of the European integration at the Maidan Nezalezhnosti (Independence Square). The video posted by Ukrainian media shows that the crackdown was draconian – “the Special Forces hit people with nightsticks and kicked them, hit people who were down and pursued the dispersed even beyond the Maidan”.

35 were injured; seven were taken to hospital as a result. Media workers and two Polish citizens were among the injured. The police said 12 officers were hurt.

After what happened at night the Ministry of the Interior and Prosecutor’s Office launched an investigation under three articles of the Criminal Code: “hooliganism”, “resisting an officer” regarding the protestors, and “abuse of power” as regards the Berkut officers.

At a press conference on what happened at the Maidan, Oleh Tyahnibok, Svoboda’s lever, announced a nationwide mobilization on December 1.

On December 1 several dozen thousand angry citizens – with different political views and unhappy with the draconian crackdown on the peaceful demonstration – took to the Kiev Maidan for the popular assembly, responding to numerous posts on social networks. Mustafa Nayem, a liberal journalist, was most active in calling on people to take to the streets. He had admitted previously having voted for the Svoboda Party as the most genuine opposition force in the 2012 election.

At the popular assembly protesters from radical nationalists took over the Kiev Rada Building and Trade Unions Building on Khreshchatyk and attempted to take control over the President

Administration building. According Oleh Tyahnibok, December 1 2013 saw the beginning of the European revolution: “Like it or not, but a revolution began in Ukraine. A stage and tents are to be installed on the Maidan. Activists are going to open national resistance offices in every oblast administration center”. He also added that the headquarters will be located in the already seized Trade Unions Building.

Ihor Miroshnichenko, Svoboda Member of Parliament, headed the seizure of the city council.

In the meanwhile there was an attempt to take over the President Administration building. A group of aggressive young people wearing balaclavas and carrying chains and sticks tried to break through the police cordon. The young people attacked the police, threw incendiary mixtures and even used a bulldozer. Some mass media that insurgents shouted: “Berkut, down to your knees!”

The police said that protesters had stolen the bulldozer from the Maidan Nezalezhnosti where it was used to install the Christmas tree. “The equipment belongs to one of the public utility companies of the capital and was standing by the Christmas tree. Participants in the mass demonstrations destroyed the wicket-gates of the Presidential Administration building using the bulldozer”, – reported the Ministry of the Interior.

Protestors told mass media that they were taking revenge for the crackdown of the Euromaidan on November 30 when several dozen people were injured.

Law enforcement officers first tried to resist the pressure of the protesters and then started to use stun grenades. However, the takeover was not over. When it started to get dark five Berkut Special Force buses arrive at the Administration building from Bank Street and started to disperse the protesters.

The Ukrainian police said that the President Administration building takeover and Kiev oblast council seizure had been organized by Dmytro Korchyntsiy (former leader of UNA-UPSD national terrorist organization) and Oleh Tyahnibok, Svoboda leader.

Before the crackdown on November 30 their key demand was to sign the European Union Association Agreement that implied, as protestors thought, a visa-free regime with the EU that the Agreement in fact did not involve. Since December 1, after the crackdown, the focus shifted to removing the Government and the President.

On December 2 2013, protestors blocked entrance to the Ukrainian Government building and disrupted Nikolay Azarov's Government activity.

On December 4 2013, Guido Westerwelle, Germany's Minister for Foreign Affairs, arrived in Kiev, visited the protestors' camp in the Independence Square and met with Vitali Klitschko and Arseniy Yatsenyuk.

On December 8 2013, Ukraine saw new demonstrations called "popular assemblies", or "veche". The most numerous protest took place in Kiev where in the center of the city Euromaidan demonstrators toppled and destroyed with hammers Lenin monument erected in 1946 on Taras Shevchenko Avenue. The Svoboda Party assumed responsibility for tearing down the statue, with Ihor Miroshnichenko, Member of Parliament, admitting he was proud of taking part in destroying the monument.

Radoslaw Sikorski, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Poland, a staunch advocate of European integration, outspokenly supported the destruction of the statue and said he was pleased that Kiev became yet another European capital to demolish a monument to the "bloody tyrant".

On December 8, Catherine Ashton, the High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy and Vice-President of the European Commission, arrived in Kiev. She held negotiations with President Yanukovich expressing the position of the United Europe that the conflict should be resolved peacefully.

On the morning of December 9, Berkut attempted to take over the Kiev mayor's office but had to give in after strong confrontation. Later that day Euromaidan activists restored and strengthened the barricades and removed snow from the Square itself and

Khreshchatyk. At night Viktor Yanukovich invited the Opposition to a round table for negotiations.

On December 15, John McCain, US Republican Senator and Anti-Communist well-known for his support for the Svoboda Party, and Chris Murphy, US Democratic Senator, appeared on the stage on the Euromaidan. “We are here to talk about solidarity on behalf of the American people, – McCain addressed the crowd. – Your peaceful protest and your peaceful fight are inspiring all the country and the world to change. We are here to support your just cause, the sovereign right of Ukraine to determine its own destiny freely and independently. And the destiny you seek lies in Europe”.

The US senator also addressed volunteers of the paramilitary “self-defense” of Maidan: “Fulfilling your duties, remember that you are here to defend your people. It is your time. It is the future of your country that you deserve, the future of Europe and the world. The US is with you!”

In response people chanted in English: “Thank you!”

The world Jewish community reacted in a different way to McCain’s sharing the stage with Tyahnybok. “McCain made a miscalculation. He clearly had no idea who she shared the stage with. But if he knew who Tyahnybok is, then it’s much more serious. This demonstrates how promiscuous American politicians are”, said Efraim Zuroff, sdirector of the Simon Wiesenthal Center of-fice in Jerusalem.

Next day, on December 16, Ihor Tenyukh, admiral and commander of the Ukrainian Navy from 2006 until 2010, member of the Svoboda Party and the would be (if for a short time) Defense Minister, addressed the Maidan in Kiev and called on the military to “side with the people”.

On December 19, the Supreme Rada overwhelmingly adopted a law on the inadmissibility of the prosecution and punishment of people involved in events that took place during peaceful rallies in Ukraine. The amnesty, however, did not change the street sentiments.

On December 22, the center of Kiev saw yet another popular assembly that announced the creation of Maidan people's union.

Co-heads of the Union are Oleh Tyahnybok; Serhiy Kvit, University president of the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy; Vitali Klitschko of UDAR; Yuriy Lutsenko; singer Ruslana who won the 2004 Eurovision; Yulia Tymoshenko and Arseniy Yatsenyuk. Russian oppositionists Ilya Yashin (the Solidarity movement) and Konstantin Borovoy (The Western Choice Party) also took part in the demonstration. Known in Russian for their radical anti-nationalist rhetoric, in Kiev oppositionists welcomed participants in the Euromaidan with typical greetings of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists: "Glory to Ukraine! Glory to the Heroes!"

New Year with Old Bandera

On January 1 2014, the center of Kiev saw a traditional march on the occasion of 105 birth anniversary of Stepan Bandera, leader of the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists. The torchlight parade with flags and Bandera's portraits marched from Mikhaylovs-kaya Square to the building of the Kiev Mayor's Office on Khreshchatyk. Nearly ten thousand activists, which was a record number, took part in the march.

When the parade of neo-Bandera supporters was passing by the Premier Palace Hotel on the corner of Shevchenko Avenue and Pushkin Street, a guy wearing balaclava came out of the crowd, ran to the entrance of the hotel, opened it, threw a lit torch and closed it. A few moments before the incident a man with a megaphone shouted that the parade would soon march by the Premier Palace Hotel where "regionals" kept their own private bordello and that those who wished could say hi with fireworks and grenades.

On January 12, Kiev's Independence Square gathered the first popular assembly in 2014. Mass media said that 50 to 200 thousand people took part. A demonstration of "Automaidan", a group

of car owners and a structure with Euromaidan, was organized at the Mezhyhirya private residence of President Yanukovich.

On January 16, the Supreme Rada passed a number of unpopular amendments to laws introducing restrictions in the media and constraining legal peaceful demonstrations. The changes included returning criminal prosecution for slander and introducing into the Criminal Code an article about “extremist activity” defined very broadly. Next day President Yanukovich signed what many called “dictator’s” law to annul them in ten days under the pressure of the Euromaidan and protests of the EU and the US.

On January 19, Kiev “popular assembly” gathered together several hundred thousand demonstrators unhappy with the laws adopted by the pro-government Rada majority. Ihor Tenyukh, admiral and nationalist, addressed officers, sergeants and the ranks and file of the Ukrainian Army “on behalf of popular assembly”. “We are appealing to you to keep the loyalty oath – to serve the people of Ukraine. The people, not the crazy regime that believed in its impunity”, – he said.

According to the health department of Kiev, on January 19-20, 103 participants in the protest were treated for injuries, 42 people were taken to hospital as a result of the clashes. The Ministry of the Interior of Ukraine reported that about 100 officers asked for medical care, 61 were hospitalized. Closed head injuries, fractures, closed wounds and intoxication of unknown chemical substances were registered.

On January 22, clashes broke out again on Hrushevsky Street in the center of Kiev. Three protesters died that day, official reports say.

Bloody February

On February 4, Vitali Klitschko, leader of UDAR parliamentary group, called on the Supreme Rada to vote for the return of

the 2004 Constitution that implied growing Parliament's and lowering President's powers. The proposition was supported by Arseniy Yatsenyuk, leader of Batkivshchyna parliamentary group. At the same time Yulia Tymoshenko sent a letter from jail that called on the Batkivshchyna not to go back to the 2004 Constitution and prepare for the presidential election.

On February 18 saw the escalation and came to be called the "Bloody Tuesday". Confrontation between Euromaidan radicals and law enforcement officers in the center of Kiev resumed on the day of Rada session when the Opposition demanded an immediate return to the semi-presidential system and the 2004 Constitution. To support the demands the opposition leaders organized a "peaceful offensive" in Rada in which several thousand armed Euromaidan activists from the Right Sector and UNA-UPSD took part.

Protestors attacked a police cordon that tried to block them, broke and set on fire a few cars and trucks in their way, broke into buildings, burnt tires, threw bottles with incendiary mixture and stones at police officers. Extremists took over and burnt the Party of Regions office. By night Berkut divisions and police forces pushed protesters back to the Independence Square.

Over the day and night 25 people died, over 350 were injured, over 250 were hospitalized as a result of the clashes. President Yanukovich and opposition representatives Klitschko and Yatsenyuk who met at night did not manage to come to any agreement only blaming each other.

The same night national extremists in the west and centre of Ukraine kept seizing administrative buildings and military armories. Over 1170 items of fire arms (nearly a thousand Makarov guns, over 170 Kalashnikovs and sniper guns, over 18 thousand of bullets were taken by the Neo-Nazis in Lviv and Lviv oblast. March 2014 saw a report saying that over 5 thousand Kalashnikovs, 2741 Makarovs, 123 heavy assault rifles, 12 Shmel rocket flame throwers, 1500 F-1 grenades and more provision were stolen in Lviv oblast from internal troop armories.

On February 19, Security Service of Ukraine (SSU) declared a counter-terrorism operation. On February 20, unknown snipers were seen on Institut'skaya Street shooting at both the protesters and law enforcement officers. The key theory voiced by Ukrainian and Western media and the Opposition said that those were Berkut snipers or even “professionals” from Russia hired by Yanukovich. However, on March 5, YouTube posted a recording of a phone talk between Catherine Ashton, High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy for the EU, and Urmas Paet, Estonian foreign minister. The conversation took place on February 26 following Paet's visit to Ukraine. Paet told Ashton that according to Olga Bogomolets, the evidence showed that people who were killed by snipers from both sides, among policemen and people from the streets, that they were the same snipers killing people from both sides. “So, there is a stronger and stronger understanding that behind snipers it was not Yanukovich, it was somebody from the new coalition”, said Paet.

During the days of February 18-20, according to the Ministry of Health of Ukraine, 75 died, 571 people asked for medical attention from 10:20 on February 18 to 21:00 on February 20, of them 363 were hospitalized. The people who died came to be called by the protesters the “holy hundred”, referring to the hundreds that the Ukrainian Insurgent Army was divided into. It was as soon as next month that the Central bank of Ukraine issued service medals “Holy Hundred on the Lookout”.

On February 21, following negotiations between President Yanukovich and Opposition representative mediated by the EU and Russia the sides signed the “Agreement on the Settlement of Crisis in Ukraine”.

The Agreement was signed by President Viktor Yanukovich and Opposition leaders Vitali Klitschko (UDAR), Arseniy Yatsenyuk (Batkivshchyna) and Oleh Tyahnibok (Svoboda). The agreement was witnessed by Germany and Poland foreign ministers Frank-Walter Steinmeier and Radoslaw Sikorski, as well as Direc-

tor at the Continental Europe Department of the French Foreign Ministry Eric Fournier.

The Agreement implied restoration of the 2004 constitution, i.e. semi-presidential form of government, snap presidential election to be held until December 2014 and a national unity government to be formed. It also stated withdrawing from administrative and public buildings and unblocking streets, city parks and squares, stopping violence and surrendering arms by the Opposition.

The Supreme Rada adopted a law on releasing all the detained during demonstrations. Berkut Special Forces and internal security troops left Kiev.

On February 21, while leaders of the parliamentary opposition publicly announced details of the Agreement with Yanukovich, the Right Sector representatives said that they were unhappy with the gradual political reforms stipulated in the document and demanded immediate resignation of Yanukovich. Otherwise they were willing to take over the President Administration and the Supreme Rada. Dmytro Yarosh, the Right Sector leader, said that the Agreement lacked any clear commitments regarding the President's resignation, Rada's dissolution, punishment for law enforcement heads and perpetrators of "criminal orders that killed about a hundred Ukrainian citizens". He called the Agreement "yet another eye soaping" and refused to comply with it.

On the night of February 22, people from Euromaidan military wing seized the government quarter abandoned by the law enforcement and put forward a number of new demands, for example, they asked for the immediate resignation of President Yanukovich.

Andriy Parubiy, Member of Parliament and commandant of Euromaidan, said that the 7th "Maidan self-defense" hundred was in the Supreme Rada accompanied by a Right Sector division, while the 19th and 3d hundreds guarded the Presidential Administration and the Government, the 15th one "defended" the Ministry of the Interior. The police were offered to put on the yellow-blue Ukrainian strip and join the 'Maidan self-defense'

in patrolling the streets. Besides, Parubiy said that “Maidan today has fully taken Kiev under control”.

As Yatsenyuk later said, he and his allies viewed such actions as direct violations of the just signed agreement. In some regions this resulted in the refusal to recognize the new Kievan government and switch to self-government. At the same time Yanukovich suddenly left the country finding himself in a while in Rostov-on-Don in the south of Russia. There on February 28, he gave a press conference calling what had happened over the last week a coup d'état and himself – the only legitimate President of Ukraine.

Despite the almost unconditional support by the European and Northern American political establishment for the Ukrainian Opposition both before and after Yanukovich left, different voices came to be heard. For example, Sevim Dagdelen, a member of the Left Party in German Bundestag, called Kiev protesters “fascists in disguise”, while her colleague Andriy Khunko talked about “fascist and anti-Semitic” elements on Maidan. When Arseniy Yatsenyuk’s government had been formed, Dagdelen stated that “fascists are part of the current de-facto government of Ukraine”.

On February 22, Vladimir Rybak (The Party of Regions) announced resignation as Rada Speaker, with Oleksandr Turchynov (Batkivshchyna) replacing him. On the same day Rada voted to “establish that Ukrainian President Viktor Yanukovich unconstitutionally removed himself from fulfilling his constitutional duties; therefore he can no longer implement his duties”. The impeachment procedure stipulated by the Constitution was not carried out but the early presidential election was announced due on May 25 2014.

On the same day a resolution was passed that released Yulia Timoshenko from the hospital in Kharkiv where she had been detained. Timoshenko flew to Kiev.

On February 23, the Supreme Rada declared Oleksandr Turchynov to be the acting President of Ukraine.

On February 27, Arseniy Yatsenyuk became Prime Minister of Ukraine and the new government was formed. It included four representative of the Svoboda Party – Oleksandr Sych, former president of Ivano-Frankivsk oblast council (2010-2012); Ihor Shvaika, Minister of Agrarian Policy and Food of Ukraine and advocate of eliminating Crimea autonomy status; Andriy Mokhnikh, Minister of Ecology and Natural Resources and staunch opponent of the Russian Orthodox Church and Ukrainian Orthodox Church (Moscow Patriarchate); admiral Ihor Tenyukh, Minister of Defense who had been trained by the US Department of Defense. In less than a month after the appointment Tenyukh resigned amid Crimean crisis and was replaced Lieutenant-General Mikhail Koval, another Svoboda member.

The Government was recognized by the US and the EU. However, Gregor Gysi, one of the most experienced and influential politicians in Germany and leader of the opposition socialist left-wing political party The Left (Die Linke), expressed his bewilderment at the Bundestag session on March 12 by the immediate recognition of the new Ukrainian Government by President Obama, the EU and the German Government. The Left Party leader reminded that deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Defense, Minister of Agrarian Policy, Minister of Ecology and Natural Resources and Attorney General of Ukraine are fascists, that the Head of the National Security Council was the founder of the fascist Svoboda Party. According to Gysi, fascists also occupied important positions in the security sector of Ukraine. The left-wing Member of Parliament reminded that “fascists never abandoned power voluntarily when they took at least part of it”. Gregor Gysi also pointed out that at least the German Government should draw the line based on the history of Germany.

Besides, Gysi said that the Svoboda Party maintained contacts with European Nazi parties and Oleh Tyahnibok, its leader, said the following: “take up arms, fight with Russian swine, German and Jewish swine and other bastards”. Then Gysi said he was

shocked that Bundestag members did not know about attacks on Jews and the “left-wing” in Ukraine. He expressed his opinion that Germany’s Government negotiations with “these people” were truly scandalous.

The leader of the Left Party also highlighted that “there were many democratic forces on Maidan. However, there also were fascists who the West supported directly and indirectly”. Moreover, Gysi reminded Frank-Walter Steinmeier, German Foreign Minister, who was present at the Bundestag session, that he himself with his Polish and French colleagues negotiated the Agreement with the Opposition, and after all that Steinmeier was claiming that President Yanukovich annulled the Agreement by fleeing the country¹.

However, Andreas Umland, Gregor Gysi’s compatriot who we have once cited in our work as a famous student of ultra-right-wing movements, unexpectedly came to the Svoboda’s defense. Umland wrote on his Facebook page quite literally: “At the party congress of “Die Linke”, German politicians again use the terms “fascism” and “neo-Nazism” in connection with the Euromaidan and the current government of Ukraine. We should, as Germans, be careful to use easily these terms for certain Ukrainian politicians. Ukrainians associate these words with rather concrete family memories. The major argument, in the past, for “Die Linke” to apply “fascism”/“neo-Nazism” to “Svoboda” are the – indeed existing – anti-Semitic tendencies in “Svoboda”. However, representatives of the Ukrainian Jewish community (Zissels, Finberg etc.) and the Israeli Embassy at Kyiv do not see “Svoboda’s” anti-Semitism as particularly threatening. As the most prominent leader of “Die Linke” Gregor Gysi is about to visit Russia (as he once

1. It is noteworthy that Neo-Nazi activity on Maidan were criticized not only by the European left-wing parties, which was expected, but also by the Nationalists. Thus, addressing in March the Congress of European Youth organized by National Democratic Party of Germany (Nationaldemokratische Partei Deutschlands, NPD), Nick Griffin, Member of the European Parliament from the British National Party, BNP, said that the Right Sector, probably not realizing that itself, was pursuing the interests of the supranational oligarchy.

went to Serbia to meet Milosevic), the German left may become non grata in Kyiv – though popular in Moscow”¹.

One of the authors of this book commented on Umland’s page and expressed surprise at the drastic change in the neo-Nazism researcher’s attitude towards the Ukrainian Svoboda party. The political scientist, founder and editor-in-chief of the book series “Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society” in the German *Ibidem-Verlag* academic publishing house (Stuttgart & Hannover, with 125 volumes from 2004 to 2013), a DAAD lecturer at the Kyiv Shevchenko University and Associate Professor at the Master’s program in German and European Studies at the Department of Political Science in the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, regular author of the *Open Democracy* (London), *Harvard International Review* (Cambridge), *Foreign Policy Journal* (Washington), *Ukrayinska Pravda* Internet newspaper (Kiev), *Dzerkalo Tyzhnia / Mirror Weekly* (Kiev), *Ukraine-Analysen* (Bremen), *Ukraine-Nachrichten* (Dresden), a member of the Institute for Central and East European Studies at the Catholic University of Eichstaett-Ingolstadt and member of the Scientific Expert Council of the Supreme Rada Committee on European Integration Andreas Umland replied: “You are working for a regime that I would by now classify as “radically right-wing”. Your concern about these issues with regards to Ukraine is thus surprising. You & Co. should be the last to care about right-radical tendencies in other countries”. It speaks for itself.

Nevertheless, the Svoboda Party remained unimpressed by the words of the European left parties. On the contrary. On March 29, 2014, addressing the XVIII Convention of the Party, Tyahnibok called on his fellow party members to keep moving forward: “Let’s plan to see our Svoboda tank drive along the Red Square!”

1. Andreas Umland’s Facebook page, post on 11.05.2014. URL: <https://www.facebook.com/andreas.umland.1/posts/10202796564568681>

The Right Sector

Ukrainian Tyler Durden¹

There seems to have never been such flash-like rise in popularity of a previously little known marginalized political force in the history of contemporary Ukrainian politics. The Right Sector broke into political life so fast that it was a surprise for its members themselves.

The phenomenon of the Right Sector proved how changeable the views of the people are at times of political turbulence. Not long ago the people who are now advocating the Right Sector used to vote for moderate liberals. A significant number of them speaks Russian and even has a Russian background. Of course, one can explain it by saying that the times of radical transformations bring to the fore radical political forces. But why the Right Sector, not, say, the Left one?

It would be a big mistake to explain the Right Sector popularity only by decaying education and nation-state propaganda in schools. It is easy to simplify an unknown phenomenon.

1. Tyler Durden is a character of Palahniuk's novel called "Fight Club" and the movie based on it.

When the conflict at the heart of Ukrainian capital entered its pro-active stage, the media paid all attention to the Right Sector. And it seems that the mainstream public started to regard these guys in balaclavas as the spokesmen of its unfulfilled interests, as its Tyler Durden of sorts. And those Durdens were used as a weapon by the new (obviously by the old “orange” ones) rulers of Ukraine¹.

But who wouldn't want to throw a Molotov cocktail at the window of the nearby police department or the fiscal authority that extort bribes? Education does not allow it. It is also dangerous – what if we get caught? But let's imagine an organization emerges that can do this all instead of you, totally free of charge, for the idea. And you have no serious ideological complaints to it. They are not fascists, they are for Ukraine.

It is important to stress ideological eclecticism of the part of the population who took to Maidan or has supported it. Maidan shared discourse combines three ideas: nationalism, liberalism and conservatism. This gives us funny ideological situations. For example, social networks showed that the same people simultaneously praised the Right Sector and Google making a special browser picture against gay discrimination in Russia. They completely ignored that the Right Sector was radically homophobic. This is the background against which the Right Sector's popularity has been rising.

Stepan Bandera Tryzub

On March 23 2014, the Right Sector political party was founded. To be precise, formally the “old” Ukrainian National Assembly party got renamed “the Right Sector” rather than a new party set

1. According to the survey “Ukraine. Presidential Elections 2014. April,” conducted by the Socis Center for Social and Marketing Research, Kyiv International Institute of Sociology, the Rating Sociological Group and the Razumkov Center, only 2% of respondents are ready to vote for “Svoboda” Party leader Oleh Tyahnybok and some 1% for Right Sector leader Dmytro Yarosh in the presidential elections.

up. It is very common in Ukraine due to a very complicated system of party registration. The leadership of the “new” Party included representative of several organizations that lay the foundation of the Right Sector: Stepan Bandera Tryzub (Dmytro Yarosh, Andriy Stempitskiy, Andriy Tarasenko), UNA-UPSD (Valeriy Voronov, Oleksandr Muzychko (who was killed later), Konstantin Fush-teyn, Yuriy Shukhevych), Patriots of Ukraine-Social National Assembly (Oleh Odnorozhenko, Andriy Biletskiy), “Sokira Peruna” White Power rock band (Arseniy Klimachev) and some other unorganized groups.

The balance of power in the Right Sector somewhat changed as compared with the Right Sector informal group that used to function at the pro-active stage of the Euromaidan. Back then the Sector was in fact associated with only one organization (Stepan Bandera Tryzub) and had a single public leader (Yarosh, the Tryzub leader). As we can see now, the leadership has been increased with other groups. UNA-UPSD is one of them. It now has more influence within the Right Sector because the Party was formed on the basis of it. In most regions it is UNA-UPSD members who represent the Right Sector. We can also notice significant strengthening of the Patriots of Ukraine-Social National Assembly since the leaders of the organization (Oleh Odnorozhenko, Andriy Biletskiy and so called “Vasilkovsky terrorists”) were released by the amnesty. Leadership of the Party also included Arseniy Klimachev, Sokira Peruna head who appears to be the link between the Right Sector and street Neo-Nazi and football hooligans.

In terms of ideology the Right Sector consists of two factions – national-conservative and neo-fascist. The former is embodied by Stepan Bandera Tryzub, while the latter – by Patriots of Ukraine-Social National Assembly and unorganized street radicals who are unofficially represented by Arseniy Klimachev.

“The program of implementing the Ukrainian national idea in nation-building” (2006) is the only platform and ideology document on the official Right Sector websites. It is written by a group

of authors from the Tryzub. In the popular Vkontakte social network the official page of the Right Sector calls this document ideological guidelines for members and followers of the organization.

We are not going to give a detailed summary of the document. We would like to focus on the key ideas that can help better understand the gist of the Platform. Repetition of the word “statehood” in almost every paragraph is noteworthy, especially for young leaders who have been living most of the life in independent Ukraine.

The Tryzub basically thinks that Ukraine does not yet have a sustainable nation state” therefore the Ukrainian nation lack a state. This interesting idea can be explained by the fact the Tryzub is known in the nationalist circles as ultra-dogmatists who “verbally” interpret the ideological heritage of the post-war emigration Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists led by Bandera.

Since the ideology of Ukrainian nationalism of the 20th century can be reduced to the struggle for an independent nation state, it is natural that the Tryzub is exploiting such slogans. For insurgent nationalism only makes sense when a nation lacks statehood. Otherwise nationalism is no longer legitimate.

The Tryzub members who do not recognize the existence of an independent Ukrainian nation state seek to establish it. The key word here is “nation”. They believe that Ukraine declared in 1991 has been “supranational”, or “cosmopolitan”.

Contemporary Ukraine’s “cosmopolitanism” means no dictate by the title Ukrainian nation towards other nations residing in Ukraine. This relates to, above all, several million Russians who Ukrainian nationalists call “so called nation”. The “so called Russians” must either go through “Ukrainization”, i.e. giving up their native language and “imperial”, “chauvinist” heritage (which basically means its history), or leave Ukraine. “Suitcase, Train Station, Russia!”¹

1. This slogan accompanied mass demonstrations and violent actions that took place in many “national”, or non-Russian, republics of the former USSR in 1990-1991.

Another distinguishing feature of the organization is its declared attitude to national minorities. Dmytro Yarosh cites in almost all his interviews Stepan Bandera's statement that "Ukrainian nationalism is friendly to those foreigners who fight for Ukrainian state, is tolerant to those who do not obstruct this cause and is hostile to those who impede it". Whoever resists Ukraine's transforming in a monoethnic state impedes Ukrainian nationalism.

In this regard, it is interesting to take a look at a journalist investigation called "Shag Vpravo" ("Step to the Right") whose author infiltrated the Right Sector. The published text of the investigation gives pretty colorful dialogues of the very Right Sector militia on Maidan. The dialogues easily distinguish "xenophobes" and "anti-imperialists". The former call for fighting with "over-run chinks" in the name of purity of the Ukrainian nation and the White race. The latter advocates cooperation with "strangers" against "Moscow imperialism".

Dmytro Yarosh appeal to Dokka Umarov, international terrorist, to fight Russia together deserves a special mention.

The Tryzub has the most uncompromising "anti-empire" attitude to "Moskals" supporting separatist national movements in Russia (peoples of the Northern Caucasus, the Volga region, etc.). However, it is no secret in the nationalist circles of Ukraine that the Ukrainian version of the famous "Caucasus-Center" is run by the Tryzub. To be precise, by its structure called "Anti-Imperialist Front".

The Tryzub position on the notorious "Jewish question" is very unusual for Ukrainian ultra-right-wing. The organization members and followers have repeatedly expressed their support for the Jewish movement. Dmytro Yarosh himself made statements against Anti-Semitism on many occasions at the Euro-maidan, which is fully within the tradition of the OUN-UIA. It is known that in 1943 when the situations at the frontlines of World War II dramatically changes in favor of the Allies of World War II, the OUN leadership decided to shift cooperation from Hitler Ger-

many to Great Britain and the US. It goes without saying that under new circumstances anti-Semitism typical of Bandera followers came to be a dangerous burden. Although the OUN-UIA kept killing Jews and Polish until the nationalists were fully defeated in the aftermath of the War, its propaganda materials stopped using anti-Semitic ideas once and for all.

It is a telling detail that Stepan Bandera himself when in emigration and under protection of American secret services welcomed the emergence of the nation state of Israel. That is why the Tryzub known in nationalist circles for its ideological dogmatism could easily continue this pro-Jewish line of the Ukrainian nationalist emigration. (Because of this the Odessa Right Sector division controlled by the radicals even attempted a riot against Yarosh.) In this regard, the Tryzub has the advantage of flexibility as compared with the Svoboda Party whose leaders have repeatedly made anti-Semites or racist statements.

The Tryzub ideological agenda cannot be understood without its position on Christianity. The Tryzub has evolved as a radical and uncompromising Christian organization. Even its slogan runs: “God. Ukraine. Christianity”.

It is interesting to point out its apparent leanings to the Catholic Church given that most Ukrainians are either Orthodox or Greek Catholic. This could be explained by a strong fundamental traditionalist denomination within Catholicism that the Tryzub masterminds prefer.

Such traditionalism and religious fundamentalism are bound to bring about the extreme homophobia that is usually called fight for “family values”. The Tryzub has been famous a number of attacks on LGBT activists, for example, at presentations of LGBT literature “120 pages of Sodom” in Kiev and Lviv. Besides, the arson attack on Pavel Gudimov’s art gallery in Kiev is also ascribed to the Tryzub. Gudimov is a member of “Okean Elzy” (Elza’s Ocean) rock band, famous in Ukraine and Russia, who is known for his consistent anti-homophobic position.

Moreover, the Tryzub having an “intellectual” environment is different from other ultra-right-wing Ukrainian racists. Vasil Ivanishyn, Tryzub’s founder, wrote a number of books. His son Pyotr also publishes ideological literature. A while ago the current Ukrainian Minister of Culture and former president of the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy used to be the organization’s member and published “Ukrainski Problemy” (“Ukraine’s Problems”) political magazine. Dmytro Yarosh tried to highlight this peculiarity in an interview: “Ukrainian nationalists and Bandera followers are not plebs with sadistic inclinations; they are intellectuals; they are people who write, they are outstanding people who work not only in the military fighting field. The Tryzub is an organization that generates certain ideas”. Does this mean that intellectuals with sadistic inclinations are much better than sadistic plebs?

From the practical point of view, the organization focuses on arranging “vyshkols”, or trainings. “Vyshkol” is a traditional Ukrainian nationalist kind of sport and military trainings. They tend to take place outside and imply trainings for military action or drills. It might remind of a famous field game called “Zarnitsa” but it is more relevant to compare it with the activities of the right militia movements in the US.

“Vyshkol” for Ukrainian nationalist organizations are not only a way of direct training for an imagined war (obviously, in most cases with “Moskals”) but also a quite efficient means of propaganda and organizational activity. It is no secret that the youth constitute the core of such trainings. It is this “audience” that is most exposed to camping emotive power, the beauty of night battle marches and military moral and brotherhood. According to some reports, on the eve of Maidan developments, several dozen members of the organization went through a number of battle marches onto the territory of Belarus.

Moreover, “vyshkol” is a good form of initiation ceremony that gathers together members of the organization from different

regions of the country with different theoretical experience and time of service. Staying together in an isolated space helps to get to know each other better and is bound to generate unity among members of the organization. Freshmen catch up with old-timers. As a result, “us” emerges with a distinct identity, “family” kin feeling and folklore.

The Tryzub shapes an organizational structure and uses badges of rank established in the times of OUN-UIA – “hundreds”, “kurins”, etc. instead of Soviet squadrons, divisions and so on. Such structure reproduced on the Euromaidan in Kiev, with “Maidan Self-Defense” having hundreds led by “sotniks” (hundred commanders). The Right Sector itself formally constituted a hundred of “Maidan Self-Defense” although it was made up of several hundred people.

In terms of social cohesion, typical corporate guidelines of such movements are all the Tryzub has. They include cooperation of all representatives of the nation, stopping class struggle, integration of workers and employers into a single entity that is meant to mitigate conflicts and resolve disputes peacefully. But all in all, the Tryzub barely develops a social agenda. It mostly raises humanitarian (cultural, national and historical) questions. Before the Euromaidan the Tryzub used to be perceived by nationalist circles as a “retro-nationalist” organization, as a sort of historical reconstruction of politics.

However, they had to adjust and the Tryzub now seriously lays claim to shaping an all nation trend. The Tryzub is a special type of an ultra-right-wing movement. It could be compared with quasi-fascist authoritarian movements similar to those in Salazar Portugal, Franco Spain, Dr. Tiso Slovakia or Smetona Lithuania.

Such national conservative clerical movements, if without racism, anti-Semitism or appeal to Nazi symbols, were common in Latin America. They were most popular during the “cold war” when they were backed by the US secret services to fight with

the “Red Threat”. Pinochet in Chile and Videla in Argentina based their dictatorial regimes on similar ideological premises.

The Patriots of Ukraine organization

The UNA-UPSD organization – founded by Dmytro Korhynskiy wanted for his participation in the Chechen wars on the side of separatists – suffered from a number of splits in the early 2000s, no longer has any clear agenda and is basically a veteran club. The UNA-UPSD activities are reduced to sponging on its “former greatness”. The Social National Assembly, the third member of the Union, however, is completely different. Oleh Od-norozhenko, its mastermind, never ceased to appear on Ukrainian TV in the winter and spring of 2014 as the Right Sector official spokesperson. He long ago replaced Artyom Skoropadskiy, the official press secretary, who is close to the Tryzub.

The “Ukrainian Social Nationalism” is a “canonical” ideological bible of the Social National Assembly. The book officially belongs to the Patriots of Ukraine organization rather than the Social National Assembly, but there is basically no difference between the two. The Patriots of Ukraine organization is a militarized wing of the Social National Assembly (the Patriots of Ukraine used to be a youth wing of the Svoboda). It is common for contemporary Ukrainian nationalism to divide an organization into political and military wings.

The Social National Assembly-Patriots of Ukraine (SNA-PA) Manifesto recognizes the nation-state of the Ukrainian nation. What they see as a problem is that in order to develop fully, Ukraine must become a superpower. It first must become a regional power in the form of Central European Confederation in the Baltic-Balkan-Caucasus triangle, which will ensure Great Ukrainian dominance over the Eurasian continent. In the long-run clause 7 of the foreign-policy chapter of the Manifesto says: “The ulti-

mate goal if Ukraine's foreign policy is world domination". It is no doubt that Ukrainian politics have never had a power that would claim world dominance.

Ukrainian imperialism is one of the pillars of SNA ideology. Its motto runs "Sociality. Racism. Great Power". Nationalists say that there can only be one center of power from the Carpathian Mountains to the Urals. The question is where it will be located – in Kiev, Moscow or Warsaw. This superpower is to become new Kievan Rus of the 21st century. Nationalists are confident that it will be the key to saving Europe and the White race.

Oleh Odnorozhenko, organization's current mastermind, says in his article "Social-natsionalisticheskoye dvizheniye I ego osnovnye zadachi" ("Social-Nationalist Movement and its Key Tasks") published in the "Ukrainian Social Nationalism" that it is only Caucasoid people who are of the same kind as Ukrainians. To be precise, it is only Southern Caucasoid people who form a distinct type. What is more, only Caucasoid people have the right to call themselves "people", or persons. They must stop maintaining contact with other races to avoid miscegenation. Representatives of other races who happen to be in Ukraine must be deported to their motherland as soon as possible.

Most contemporary nationalist politicians of the radical wing try to camouflage their racist views with the fight against illegal immigration, Islamism, "erosion of cultural identity" and the like, while the race question is the backbone of the SNA ideology. Their "Sociality. Racism. Great Power" slogan is telling. Such racism forms the organization's attitude to its own nation as well as other nations. We will explain.

Andriy Biletskiy, SNA-PU leader, who has recently been released by the amnesty announced by the victorious Euromaidan dwells on this issue in his "Language or Race" article in the section called "The Leader's Column" on the Patriots of Ukraine website. According to Biletskiy, it is its racial type that fully shapes a cultural face of a nation. Therefore, all national cultural phenom-

ena, whether it be language, national architecture, clothes and the like, are “superstructure” of the race that is the “base”. Biletskiy thinks that Ukrainian racial type has remained unchanged for over 40 thousand (!) years. That is why Ukrainian nationalists must struggle, above all, for conserving racial purity of the Ukrainian nation rather than the Ukrainian language. If they manage to save it, it should not be hard to “Ukrainize” Ukrainians and other racially compatible citizens of the country over a short period of time.

Another ideological peculiarity of the Social National Assembly is its authoritarianism and anti-democratic character, while the Tryzub declares commitment to democratic ideals, if in the form of “democracy for Ukrainians”. In its authoritarianism the SNA has come so far as to call its leader Andriy Biletskiy “Vozhd”, or “Chief”. By the way, it is spelled with the capital V in all ideological documents of the SNA, along with “Nation” and “Ukrainian”.

The group outspokenly admits its authoritarianism and explains its anti-democratic inclinations in the typical of fascists’ manner. People are born different: “How can you equate the voice of a prostitute and an academician?” Hence, strict hierarchy. However, the documents fail to explain how what criteria regulate everybody’s place.

On the other hand, the “President of the State”, or Vozhd, is to concentrate the function of ruling the state. The Vozhd is also to head the Government. The Parliament is formed by a professional-estate system, which is by representatives of state trade unions, rather than by political parties. The SNA masterminds adopted the idea of the future organization from Mykola Stsiborskyi, prominent OUN ideologue of the pre-war time. His book “Natiocracy” is considered an ideological bible. It gives a detailed description of the corporate fascist-type state.

It is a corporate state run by a National Vozhd who enjoys full personal authoritarian power. A professional parliament of estates

defends the interests of “employees and employers” who are organized into syndicates. Such system is typical of fascist regimes in Italy, Germany, Spain, Portugal and Vichy France. Corporate state is the backbone of fascism while the essence of a corporate state is reconciling employees and employers.

Almost every article of the SNA-PU book reproaches capitalism. They also say the organizations are against Marxism and the “Left-wing one-size-fits-all policy” implying eliminating private property is not welcomed. On the contrary, the organizations guarantee development of small and medium enterprises while large and strategically important companies must be nationalized.

With all its super-authoritarianism, the SNA manages to declare its commitment to the principles of self-government and self-organization. It is clear that such model of state is very limited and can only survive on a very local level.

The SNA approach to free media also speaks volumes. They suggest full media nationalization and banning any foreign media on the territory of Ukraine. The Manifesto says that “media must be deprived of monopoly on shaping the public opinion”, and must only seek “to report objective information”. Obviously, it implies establishing a powerful agitation-propaganda machine à la Dr. Goebbels.

Neither the Manifesto nor other articles of the ideological book of the SNA say a word about the Internet, although the organization itself is well represented there through a network of websites and groups in the Vkontakte social network. It seems to be simply due to the fact none of the ultra-right-wing masterminds of the early 20th century wrote about it. There is a less funny explanation. The Internet just cannot exist in such a totalitarian society. Or vice versa, a totalitarian society does not survive when the population has access to the world web.

In the sphere of cultural policy the SNA holds traditional ultra-right-wing view, that is to say propaganda of healthy lifestyle, militarism, heroism and family value, which is a typical set of any

fascist movement. Something similar is now only left in North Korea. And this set is no accident since an aggressive fascist regime cannot survive without an imminent war or, at least, permanent preparation for it.

Even more so if the regime openly declares that it seeks to create a Ukrainian empire and annex territories of neighboring countries or the courtiers themselves and to establish an Aryan Confederation of the White Peoples of the World on their basis. Oleh Odnorozhenko's article "Social-natsionalisticheskoye dvizheniye I ego osnovnye zadachi" ("Social-Nationalist Movement and its Key Tasks") describes this all in detail.

To implement this mission, a lot of blood must be shed. It also requires indoctrinating the people with jingoism. Besides, there must be enough human material, and of good quality meaning trained and motivated. This is why the mission apparently requires a high birth rate and healthy nation, not because of humanism feelings or care for the peaceful future of the nation. Defenders of the fatherland are to be trained from the very childhood through a network of special military sport organizations.

The military issue is in general vital for the SNA. It is no coincidence that the Manifesto says that Ukraine must create the most powerful army in the world. It also included creative ideas on how to organize the army, for example, setting up its own aircraft-carrier squadron.

But of course the most "valuable" idea is to form a "squadron of Lozino-Lozinskiy space bomber aircrafts and fighter jets". This could be part of some folklore or anecdotes of the authors of such "howlers" did not affect thousands of young Ukrainians and did not seek power in modern Ukraine.

As regards social sphere, the SNA has a "social-democratic" agenda aiming to create a "welfare state" with free medicine, education and other social security functions. A paternalist nanny state is another typical element of fascist ideology.

It is noteworthy that the SNA headquarters is in Kharkiv, not Lviv or Ternopol. A significant majority of its members are Russian-speaking, which is in contrast with the Tryzub in particular and Ukrainian nationalism tradition in general. Traditional Ukrainian nationalism is mostly popular in the West of Ukraine. That is why one could easily call them the followers of Hitler rather than Bandera.

Xenophobia has always been a good way to vent frustration and unhappiness with the state of affairs. But the SNA goes further and harshly criticizes “speculative capital” and corruption of the party based political system. It also offers a way out – by establishing a dictatorship.

It would make no practical sense to study ideological peculiarities and minor differences between the Tryzub and the SNA-PU if such neo-fascist structures were marginalized in the political life of Ukraine. However, what happened on the Euromaidan brought to the fore youth ultra-right-wing groups and introduced to the big politics. The Euromaidan key trend is liberal-nationalist, unlike the liberal-democratic Maidan of 2004. Most Kiev city dwellers who took to the Euromaidan in 2013 were cautious about the ultra-right-wing. However, since the situation was turning increasingly violent and dangerous, a force was needed to fight the government. Liberals could not create such force by themselves, which is why the ultra-right-wing had to play this role.

A special cynicism and pickiness of Ukrainian liberals should not go unmentioned. They kept finding and spreading any information about the “neo-Nazi” who took part in pro-Russian demonstrations in the South and East of Ukraine. But they wouldn’t want to see their “own” neo-Nazi. One could often hear funny sayings like “try find any Nazis on Maidan”. And those who did so were accused of working for the enemy, giving advantage to Putin imperialism and other such sins. This speaks volumes about Ukrainian liberals: studying closely pro-Putin “neo-Nazi” with the microscope, while trying hard to ignore pro-Maidan ones.

“Hromadske TV”, a very popular Internet-TV channel, is a good example in this regard. On January 16 2014, journalist Dmytro Hnap commented on the fights at the Dynamo stadium in Kiev that he saw with his own eyes. That says the Right Sector started violent confrontations with the police, started to set on fire the police buses and turn them over. One of the Right Sector fighters had printed on his shield the Celtic cross, a traditional ultra-right-wing symbol, and 14/88 used by neo-Nazis all over the world.

The picture of the guy was shown by both Russian and Western media but not in Ukraine. The above-mentioned Dmytro Hnap that same day said on the air that he has been among the Right Sector fighters and did not see any Nazi there. Even French journalist managed to find them while Ukrainians ones did not.

Andriy Manchyuk, a Ukrainian journalist, started to disseminate the picture on his personal Facebook page, but was many times banned due to complaints by the Euromaidan followers. Others who try to spread the picture from his page were banned too. It is noteworthy that the excuse the followers used to complain was the dissemination of the Nazi ideology. This is a stunning example of cynicism and double standards.

In February 2014, a BBC journalist made a short report about neo-Nazi on the Kiev Euromaidan. The Ukrainian BBC office had to spread it too on its Internet sources. The feature to comment on the video was turned off, though, which had never happened with other BBC Ukrainian videos. It is obvious that the video turned out to go unheeded by the liberal journalists. On the other hand, they went to great lengths to find “neo-Nazi” among pro-Russian protesters in the South and East of the country!

David Kramer, Freedom House president, said that rumors about an extremism treat in Ukraine were vastly overrated, that ultra-right-wing organizations existed but were very weak, unlike Russia. This is yet another example of double standards.

Ties between Neo-Nazi and Secret Services of Ukraine

The Right Sector was established since the very first days of protests on the Euromaidan in Kiev. The idea belonged to the Euromaidan masterminds due to weak organization and coordination of protesters and activists on the Independence Square. The coordination was originally spontaneous; however, thanks to social networks and skilled instructors, the militiamen of the Right Sector were soon able to acquire skills of well-coordinated work. Trench confrontation with Berkut Special Forces is a good example. The Right Sector adopted from the constituent organizations a number of additional distinguishing features to be described below, as well as its ideology.

“Colonel” Dmytro Yarosh, Stepan Bandera Tryzub “provydnyk”, is the Sector’s commander. His deputies include Andriy Stempitskiy of the Tryzub (known as “litun”, or flyer, as he used to study in the Kharkiv military flight school), Andriy Tarasenko (known as “Pylypas”) and Mykola Karpyuk (“Taran”, leader of UNA-UPSD and the veteran of Ukrainian radical right-wing movement. The Right Sector also includes “Biliy Molot” (“White Hammer”), a very exotic structure led by Oles Vakhniy.

As for the Tryzub, Valentyn Nalyvaichenko, current Head of the Security Service of Ukraine who also used to run it 2006 to 2010, can be viewed as its the main coordinator and shadow leader. Nalyvaichenko is a trained and experienced diplomat who used to work in the US, among other countries. The four years when he headed the SSU were considered controversial both inside and outside of the structure. It has to do with his extremely close – beyond regular cooperation – relations with the CIA leadership. Thus, the diploma award ceremony for the SSU Academy graduates attended by both the head of the Service and the US Ambassador William Taylor Jr. in 2008 caused a very negative reaction.

Taking into account that counter intelligence agents were also awarded diplomas, Nalyvaichenko's decision to invite the US Ambassador was criticized by current and former employees of the Service. Given the role played by the current US Ambassador in what has happened in Ukraine, it cannot be ruled out that Geoffrey Payette (the US Ambassador to Ukraine since August 3 2013) could follow Taylor's suit.

The SSU leadership in 2006-2010 was also famous for exhibitions devoted to Holodomor, or Hunger-extermiation, and initiating criminal cases over Genocide of the Ukrainian people in 1932-1933.

In 2013, when Nalyvaichenko used to be a Member of Parliament, a number of Communist lawmakers accused him of cooperation with the US, for example, disclosure of classified information.

Now that he is Head of the SSU, proven information leaked that Nalyvaichenko took part in summer trainings of the Stepan Bandera Tryzub.

It is at the trainings at the Zarvanitsa village of Ternopol oblast on July 17 2013 that Dmytro Yarosh, leader of the Tryzub, made a statement that the country needs a "national revolution", and as long as "The Russian Empire in any form" exists, Ukrainian independence is impossible.

In early April 2014, "Ukrainian Pravda" ("Ukrainian Truth") paper published a report called "Za Kulisamy Pravogo Sektora" ("The Right Sector: Behind the Scene") that, among other things, cited documents proving that while Nalyvaichenko was a Member of Parliament, Dmytro Yarosh was his aide and consultant in the Supreme Rada pro bono.

Of the Right Sector member, there are other people, besides Yarosh, who have come to be famous for notorious statements. For instance, Andriy Tarasenko, Yarosh's deputy in the Tryzub, when giving an interview for Rzeczpospolita Polish paper, shocked, to say the least, the journalist by saying the following:

“We only want what is ours, – said Tarasenko. – If truth be told, Ukraine should return the lands where Ukrainians have been living for thousands of years”. Tarasenko stressed that he meant “uniting all the ethnic lands of Ukrainian people” that “Ukrainians were forced to leave”. Tarasenko implied the “Vistula” operation after World War II, when over 140 thousand Ukrainians were resettled from the southeastern territories of current Poland to the Ukrainian Soviet Republic.

The Right Sector representative also highlighted that Bandera’s responsibility for massacres of the Polish in Volyn in 1943-1944 are “nonsense”. “Bandera advised radical methods; for you can fight occupants with any methods”, – said Tarasenko.

Rzeczpospolita’s correspondent wrote in the same article: “Stepan Bandera is today the greatest hero for the protesters [on Maidan]”, even more so “protesters against making Bandera a hero are unheeded”.

The UNA-UPSD

Of all the organizations listed at the beginning of this chapter, the Ukrainian National Assembly – Ukrainian People’s Self-Defense has been most famous in Russia. A brief history of the organization is required here.

In the summer of 1990, the Ukrainian Inter-Party Assembly (UIPA) was established. It was founded by intellectual students, including Dmytro Korczynkiy, Oleh Vytovych and Oleh Kubakh who later came to be well known in nationalist circles. A number of graduates and students of Kiev University were members of the organization too. At the time of the August Putsch, or August Coup, in Moscow in 1991, the UIPA initiated setting up self-defense divisions in Lviv, Kiev, Rovno, Ternopol and other cities. The divisions attracted quite a lot of radical young people who had military experience or were former officers.

In late 1991 the UIPA was renamed into UNA and the whole organization came to be called the UNA-UPSD. The newly trained defenders of the Ukrainian nation went to Transnistria¹ to vent anger. There they took part in military actions against Moldavian troops. Mykola Karpyuk, Rovno born current commander of the UNA-UPSD, led the UPSD divisions in Transnistria. The war's end for members of the organization quiet successfully, without serious losses.

Further wars that the UNA-UPSD participated in took place outside of Ukraine, which is typical, and were far bloodier. Reasoning why “Ukrainian Self-Defense” took part in wars in regions with barely any Ukrainians was unconvincing. Later a more valid argument came to be used that the organization fought against “Russian imperialism”, Ukraine’s eternal enemy. However, they have not been able to explain why they fought against imperialism under President Yeltsin and did not want to do it when Vladimir Putin came to power. The UPSD rivals among other Ukrainian right-wing radicals said the reason was money. It was rumored that the UNA-UPSD leadership was paid for its militiamen heads and did not share the money with other “fellow” members.

Here is an approximate list of conflicts that the UNA-UPSD took part in at the turn of the 1990-s and 2000-s:

– In the summer-fall of 1993, the UNA-UPSD militiamen participated in the Georgia-Abkhazia war on the side of Georgia. Seven UNA-UPSD fighters were killed, a few were injured.

– In the fall of 1994-1995, UNA-UPSD divisions and separate UNA-UPSD volunteers participated in the First Chechen War on the side of Dzhokhar Dudaev. Oleksandr Muzychko (known as Sashko Bylyi) killed by the police in March 2014 in Rovno had been head of Dudaev’s guards and came to be famous for unprecedented violence and even sadism towards Russian prisoners of war.

1. It is an unrecognized breakaway state located mostly between the River Dniester and the eastern Moldovan border with Ukraine largely populated by Russians and Russian-speaking citizens.

It was the time when activists of Ukrainian parties and organizations rumored that the UNA-UPSD was being paid for recruiting mercenaries to Chechnya.

– In April 1996, a UPSD delegation attempted to take part in presidential “elections” in Belarus on the side of Lukashenka’s opposition. The organization members admitted that called on the Byelorussian radical youth to “decisive action”. As a result, seven people were arrested and convicted in Minsk.

– In the summer of 1996, a UPSD delegation tried to take part in different “humanitarian” projects in Grozny. In the end, Dmytro Korchynckiy, Oleh Vytovych and some other “intellectuals” were accused by the organization’s radical wing of betrayal, secret deals with the SSU and Russian Ministry of the Interior, financial schemes, etc. In May 1999, Andriy Shkyl, a graduate of the Lviv University Journalism School, became the organization’s actual leader.

– In December 2000 – March 2001, it participated in “Ukraine without Kuchma” campaign launched after journalist Georgiy Gongadze was killed. Yulia Timoshenko played a key part in the demonstration and thus started her electoral campaign. The UNA-UPSD was the protesters’ main fighting force although its leaders claimed they had nothing to do with Timoshenko. After what happened on March 9 2001, UNA-UPSD leaders got into quarrels over mutual accusations of betrayal.

They accused, as later found rightly so, each other of cooperation with the SSU and Russian Ministry of the Interior. Fellow organization members were mostly unhappy with Andriy Shkyl who in 2002 while being investigated was elected a Member of Ukrainian Parliament and immediately entered “Yulia Timoshenko Block”. (Right after the 2012 parliamentary election, Andriy Shkyl who did not win the popular mandate that time and left Ukraine fearful public prosecution over purely economic crimes.)

In the end, UNA-UPSD activists persuaded Yuri Shukhevych, one of the founders of the organization who long ago retired, to

once again head the structure (Yuri Shukhevych is the son of Roman Shukhevych's who used to be UIA commander).

Mykola Karpyuk, organization's veteran, came to be Shukhevych's deputy and actual leader of the organization. The UNA-UPSD website has once reported that around 70 people have been killed in military action over its 20 year history. Many members have been prosecuted or served a prison term. They are very aggressive and experienced people. However, after Shkyl left, there have been barely any intellectuals left.

Given some "commercial" aspects of UNA-UPSD activity, it is interesting to study literature that this structure publishes and the training its fighters receive. The UNA-UPSD has not been just preparing "slaughter flash" for yet another Maidan – it has been selling "multifunctional specialists", who obviously cost much more.

Here is a glaring example. Since the early 1990s the UNA-UPSD have been preparing and issuing military charters, such as "Collection of Instructions of UPSD commanders" made in Kiev in 1993 of 67 pages. The Collection includes organizational principles of the UPSD in the times of peace and war (basically military charter).

Take a closer look at some chapters of the Collection. They are prepared for serious "revolutionary fighters" rather than some boys with sticks and shields in Kiev:

- Hunting weapons, making ammunitions, sub caliber weapons, combat knife, making knives, gas spray guns;
- What is an infantry combat vehicle and how to fight it;
- Chemical warfare agents and protection;
- Flammable mixtures, how to make and apply them (napalm manufacturing technology, «Napalm II» (supernapalm), napalm powder manufacturing);
- Ammonal manufacturing, ammonal antipersonnel mine manufacturing, ammonal hand grenade manufacturing;

- Demolition techniques (description, pictures from a Soviet Army demolition handbook);
- Antitank and antipersonnel mines. Hand grenades;
- Operation manual for a rifle, machine gun, bullets of different kinds;
- Explosive, non-explosive and fire stops on motorways, anti-airborne and anti-tank stops;
- Tactical characteristics of local conflicts within the Commonwealth of Independent States;
- Battle position (Transnistria case);
- Urban battle;
- Defense of back areas;
- Combat suit;
- Sabotage;
- Emergency help memo.

It is noteworthy that the SSU and Russian Ministry of the Interior were fully aware of both organization's activity and such literature. At rare times of persecutions and arrests, such brochures were taken away in bags.

There is an opinion expressed by even such famous Ukrainian public figures as late Mykhailo Horyn (one of the founders of the People's Rukh of Ukraine and the Ukraine Republican Party) that the UNA-UPSD existed to gather together the most radical Ukrainian youth under the control of the SSU and Russian Ministry of the Interior.

Much has been written and said about the SSU and Russian Ministry of the Interior influence among the UNA-UPSD. Most leaders of the organization have been accused of relations with them. After March 9 2001, when the UNA-UPSD was basically neutralized, it was replaced by the Stepan Bandera Tryzub and Patriots of Ukraine in consolidating the radicals.

Although the UNA-UPSD today appears to be an organization of Ukrainian nationalist movement veterans, its members who blended in with the Right Sector have done their best to affect its

ideology through countless conversation of the old veterans with young fighters and through disseminating exotic propaganda materials.

The White Hammer

Although the White Hammer falls short of the UNA-UPSD in terms of both “historical achievements” and number of members, it cannot be ignored in the context of the Euromaidan.

The White Hammer is no doubt the elite of violent protests! It consists of full-time militiamen united by the ideas of Nazism, hatred for the Hebes, the Blacks and the cops. They do not hide anything, no disguise or innocent batting eyelashes “we don’t see any Maidan fascists”: swastikas, Hitler “siegs”, 14/88, White Power and so on.

Members of the group are known in the Ukrainian nationalist circles as most aggressive and inadequate fighters ready for any campaigns against anyone. Most members of the group are former criminals. It was this group that “did not like” that representatives of Jewish communities of Ukraine addressed the Euromaidan. As a result, despite orders from the Euromaidan leaders, the White Hammer fighters attacked members of the Jewish community on Maidan, Khreshchatyk and territory of the Podol synagogue (also known as Rosenberg’s synagogue).

Oles (Oleksandr) Vakhniy is considered to be the leader of the White Hammer. He has been well known in the nationalist circles since the early 1990s. Back then he was one of the heads of the Kiev office of the “Union of Ukrainian Youth” that was established by Ukrainian emigrants after the Second World War and was financed during the “cold war by western special services.

Vakhniy came to be famous during the first modern Ukrainian war against “monuments of the totalitarian past”. For example, on February 8 1993, members of the Kiev Union of Ukrainian Youth

led by Vakhniy partly demolished Lenin statue at Boyarka station. On February 3 1995, they destroyed the statue of “leader of the world proletariat” in Klavdyevo-Tarasovo of Kiev oblast.

Vakhniy even used to head an office of the Social National Party of Ukraine where he came to be known for attracting skin-heads and blatant Nazis.

He has been arrested repeatedly. For example, for attacking the office of the Commission of Ukrainian voters that he viewed as a “group of young mandarins of politics” responsible for manipulating the public opinion. He served over 5 years in prison.

In 2005 he got his second term in prison. Over the recent years he has actively participated in a number of protests, including demonstrations against foreigners and “cannabis marches” in Kiev.

On March 22 2007, at a press conference on “Anti-Racism March” he threw a bunch of bananas at black-skinned Sunday Adelaja ¹ after the latter did not answer why among drug-sellers there were so many of his compatriots. Adelaja filed a lawsuit against Vakhniy who got 15 days of administrative arrest.

Many other representatives of the Right Sector structures also have a rich criminal experience.

1. Sunday Sunkanmi Adelaja is the founder and senior pastor of the Embassy of God, an evangelical-charismatic megachurch, spiritual advisor of Leonid Chernovetskiy, ex-mayor of Kiev.

EuroNazis on the Euromaidan

Hardly had Right Sector leaders appeared on the Euromaidan than they expressed their unambiguous position on the Russian Federation, the Customs Union and all forms of Russian-Ukrainian cooperation. To prove their point, they started to actively disseminate anti-Russian posters and leaflets, with significantly increasing number of Red-Black flags of the OUN-UIA.

The Euromaidan, unlike the Orange Maidan of 2003-2004, quickly degenerated from a popular assembly in favor of European integration and common European values into an endless aggressive nationalist festival. This all happened because of the unprecedented number of Ukrainian nationalists and fascists who pretty soon took control over the Euromaidan and its agenda, with barely any resistance.

When the Euromaidan started to degenerate from a democratic protest into a nationalist one, the Svoboda Party became its trendsetter. Its flags dominated symbols of other parties but soon even more radical forces emerged with far more radical slogans. The previously little know Right Sector came to be a new trendsetter.

Their first attack on law enforcement officers and Berkut divisions took place on December 1 2013. They back then were con-

sidered provocateurs and had been criticized for quite a while. Neither did many Kiev city dwellers and Maidan activists like when the organization members took part in toppling Lenin monuments on the Bessarabskaya square.

However, January 19 2014 saw their first success when the Right Sector fighters actively participated in clashes with the police that grew into, unlike the fight on December 1 2013, protracted street confrontation on Grushevskogo Street.

Euromaidan participants recall that on the morning of January 19, before the popular assembly due later that day, they saw radicals organized into columns on Khreshchatyk Street and at Maidan Nezalezhnosti metro station. This suggests that the demonstration had been planned, regardless of the result of the popular assembly and of whether the police would let the protestors go to the Government district on Grushevskogo Street or not.

In other words, the Right Sector leadership did not care about negotiations or reaching any compromise. Their task was to destabilize the situation in any case. At the moment leaders of the organization and its coordinators decided on their strategic task, which was to take power in Kiev by force.

It was easy to recognize Right Sector activists on the Maidan. They were all equipped with metal military helmets while the vast majority of other participants only had motorcycle or construction helmets or exotic protection helmets made from casseroles.

The Nazi militiamen also had nightsticks, chains and shields, which came to be an integral part of their ammunition during the last month of the confrontation. Numerous witnesses pointed out an unusual teamwork and unity of the Right Sector. They attacked in an organized way, in small groups and suddenly moved back not giving Berkut forces any time for a counter-attack.

It is noteworthy that Molotov cocktails against Berkut were first used by the Right Sector as well. They were also first to apply pyrotechnical devices, besides incendiary bottles, that they threw straight at the police. When on January 19 street clashes broke out,

Maidan activists immediately got involved. Being so uncompromising towards the Special Forces and the government, the Right Sector affected the Maidan feelings and sentiments that the Opposition for a long time tried not to touch.

The authors do not seek to write yet another Bandera revolution story. This phenomenon is not over yet. That is why we would like to dwell on some of its aspects that are directly related with the research.

When the book is being written, the South and East of Ukraine are experiencing an armed conflict between the people of Donetsk and Luhans oblasts and the new Kiev authorities. A different, information war has been waged for over a month and the Security Service of Ukraine led by Nalyvaichenko, an old friend of the Right Sector, have been taking an active part in it.

The SSU has been copying and spreading through social networks and Ukrainian media a number of blatant fabrications about allegedly leaked negotiations of spies of the Main Intelligence Directorate allegedly by mobile phone while being, as it seems, in some studio. There have been video clips with some colonels and “green people” giving numbers of Russian military commands that have allegedly invaded Ukraine. The quality of such fabrications leaves much to be desired but the signature appears to be the same.

It was surprising but something similar happened a few months ago and it was directly related with the Euromaidan and the Right Sector” (below is the citation by the “2000” Internet source):

“Andriy Levus, Maidan Self Defense commander and one of the masterminds of the Right Sector extremist union announced a narrow group the plan of so called “special operation” to “dispel” yet another information bomb. The “2000” learned about it from a source in the UDAR Party. A meeting in the Trade Unions Building is working out the details of implementing yet another campaign to create information hysteria to later accuse “the Kremlin Special Forces” of provocations and murders of the Euromaidan activists.

With the purpose, the Right Sector is choosing an object of law enforcement officers who would be taken hostage and persuaded to testify that “he is a member of the Russian Federal Security Service staff sent to Ukraine to implement “special operations” on the Maidan Nezalezhnosti”. The meeting discussed a plan B in case they do not manage to take hostage a law enforcement officer. In this case they were going to choose a Russian speaking activist from one of the Eastern regions, desirably former law enforcement officer, who would make a similar statement with a covered face.

The Right Sector discussed a plan to take over Berkut Special Force and law enforcement officers and to arrange their “public obstruction”. The idea of the masterminds was that some of the detained officers were to agree to reveal “shocking information” that “according to a tacit order from the Russian Minister of the Interior”, Berkut allegedly was to open fire at law enforcement officers in case they side with the activists or refuse to follow the order of cracking down on the Euromaidan. We would like to believe that such plan will remain dreams and fantasies of the Right Sector”.

End of citation. Such different structures with such surprisingly similar signatures!

The information that top SSU officers arranged the meeting of Dmytro Yarosh and President Yanukovich on February 20 2014 has been verified. It was the day when several dozen unarmed people were killed by “unknown” snipers a few meters away from the Presidential Administration.

It might be this “strange” friendship of two such different organizations that explains why the Right Sector Internet sources despite the armed confrontation remained open and available to anybody over the Bandera Revolution. Explain why the websites have pictures and detailed information about members of this organization and why its leaders did not close the websites after the confrontations started to defend their activists.

To conclude the chapter, we would like to say a few words about how selfless the heroes of the Ukrainian revolution are.

According to numerous and repeatedly verified reports by the very participants in the Euromaidan, since it started every leader of a resistance group (like Parubiy's Self-Defense and Yarosh's Right Sector) was promised a compensation. US \$200 a day for every active fighter and an additional US \$500 if the group was over 10 people. Coordinators were promised about US \$2000 a day of mass riots if the subordinate group implemented direct attacks against law enforcement officer and officials. It is reported that the money came through diplomatic channels to the US Embassy in Kiev and then to Svoboda and Batkivshchyna central offices (around US \$20 million a week).

The money was used to support the Euromaidan (life support system, bribes for individual officials and law enforcement officers, media and propaganda) and to pay active fighters weekly. Protest leaders received the money via bank transfers to personal accounts. On the other hand, it was found out that the leaders of the right-wing structures, upon their request, were guaranteed help in an emergency to urgently evacuate them out of Ukraine and provide accommodation and money in any EU country to their liking.

The Odessa massacre

On May 2 2014, the southern seaport of Odessa, the Pearl of the Black Sea and the humor capital, saw clashes between Ukraine federalization supporters on one hand, and the neo-Nazi Right Sector, Euromaidan activists and football fans on the other. At least 46 died, with another 200 injured. 38 federalists burned alive in the Trade-Unions Building assailed with Molotov cocktails.

Trade-Unions Building on Fire

At 15:00 on May 2, 2014, the radical right-wing Euromaidan followers and the Right Sector, along with fans of *Chernomorets* and *Metalist* football clubs, arranged a march “For Ukraine’s Unity” on the Sobornaya Square in the center of Odessa. The slogans included “For Ukraine’s Unity”, as well ultra nationalist “Death to Enemies” and “Impale the Moskals”. At 15:00 the square witnessed around 1500 aggressive people. A column of 500 supporters of Ukraine’s federalization arrived at the same time from Kulikovo field, which triggered bloody confrontations.

During the clashes around Deribasovskaya Street, where the rival parties threw paving blocks, stun grenades and Molotov cocktails at each other, one of the participants in the “For Ukraine’s Unity” march was shot in a lung and had died before the ambulance arrived.

Afterwards, nearly 200 Pro-Russian activists were blocked at Grecheskaya Street, with the local police protecting them. Out-numbered federalization advocates shot back with non-lethal weapons at the Right Sector and Euromaidan Self-Defense Forces. A part of the federalists withdrew to the *Afina* Trade Center and occupied a position there and stationed riflemen for defense.

Nationalist activists forced federalization supporters back to Kulikovo field, defeated them and burned their camp. Pushed from Kulikovo field, federalists hid in the Trade-Unions Building situated not far from their destroyed camp. Both sides used paving blocks and metal building materials with gunshots heard. The building caught fire with Molotov cocktails during the confrontation. The fire spread through several floors exacerbated by a late fire brigade arrival. The right-wing radicals prevented the fire from being extinguished in the building and had pinned the federalists in the building by shooting at the windows with firearms.

Some federalists tried to jump out of the windows of higher floors and fell to their death. Those who managed to leave the building were cruelly battered by Ukrainian nationalists with the police inactive.

Forty-six deaths were confirmed as of May 3, 2014 as a result of clashes on Grechekaya Street and Kulikovo field. Thirty-eight people, including the elderly and a famous Odessa poet Vadim Negaturov, died in the Trade-Unions Building fire. Most of them died from burns and carbon dioxide poisoning. At least 12 people who died in the Trade-Unions Building were documented to have gunshot wounds. Two hundred fourteen people sought medical help in Odessa’s hospitals, with 88 people hospitalized and 40 in a critical condition.

However, many question the data. “According to our sources, 116 were murdered in the Trade-Unions Building. They didn’t just die – they were slaughtered. We don’t say “burned” or “suffocated” because the autopsy has not been performed on the bodies. For the sole reason that they have shotgun wounds in the head”, said Vadim Savenko, a deputy of the Odessa oblast council.

He also added that most of the victims have burns on the head and shoulders. “This means that people were deliberately burned with flammable materials so that the bodies could not be identified”, explained Savenko saying that the information came from Antimaidan activists, “people who themselves were in the Trade-Unions Building that day”.

Answering the question why the death toll he announced was twice as high as the official figure, Savenko stated that “Ukrainian authorities are ordered to conceal the true scale of the tragedy in order to hide from the world community that Odessa suffered from a punitive operation against pro-Russian citizens”.

Mykola Volkov, a 33-year-old Maidan Self-Defense activist, also known as Captain Mykola, was in charge of the shootings in the Trade-Unions Building and finishing off the injured. Although he has been wanted since 2012, after President Yanukovich was toppled, Volkov became Captain (a centurion) of the Storm battalion of the Ministry of the Interior made up of Odessa volunteers. This shows that the line between illegal armed groups and the Ministry of the Interior of Ukraine after the Euromaidan victory has become factitious in Ukraine.

On the eve of the Odessa massacre, Andriy Parubiy, the Secretary of Ukraine’s National Security and Defense Council, former editor-in-chief and author of blatantly racist articles in the Guidelines (Orientiry), the SNPU official magazine, met with Captain Mykola and gave him instructions. Parubiy also gave Mykola Volkov a modern bulletproof vest of protection level 5 he was wearing on May 2, 2014. It was Parubiy who Volkov reported to on the operation aimed at killing “pro-Russian militants” blocked

in the Trade-Unions Building. “Arrange a corridor and we will do our job”, asked “centurion Mykola”. The corridor was given and the job was done.

On May 26, Mykola Volkov was detained in Odessa on charges of organizing civil unrest, was taken to Kiev, where as soon as May 28 he was... released and placed on house arrest.

“Bravo to the murderers!”

When the first pictures of Odessa’s Trade-Unions Building on fire were posted online, it was hard to understand which was more shocking – what the right-wing radicals were doing, or how the events were being commented on by the people who consider themselves cultured and civilized advocates of Ukraine’s European integration.

This is how the Odessa tragedy was commented on the official Twitter page of the Euromaidan:

Євромайдан @Dbnmjr: “Odessa, I am proud of you! Thousands of the city residents are cleaning their land off the Colorados¹. Kiev and the entire Ukraine are with you #Odessa”.

Nikolay Zolotaryev @AdCoolAs: “Zaporizhia has kneaded a pie from the separatists², with #Odessa baking it”.

Євромайдан @Dbnmjr: “A hornet’s nest ... was ... #Odessa #Ukraine”.

Some blog posts shock by more than just cynicism – it is just difficult to find the right name for this: “I am going to say a very

1. “Colorados” (“Колорады” in Russian) is a derogatory name for pro-Russian activists on the south-east of Ukraine that emerged because of the latter actively using St. George’s Ribbons that resemble the coloring of a Colorado beetle. St. George’s Ribbon is a bicolor ribbon as part of the Order of St. George. The Medal “For the Victory over Germany in the Great Patriotic War 1941-1945” was also decorated with the St. George’s Ribbon.

2. A week before the Odessa tragedy, Zaporizhia saw confrontations between Ukrainian nationalists and federalization advocates, with the latter beaten and showed with flour.

harsh and, from a Christian perspective, totally unforgivable thing: let this tragedy be a lesson for all motherfucking Colorados. Each and every!”

Iryna Farion, a Member of Ukrainian Supreme Rada from the nationalist Svoboda Party (a part of the coalition government of revolutionary Ukraine), head of the Subcommittee on Higher Education within the Committee on Science and Education, responded to the Odessa tragedy by saying: “Well, has your Putin saved you, imbeciles? This is what is going to happen to every separatist! Game’s over. Keep burning, now burning in hell. Bravo, Odessa. The Pearl of the Ukrainian Spirit! the motherland of the nationalists Ivan and Yuri Lipas¹. Let the demons burn in hell. Football fans are the best insurgents. Bravo!”

Volodmir Nemirovskiy, head of Odessa oblast administration, said that “What Odessites did to neutralize and detain armed terrorists (referring to Ukrainian federalization advocates – Ed.) was legal”.

Lesya Orobets, a Member of Ukrainian Supreme Rada from the Batkivshchyna liberal party, a candidate for Mayor of Kiev, commented on the events in Odessa on her Facebook page: “This day has become history. Despite the betrayal of at least a part of the police, Odessites have defended Odessa and proved to everyone that Odessa is Ukraine. An outstanding victory has been won at the cost of lives of patriots. Crowds of Colorados have been annihilated. The aggressors who were first to attack have been given a more than adequate response”.

The Ukrainian TV channels reacted to the Odessa tragedy quite unequivocally. For example, the ICTV Channel owned by Viktor Pinchuk, Leonid Kuchma’s son-in-law, reported on clashes between “pro-Russian militants” and “supporters of Ukraine’s unity”.

1. Members of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army that existed from 1943 to the early 1950s and fought against Soviet and Polish guerillas as well as against the Red Army. The UIA is notorious for cooperation with Nazi Germany and bloody punitive operations against the Polish and Jewish civilian population of the western Ukraine.

“Pro-Russian radicals were first to use thunder-flashes. They also threw Molotov cocktails at the crowd from the roof of the [Trade-Unions] Building”, said the anchor of the TV program surprisingly called “Facts”. “It was followed by the storm of the building from all sides. The front and the back doors caught fire. The fire and toxic smoke quickly spread throughout the building. People cried for help out of the windows”.

Later, according to the anchor, Ukrainian nationalists (“supporters of Ukraine’s unity” as the Ukrainian press calls them a-la Orwell newspeak) “brought a metal construction to the building to help the pro-Russian activists blocked on the 2nd and 3rd floors. But they kept throwing stones at the heads of the pro-unity activists”.

Thus, the anchor thinks that “pro-Russian militants”¹ not only attacked their ideological opponents who they knew outnumbered them but also later blocked themselves in the Trade-Unions Building, burned themselves and fended off those who came to their rescue”. Those “rescuers” who shot at the activists who tried to get out of the windows of the burning building and finished off the people who jumped out of higher levels of the building and broke legs (anyone can find documented proof on YouTube²).

Historical Parallels

The Odessa massacre of May 2, 2014 will be known as one of the darkest pages of Europe’s recent history. For many decades, Europe has not experienced such savageries of people setting a

1. At first, all Ukrainian press wrote a lot that those were Russian citizens; however, all the identified victims of the tragedy proved to be Ukrainians, with most of them Odessians.

2. YouTube: Proof of arson and shootings at Odessa residents. The Trade-Unions Building. Odessa. URL: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uid6k1wjPQg>

building on fire with their political rivals inside and burning those trying to get out.

Reprisals against civilians were arranged in the same way Ukrainian Nazi police goons, recruited by the Hitler's forces from Stepan Bandera's Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN), cruelly dealt with the entire population of the Byelorussian village of Khatyn in March 1943. Defenseless residents of the village were surrounded by superior forces, driven into a shed which was set on fire, with the people burning alive. Those trying to escape were beaten to death with the cries of "Heil Hitler!" and "Glory to Ukraine!"

Khatyn saw grand and grand-grandfathers bedazzled by the opportunity to create a "Ukrainian Ukraine". Likewise, Odessa witnessed grand and grandchildren brainwashed accordingly. The right-wing radicals in Odessa shouted "Glory to Ukraine!" watching burning people jumping out of the windows of the building set on fire with Molotov cocktails. Just like the henchmen of Hitler's forces later accused Khatyn's residents of assisting the guerrilla and shooting at the German allies of Bandera's OUN, "Ukrainian patriots" have now cynically claimed that "separatists burned themselves": they could not use Molotov cocktails, spilt combustible mixture and set it ablaze accidentally. This is the official version of Ukraine Ministry of the Interior with regard to the cause of the fire in the Trade-Unions Building. The Ukrainian media also immediately bandied about the news that all the killed are not locals, but rather Russian citizens who came to destabilize the situation in Ukraine. It later turned out that all the burned alive by the neo-Nazis were Odessites.

There is another resemblance that is also scary. Jewish massacres committed by Ukrainian nationalists in 1941 in Lviv, which is in the west of Ukraine, had a huge number of supporters who watched reprisals against the "Jids" (Hebes)¹ with joy. Photo-

1. Hebes ("Jids", «жиды» in Russian) is a derogatory label for Jews in East Slavic languages (does not have a derogatory connotation in West Slavic languages).

graphic evidence of the Lviv massacre of June 30 – July 2, 1941 depict both the victims' sufferings and the audience's hungry curiosity. They used to be right-minded Lviv residents as recently as yesterday, but all of a sudden they turned into bloodthirsty beasts who watched with interest the ingenious killing of the Hebes. Lviv residents of the right ethnicity welcomed any inventive torture of their former neighbors with whistle, cries and jeers. They knew that the latter would be killed and they would be able to take their abandoned flats. Or at least, loot their possessions with impunity.

The same is true of June 25, 1941 in Kaunas (Lithuania) even before the German troops invaded the city.

An event of the same kind took place in Odessa on May 2, 2014. Likewise, the beast hiding inside every person flew off the handle whose strength had been overestimated.

Aleksandr Aronov's poem "Ghetto. 1943" commemorating the rebellion in the Warsaw ghetto has such lines: "When the ghetto had been burning for four days, and there was so much crack and light, and all of you were saying: "bedbugs are burning". With bedbugs replaced with Colorado beetles, the difference between 1943 when the SS regular troops crushed the Jewish rebellion against the Nazis and today when the Right Sector and the Euromaidan Self-Defense forces did exactly the same is not that significant.

After President Yanukovich was ousted late February 2014 and a de facto civil war broke out in Ukraine, a researcher finds it quite hard to distinguish activities of Ukrainian paramilitary nationalist groups from military operations carried out by the new regime itself. In other words, we are wondering if the history of Ukrainian political nationalism traced back to 1991 has become the history of the entire Ukraine. When the "national guard" made up of neo-Nazis killed nearly a hundred people on May 9 in Mariupol in the southeast of Ukraine, was it revenge by Stepan Bandera's successors for the defeat in the Second World War or was it done by the "democratic" and "pro-European" government? When Donetsk, Luhansk, Slavyansk and Kramatorsk in the east of Ukraine

are attacked with multiple rocket launchers and combat aircrafts, is it a “restoration of the constitutional order” or is it the continuance of old “bloody” traditions of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army slaughtering civilians “as a warning” on all the occupied territories?

After the Euromaidan won, the history of Ukraine increasingly resembles dispatches from the fronts of a civil war. We are witnessing Eastern Europe’s contemporary history in the making. But we would give a lot to turn back the time.

The Psychology of Ukrainian Neo-Nazism

Analyzing speeches by leaders and activists of the Svoboda Party, the Right Sector and other radical organizations at meetings and talk-shows, studying Manifestos, Internet forums and party groups in social networks and, above all, talking with activists themselves, we tried to draw a psychological portrait of a Ukrainian nationalist. We tried to avoid extremes, whether calling them the ultimate heroes of Ukraine or “pathologizing” them. We sought to reveal shared typical features of the radical right-wing studied in the book.

Men Among the Ruins

The break-up of the USSR came to be a serious moral and psychological turmoil for most its inhabitants, let alone dramatic decline in the standards of living. Millions of people who adopted a single, whether it be good or bad, picture of the world created over 70 years by the Soviet regime found themselves at the bottom of the ladder. A lot is said today about radical anti-Christian

policy of the early Bolsheviks embodied by the notorious pictures of the destroyed Christ the Savior Cathedral in Moscow. The collapse of the Soviet ideology was no less painful for the former USSR citizens.

One of the main fears of children who have just learnt to walk is losing support. Religion embracing all spheres of life was the foundation that supported the people of the Ancient World and the Middle Ages. Religion later was replaced by an ideology of humanism that was based on the human in all its manifestations rather than the sacred. The French Revolution slogan “Freedom, equality, brotherhood!” generated three fundamental Modern religions, namely liberalism, communism and nationalism.

After the Second World War, nationalism ideology came to be outlawed in Europe. European communism was almost defeated in the late 1980s. Liberal “freedom” – that no longer satisfies humankind needs in a higher justification of life – is the only one left. Political liberalism and spiritual atheism create a moral vacuum, a feeling of emptiness and meaninglessness of existence that cannot be filled in by external well-being and material wealth, exclusively physical categories.

The early 21st century, the postmodern era, is marked by growing cultural, economic and political globalization, on the one hand, and reversed the process – reviving regionalism and disintegration political trend. One would think that in the era of the Internet and instant e-payment, the questions of Scotland’s independence from Great Britain, or Catalonia’s and the Basque country’s independence from Spain, Gagauzia from Moldavia are not important. Surprisingly, they are.

Liberal ideology that has won in the “civilized” world promotes total atomization of society into individuals bound only by economic ties. This atomization naturally leads to declining trust between people; for trust is based on a shared experienced, common values and universal behavior standards that cannot exist with the way freedom is understood by liberalism.

On the other hand, the feeling of permanent fear, if not realized, together with lack of trust is very painful for “atomized” individuals. They start to look for (or construct) the communities they call “their own” and where they will be comfortable. This is the reason why a plethora of subcultures and philosophical and religious movements have emerged. Thus postmodern people deprived of roots amid “free” society” try to define themselves.

Some find themselves in association with such modern constructs as “nation”, or in history or mythology of their motherland, or in the language or cultural background. Against this background nationalism is no longer banned all over Europe and the failure of Britain and Germany to create a multicultural society is recognized. In this regard, a surge in popularity of the Svoboda nationalist party and victorious parliamentary election is within the common European trend.

Free-Floating Anxiety

Economic and political volatility in the country and uncertainty result in anxious and mistrustful traits of character. This is especially true of people whose adolescence fell in the late 1980s and the early 1990s, the time of the collapse of the USSR and “bandit capitalism” high day.

Older citizens keep positive memories about “good old times”, with a calm life in a stable society not shadowed by any calamity. The older generation that is traditionally more conservative has an example of what “life should be like” while young Ukrainians whose personality was formed during the “times of trouble” are deprived of such positive memories about the country. On the other hand, they are familiar with the discomfort and “thin ice” feeling, need for a permanent struggle for a “place under the sun”.

The feeling of a “free-floating anxiety” as psychoanalysts call it is much harder to bear than phobias about something certain.

While, according to a famous definition, expecting death is worse than death itself a free-floating anxiety is worse than a clear fear of a person, event or situation.

Free-floating anxiety cannot stay in a person's consciousness for long. Such anxiety is either "squeezed" into the subconscious to later surface constantly in repeated nightmares or obsessive-compulsive neurosis, or "stick" to some "external" objects, whether it be an animal, some people, or representative of entire subcultures or ethnic groups, situations, places or vehicles.

If an anxious person goes in for politics, his fears can be rationalized through historical mythology, through bias towards historical or contemporary facts. Rationalization is a function of psyche to seek a rational (or sensible) explanation of any liking or dislike, inclinations, mood, joys or fears. However, such an explanation does not necessarily reflect real cause-and-effect relationships. True relationships are often hidden, "squeezed out" of consciousness.

It is difficult for a grown-up to admit irrationality of their phobias while giving an allegedly rational external reason is quite acceptable. Musketeer Porthos, however, was an open-minded person who did not look for rationalization, which is why directly admitted: "I fight ... simply because I fight". However, real life, let alone politics, is often completely different. It goes more commonly like "I fight because enemies scare me and I must attack first and my behavior is shaped by external reality, not my internal hidden motives" rather than "I fight because I fight". And "external" enemies, whether it be true or more commonly fake enemies, are always easy to find.

Ritualism

One of the ways to deal with anxiety, the feeling of uncertainty and the feeling of undifferentiated flow of scaring external impres-

sions that sweeps everything in the way is to strictly observe a ritual. Rituals structure reality amid changing world. Primitive societies of the Ancient world and the Middle Ages that suffered from wars, epidemics and starvation maintained life largely with the help of rituals connected with the solstice or equinox, season change and harvest, gender or professional initiation and religious holidays.

In the contemporary world, remaining rituals (such as a military oath or school graduation ceremony) no longer significantly influence a person or society. Modernity is individualized, with everyone following their own schedule and living their own life. However, acquisition of individual freedom, Renaissance philosophers sought, has not made a person happier. On the contrary, an individual of the 21st century has been left face-to-face with the external world. To survive this face-to-face confrontation, a man once again has had to ritualize his life.

Attractiveness of German National Socialism that radical Ukrainian nationalists are guided by – as much as they deny it (nevertheless, some social nationalists admit it in private conversation) – is based to a certain degree on admiration for a ritual. Night torchlight swastika parades by lines of columns, solemn parades of the “blond beasts” in black suits designed by Hugo Boss, solemn rituals of initiation into the NSDAP or SS with oaths of allegiance and blood badge are all important elements that help people feel affinity with their fellows and the like-minded and simultaneous involvement in history, in generation of heroes rooted in antiquity, in ideas and business of a higher order.

The Svoboda and Right Sector rituals are of course simpler and less pretentious than that of the NSDAP; however, they fully meet the task of uniting the rank and file and of “charging” activists emotionally and ideologically. Thus, ultra right-wing hot-eyed Ukrainians of different age and social status with excitedly describe their marches in remembrance of Ukrainian Insurgent Army, nationalist symbols and rituals of initiation into the party. By the way, probationary period in the Svoboda party takes an entire year

when a candidate overcomes a number of initiation tests ranging from filling in an application and an interview to daily duty shifts in the staff office, work in agitation support groups and participation in protests. A traditional Ukrainian shirt with stitch embroidery that does not always complement the rest of a more modern outfit has become a key element of the Svoboda party dress code, although it was Viktor Yushchenko and Yulia Tymoshenko who brought it into vogue during the Orange Revolution. Party members do their best to stress their national and cultural identity and their uniqueness, unlike standardized political clerks in ties and similar shirts.

What is Good and What is Bad?

Iryna Farion, the scandalous lawmaker and key mastermind of the Svoboda Party, has become famous even outside of Ukraine for her blatant Russophobic statements, bizarre and hysterical behavior. One can get an impression that Madame Farion is always aggressively agitated, almost restless and dysphoric (which is the opposite of euphoric). However, Svoboda members appreciate their colleague and officially praise her for professionalism in history and philology matters (she is a PhD in philology) often choosing her as a speaker at demonstrations and popular talk shows.

“Why are so many books translated into Russian rather than Ukrainian published and sold in Lviv and Ukraine? Why are Moskal pop music and Moskal commercials played in our buses? To fight this we have to resist aggressively. And I am asking you to resist everything Moskal”, she calls on nationalists. In her opinion, such radically negativist rhetoric is not a manifestation of Russophobia but a mere call for defending the Ukrainian language and culture and the Ukrainian nation from erosion by globalization and unification wave.

Since, according to history student books authorized by the Ministry of Education of Ukraine, over the last 400 years, Ukraine has been under the oppression of Russia, it is everything Russian that anti-globalizers should fight against. At the same time the idea of Ukrainization of traditionally bilingual Kiev or Russian speaking Kharkiv, Donetsk, Luhansk, Odessa and Sevastopol does not seem to be a manifestation of the very violent globalization and unification (on the country scale this time) that they fight. “Bilingualism is not a historically shaped phenomenon, but rather the heritage of Moscow occupation, repressions, genocide, heterogeneous marriages, prohibition of the Ukrainian language, planned and natural migration”, Madame Farion reveals the “truth” about the reality.

“It Is Not Us – It Is Life”

“It is not us – it is life”, says one of the criminal characters of a popular Russian film “Beemer’ (2003) justifying his violent and aggressive behavior. Psychology calls it “projection”.

Psychological projection is one of the most common mechanisms of psychological defense. It is a function of a human psyche to deny in oneself existence of some, most commonly negative, impulses (like anger, aggressiveness, deceit, expansion, ignorance, etc.) and to project them on the people around.

This solves the problem of self-esteem and constructs a black and white perception of reality in which a “good” me is opposed to “bad” them having all the bad qualities that I deny in myself.

Negative qualities can be projected on both individuals and groups of people – followers of a “bad” ideology or religion, representatives of a “bad” country or people, etc.

Having created a simple and clear black and white picture of the world, a man starts to develop respective black and white relations with the world defending him/herself from the perceived

aggression of the people around. In case the “bad” do not want to behave as “badly” as a projection prone individual expects the former has two ways out: to either admit being wrong or to make (provoke) the “bad” behave towards that individual in the way he/she wishes. This generates a vicious circle.

The less educated and critical a person is towards themselves, their thoughts and deeds; the more likely he/she is to project some of their qualities outwards and the less likely he/she to be able to refuse their black and white perception of reality. The sleep of reason produces monsters, as they say in Spain. Speaking of monsters...

The Sleep of Reason Produces Monsters

A disposition to construct predominant ideas and of self-partiality is a distinguishing feature of a paranoid accentuation of personality. Accentuation of personality is not pathological but merely “stressed” or strongly marked traits of character. A predominant idea takes control over a paranoid personality consciousness cannot be corrected, with any criticism “bouncing off” it. Whoever tries to point at paranoid’s inconsistencies in reasoning and conclusions right away becomes an “enemy”.

Nationalist organizations, with the Svoboda Party a glaring example, include a significantly higher number of paranoid personalities than society on average. The very ideology attracts people predisposed to a black and white perception of the world or promotes a binary system of thinking, i.e. that of friends and enemies, with more enemies than friends. Enemies are everywhere – inside and outside a nation, at home or abroad.

In this black and white world where one is surrounded by hordes of enemies, there is only one ideology and one party that can fight with “impenetrable darkness of the outside”.

While slogans like “only we can save the country from [insert what]” tend to be typical of the rhetoric of opposition political forces and they are elements of a well designed promotion campaign, radical Ukrainian nationalists truly believe in their mission and call their opposition fellows “ally of the moment”¹.

Despite declaring neutrality to ethnic Russians and Russian speaking citizens, young Svoboda members and followers – even from traditionally Russian speaking parts of Ukraine – speak exclusively Ukrainian when talking to them. They explain this by saying they do not speak Russian well, which is doubtful. It is noteworthy that a similar trend towards “forgetting” Russian takes place among the liberal opposition as well, for example, in the Batkivshchyna whose members occasionally go back to “forgotten” Russian in private talks.

Ukrainian nationalists tend to interpret all facts linked with history or modern Russian-Ukrainian relations exclusively in terms of “Russian imperialism” that seeks to invade, oppress and enslave tiny Ukraine that has been struggling for independence for centuries. After the referendum and following the return of Crimea into Russia, this myth has significantly strengthened spreading on a bigger number of formerly apolitical Ukrainians.

While it was trendy in Russian politics just a few years ago to accuse the opposition of “working for the US State Department”, it is now popular in modern Ukrainian politics to accuse rivals of “working for the Kremlin”. For instance, former president Yushchenko’s electoral slogan ran: “The only one who is not controlled by the Kremlin”.

Despite all “uniqueness” statements, Ukrainian politics, including Ukrainian political nationalism embodied by Svoboda, cannot or does not want to separate from the image of the “big brother”. Ukrainian nationalists always turn their head to see Russia’s reaction. Russia for them is mostly a combination of myths

1. Before 2013 parliamentary election, the Svoboda Party, Batkivshchyna and Vitali Klitschko’s UDAR reached an agreement on joint action.

and an object to project fears on, Tolkien's Mordor or rather Lovecraft's Mountains of Madness rather than a really existing state.

Collectivism as Way Out of Individualism

A significant majority of Svoboda activists are university (including most prestigious) students. Most Svoboda members among Kiev students who we were able to talk with live in dormitories because they came from other regions of the country. It is typical that, while previously apolitical, many of them have been serious about going into politics and entered the party when in Kiev. It is easy to get disoriented when you come from a quiet province to a big modern European city, with more stressful situations and reasons for anxiety. The Svoboda Party, though, has its own image of a real brotherhood, sort of modern Männerbund¹ where you are always supported and never let down. Among reasons to enter the Svoboda, the young people named "cultural racism" of Russian speaking Kiev city dwellers.

Provincial Ukrainians are quite sensitive to what is called snobbism of natives of Moscow and St. Petersburg towards people who came from "Zamkadié" (or the outside of Moscow)². This is where the desire to "Ukrainianize" even the traditionally Russian speaking capital of Ukraine seems to stem from.

Adolescent grudge against Russian speaking Kiev city dwellers, if "ethnic Ukrainians", is projected on Russians who, according to official party (and as it turns out also state) mythology "Russified Ukrainians by force". In other words, according to Svoboda mythology, capital residents express their superiority over provincials due to the centuries of oppression and Russification by the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union rather than due to their bad manners or the very fact of being capital residents.

1. Men's Union (Männerbund in German) is a public institution in primitive societies and military democracies, it is a closed group of men who have come of age.

2. Territories beyond the Moscow ring motorway.

The quasi-logical line of reasoning that to an average, say, Russian seems absurd or nonsense, is uncritically accepted by young Ukrainians who understand that the world is organized in a strange way and want to change it for the better. Good intentions and a combination of real and routine problems and historical myths produce the ideology of radical Ukrainian nationalism that attracts an increasing number of supporters in Ukraine and abroad. Thus, a number of Russian democratic and national democratic movements and individual leaders have been enthusiastic about firstly the Svoboda's becoming a parliamentary party and later the radicals' victory over the government during the Euromaidan¹.

The Svoboda's members and followers are different from that of other parliamentary political parties of Ukraine and post-Soviet space. Having attended the 26th Convention of the Svoboda Party devoted to drawing conclusions of the victorious parliamentary campaign, one of the authors of this book witnessed an unprecedented bureaucratic activity, with the meeting room full of crowds. The convention saw men and women of different ages wearing different clothes, whether it be traditional Ukrainian embroidery shirts, or stretched sweater and blue jeans, or military suits with many awards and stars, all feeling comfortable when coming to the stage to get honorary awards from Tyahnibok.

Activists of the party were also awarded after the election. Other opposition parties or the former ruling party could not boast of such true and devoted activists who were no paid for. The Svoboda Party, lacking many financial resources available to motivate its activists, was able to wisely arrange work with the activists showing them their importance. This is one of the key secrets of the success the party has been trying to achieve over many years.

1. The authors tend to regard this as a manifestation of a "dizziness from [other's] success" that representatives of Russian opposition or non-system politics often experience when in Ukraine. Russians whose Parliament is "not the place for debate" since the mid-2000s, at first turn, were euphoric at dynamic, competitive and full of events political environment of Ukraine.

Necessary Roughness

Cultivating violence and admiring a strong, charismatic leader are often regarded as defining characteristics of the Ukrainian Neo-Nazi's world view. A party member can describe with a kind smile how he and his fellows destroyed leaflets of a rival party or sabotaged a performance by an "ideologically alien" historian or a musical band. In the wake of the bloody Euromaidan that claimed many lives, there have been significantly more such stories told with hatred rather than a kind smile.

The very militarists aesthetics of Ukrainian nationalists marked by glorifying "Sich Riflemen" (divisions of Austro-Hungarian Army formed from residents of Western Ukraine who fought against Russian imperial divisions in the First World War), warriors of Ukrainian Insurgent Army and the 14th Waffen SS "Galicia" division implies an inclination to the violent resolution of political problems. This is bound to make the Svoboda Party and, even more so, the Right Sector more popular among young people who see how weak the leadership (equally the old "authoritarian" and the new "democratic" one) of the country is in both foreign and domestic policies. Violence is the asymmetric response of Ukrainian youth to the helplessness of the central authorities.

"Glory to Ukraine!" Oleh Tyahnibok greets his fellow party members from the demonstration podium and raises his right hand with the thumb and little finger sign (which forms a three finger figure, so called the tryzub/trident, a traditional symbol of the Kievan Rus also shown on the Ukrainian coat of arms). "Glory to heroes!" respond in unison his fellow party members and followers. (Another response slogan of the party is more aggressive: "Glory to the nation!" – "Death to enemies!")

"Motherland is a collection of heroic acts rather than territory", said Dmytro Korchynsky, one of the UNA-UPSD founders. This includes the deeds by only those Ukrainians who fought

against the Russian Empire, such as “Sich Riflemen”, against the Soviet Union, like the UIA and Galicia SS fighters, or against the Russian Federation, like the UNA-UPSD. Acts of bravery by a significant majority of Ukrainians who – not biased by the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy or German Nazi – fought in both world wars for the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union are diminished.

“Those Ukrainians suffered from Moscow Empire propaganda; that is why they fought for the occupants rather than for their own country”, young neo-Nazis explain without thinking. One would understand to some degree if that were said by guys from Lviv or Ivano-Frankivsk, but that was said by students from Kiev and Cherkassy, which are traditionally completely “non-Bandera” regions of Ukraine.

Despite that fact that Svoboda successfully “crossed the Dnieper” during the 2012 parliamentary election and transformed from a regional (Lviv, Ivano-Frankivsk and Ternopol oblasts) onto a national party, its ideological interpretation of Ukrainian history, as one can easily notice, is obviously very “local” and “parochial”. The views, sufferings and phobias typical of a small group of Ukrainian people that for a long time had been under Polish and Austro-Hungarian control are now being imposed on the entire Ukrainian people.

Thus, instead of universal all-Ukrainian idea, a rather regional idea of former provinces of Catholic kingdoms of Eastern and Central Europe is being formed. The party of the national majority turns out to be based on “parochial narrow-minded and chauvinist ideology. Although Svoboda members deny distinguishing Western and Eastern Ukraine arguing that this division has been made up by enemies of Ukrainian people (it is not hard to guess which enemy they imply), from the point of view of significantly different and often opposite perception of the history of the current single country, this distinction is indeed valid

The distinction is tangible in terms of both parliamentary and presidential elections, as well as support for and criticism of

the Euromaidan. At the peak of armed protests in Kiev in February 2014, neo-Nazi started to send “friendships trains” (an Orwellian style title!) to those regions of the country that were not active enough in supporting the Euromaidan or even advocated federalization of Ukraine or opposed the new government. Despite significant number of armed “democratizer”-activists who brought the “friendships trains” into “non-Bandera” regions of the south and east of the county, they were fought off and returned to either Kiev or Lviv.

Mythology Yet Another Time

Every nationalized relies on some historical mythology. Nationalist mythology of a nation includes three constituent elements:

- Our people used to be great and powerful;
- Enemies occupied our lands and deprived our people of its power and greatness;
- Our nation is now spreading (or should spread) its wings to overthrow the occupants and to once again become as great and powerful as it used to be.

Instead of “great and powerful”, a people can be prosperous, beautiful, rich or whatever. All historical events starting from the times long gone are interpreted in the nationalist discourse exclusively from the point of view of these three elements. Since popular history is always a history of wars, often wars of all against all, it is not hard to find a candidate for the “most important occupant”.

A modern man who has overcome the stage of primitive thinking and who is formally a rational being is in fact very non-resistant against the beauty of such myths. The myths referring to antiquity and making one feel involved in a great civilization, heir to a virtuous culture are especially attractive.

Negative myths, sort of ancient tragedies related with such notions as occupation, genocide, mass violence or forced population transfers, are also very strong. These are the myths that the ultra nationalist Ukrainian propaganda is making focus on, with the contribution of the mainstream Ukrainian historical studies of both liberal and nationalist nature. It perceives Russia and Russians as exclusively negative and evil-minded characters who came to rob, murder and pursue forced collectivization of Ukrainians rather than liberators of brother Ukraine from Polish, Tatar, German and other invaders and builders of basically all infrastructure in the country. The black and white perception of the world does not know “a few bad” protagonists.

Trying to provide a possible explanation of the inhumane bloody Serbo-Croatian wars in the 20th century, wars between the people divided along political and religious lines, but speaking the same language and coexisting for centuries, psychoanalysts have come up with the theory of “Narcissism of small differences”. The idea is that mutual antagonism growing into absolutely blind and all encompassing hatred is more likely to break out between close and very similar people or entire ethnic groups. In this regard, a sad anecdote is relevant about a Ukrainian who “would kill all Moskals” because they say “pivo” (beer) instead of “pyvo”.

The anecdote keenly grasps the idea of the “Narcissism of small differences” theory. It is mythological thinking that generated the idea the Russians are not Ukrainian brothers, which was postulated by pan-Slavism, but rather a “Finno-Ugric and Tatar-Mongol mixture that stole from the true Russ (i.e. modern Ukrainians) their nation and country name”. Such fantastic, from the point of view of Russians, ideas are often discussed by speakers and representatives of Svoboda itself as well as forums and Internet communities of Ukrainian neo-Nazis (who are interesting to study in terms of psychology). While anti-Semitic statements are less often heard from them, the anti-Russian rhetoric is increasingly

common. Indeed, it is harder to “integrate in civilized Europe” being anti-Semitic than Russophobic.

In the “1984” novel the Orwell character had to admit that “ $2 + 2 = 5$ ” and “war is peace” after hours of sophisticated tortures. It is horrible to even imagine what tortures against the common sense and a conscious mind one has to undergo to start regard Russians – who ethnic Ukrainians see every day, who they talk to every day and who are physically the same as Ukrainians and other Eastern Europeans – as “Tatar-Mongols”! Another explanation of this mythological “transformation” of Russians is demand for an “eternal enemy” myth. Pushkin, a great Russian poet, wrote: “It is so easy to deceive me, for I am glad to be deceived”.

For Svoboda and Right Sector neophytes, such Russophobic and other ideological myths at first do not seem to hold up to any scrutiny. But later, as they get involved in the party fuss, with its rituals, slang and permanent Russophobia (like a de facto ban on using Russian in internal party conversations and full ban on the official party Internet-forum in a case like Svoboda), recently converted Ukrainian nationalists start to adopt the party mindset and accept it less and less critically. The party members themselves admit that ideological debates are discouraged. This creates a fertile soil for such Russophobic myths. Besides, as we have previously said, the Ukrainian official political and historical mainstream has been promoting them too since 1991.

To prove this idea, we would like to recite a story by a Russian diplomat we heard in the fall of 2012. His little daughter went to an ordinary Kiev school and once asked her dad: “Are we, Russians, good people?” “Of course, we are. Why?” the diplomat asked surprisingly. “If we are good, then why have we always oppressed Ukraine?” she replied. Is this a national policy of imposing a guilt complex on the Russian citizens of Ukraine? This is beyond our research, but all the respondents answered in the affirmative.

Stockholm Syndrome a la Ukraine

The conventional wisdom that love and hate are just one step apart is pretty much verified by the ideology of radical Ukrainian nationalism. While Russian nationalism is traditionally “broad”, pan-Slavic, Ukrainian nationalism in the Svoboda and the Right Sector interpretation are its complete opposite.

The Svoboda nationalism does not recognize pan-Slavism since it does not view Russians, the biggest Slavic people, as true Slavs, but rather a “Finno-Ugric mixture with Tatars”. Paradoxically, on the international level, until recently Svoboda representatives were on friendly terms with both Hungarian (Ugric) and Finnish nationalists. The united Ukrainian opposition (with which the Svoboda All-Ukrainian Union took part in the elections) also signed an agreement on cooperation with The Mejlis of the Crimean Tatar People in the summer of 2002.

One of the White Movement leaders during the Civil War in Russia is quoted as saying: “Even with the devil as long as against the Bolsheviks”, just like Ukrainian nationalists who seem to be willing to be friends with the Finno-Ugric or Tatars but never with Russians, but rather against them.

Officially the Svoboda and the Right Sector deny being Russophobic reiterating that they are “not against the Russians, but rather against the Moscow-Bolshevik occupants”. At the same time “occupation” involves basically all the history of the coexistence of Russians and Ukrainians within a shared state. It also involves both the Russian language and culture. (A scandalous incident is well known when, at the initiative of Iryna Farion, the Svoboda’s mastermind, a driver of a Lviv shuttle bus was fired in June 2012 due to his refusal to turn off Russian music at her request.)

By the way, the Bolsheviks of the early 20th century who new Ukrainian nationalists views as their “bloody” enemies hardly connected themselves with Russian culture or the Russian state

and very often were not ethnically Russian. While Bolsheviks passed into oblivion in Ukraine, Russians and the Russian speaking, despite the policy of forced “Ukrainization” in both Soviet and “Nezalezhnost” (independence) times, have remained. It is they who are, along with the Communists and Jews, have become the main enemies of the new Ukrainian nationalists.

Paradoxically, the very name of the Russian ethnic group – “Russ”, “Russians”, that, according to the official Ukrainian nationalist mythology, was stolen by Muscovy from the ancestors of the modern Ukrainians (which is itself very anecdotic and improbable but quite acceptable within the fabulous mindset) – is prohibited, among other things. The party activists say that when the Kiev office of the Svoboda Party was being established, a pretty big group of Nazi-Skinheads called the “Russian militia” joined them. The skinheads were admitted into the party but were strongly encouraged to ... No, not to change their hairstyles or remove swastika tattoos, nothing like that. Instead, they were told to change the name to the “Slavic militia”.

There is a beautiful town called Rava-Ruska in the Zhovkva Raion in Lviv oblast on the very border with Poland which was first mentioned in the mid-15th century. Rava was called “Russian” to distinguish from Rawa Mazowiecka that is now in Poland. We are puzzled why the city has not been renamed “Rava-Ukrainska” yet?!

Freedom from What and Freedom to What?

The Svoboda Party member cannot be called marginalized or looser teenagers angry at the world of “peripheral capitalism” without any ambition or opportunities for career and personal growth. On the contrary, among the party followers and members, there are many educated people, self-made businessmen, lawyers and people of art and lawmen of different levels. Oleh Tyahnibok says,

and independent sociologists verify it, the party relies on the middle class, just like all nationalist parties of Europe.

Nobody doubts the good intentions of those who entered the party until October 28, 2012, that is to say until the victorious parliamentary election for the Svoboda party. They want to see their country strong, proud, prosperous and victorious. They want their young generation to be sporty and successful, knowing Ukrainian history and loving it. They want the Svoboda to be a leading political and ideological force that would shape a new Ukrainian nation.

On the other hand, the black and white perception of the world of the social nationalists there is much blatant mythology that justifies violence. The fundamental personality anxiety, along with paranoid, suspicious and mistrustful perception of reality results in finding more and more foreign and domestic enemies. Any disagreement with the official party ideology, for example, over Holodomor (1932-1933), the Russian language or federalization of Ukraine, is interpreted as blatantly aggressive behavior and leads to accusations of liking for the Communist ideology or work on the Party of Regions, KGB or the Kremlin.

The adolescent “search for enemies” is very successful amid volatile social, economic and political situation, with the permanent war of all against all. However, the “permanent” enemies have been successfully identified, and they are historical Russia in all its manifestations. Even Poland, which the Western Ukrainian nationalist should logically have more complaints against, is not regarded as a primal enemy.

The Svoboda and the Right Sector leadership, above all, Oleh Tyahnybok and Dmytro Yarosh, are without doubt talented managers. The politicians have been able to direct traditional protest sentiments of the middle class of the country in the relevant nationalist way and have clearly identified the “friends” and the “enemies”, thus having transformed the free floating anxiety into phobia about certain states, ideologies and ethnic groups.

Will the people of Ukraine be able to unite around such an ideology cultivated from historical myths and relevant fears? the Orange Revolution masterminds failed to do it in the mid-2000s, while the Red and Black neo-Bandera revolutionaries of 2013-2014 brought about Crime separation and dramatic confrontations in the south and east of Ukraine, with federalization and even separation demands.

All in all, radical neo-Nazism playing some role in Ukrainian nation-building disintegrates rather than unites the nation. Instead of “one nation, one language, one people”, two nations loom on the horizon. The separation is taking place along the language and cultural lines and due to differences in the attitudes to history, culture and political violence, rather than blood or ethnicity, which the radicals insist on. Ukrainian nationalism is naturally degenerating from “the love for nation” into justification for hatred towards those Ukrainian citizens, including ethnic Ukrainians, who view prosperity of their country differently than Bandera successors.

Conclusion

The spring of 2013 saw the publication of the Stanislav Byshok's book called "Illuziya Svobody: Kuda Vedut Ukrainy Novye Banderovtsy" ("The Illusion of Freedom: Where Neo Banderera Followers Are Taking Ukraine") which became popular in both Russia and Ukraine. The author has been many times asked to answer the question in the title. His reply was towards a break-up. Barely anyone liked the answer. The author was told that he was exaggerating, that he had not spent enough time in Ukraine and that he had drawn wrong conclusions, that he was working for the Kremlin to caricature Ukraine where, in fact, there were no neo-Nazis, no discrimination against ethnic minorities or discriminatory anti-Russian language laws, etc.

Just a year has passed since then. It is banal to talk about Ukraine's disintegration as everybody is talking about it as about something very likely in the long-run or in fact already happening. The question is now what will be left of Ukraine in the end, if anything, rather than if it will take place or not.

The worst in this situation is to look for the people to blame for what has been happening, instead of looking for the root cause of the failure. The guilty are mostly looked for in the east of the coun-

try. And the guilty are always found. Lack of criticism to oneself multiplied by projecting everything negative outwards is a distinguishing feature of Ukrainian nationalists. “We are not to blame; they are to blame for everything”. Self-reflection, a sign of transformation of an individual from adolescence into adulthood, is not part of modern Ukrainian politics.

It is time to think why the Euromaidan failed to achieve anything, besides toppling President Yanukovich, bloodshed and territorial contraction. Why the Black and Red revolution started with All-Ukrainian (or so it seemed) upheaval and ended in with a catastrophe that yet to come to an end? For “the dizziness from success” that Stalin once wrote about should have passed long ago.

The radical Ukrainian nationalism that came to be the 2013-2014 revolution main force was at the same time the main reason for its failure. The visotry proved to be Pyrrhic. Nationalism that declares national unity its key goal turns out to the bone of contention in Ukraine. An unprepared reader might find it strange, given the Ukrainian ethnic majority in almost every region of the country. This is what nationalists have been stressing insisting, for example, on banning Russian language education at schools in the south and east of Ukraine. Why study the Russian language, culture and interest in historical Russia if the population is largely Ukrainian?

Their very ideology based on a vulgar biological racism rather than a cultural one, as they claim, is the reason why the Bandera followers have failed. Their appeal to “ethnic Ukrainians” implies that they all must share common values, think in the same way, perceive the past, present and future of Ukraine in the same way and in the end speak the same language only due to their ethnic background. This is of course not true.

The people that the world now knows as Ukrainians, over half a thousand years (mid 15th to mid 20th centuries) lived and developed separately within different, often changing states, religions and civilization systems. Although different parts of the single peo-

ple had long sought reunion, they failed to avoid the influence of the states where they used to live. While ethnic purity to avoid getting lost among the Polish was typical of Galicia residents, Dnieper Ukrainians (Naddniprovyanshchyna) blended in Great Russia so well that some of them managed to become Russian Empress's favorites and even General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

On the whole, Ukrainian nationalism in the interpretation of the OUN and Bandera, who was born in the current Ivano-Frankivsk oblast, developed well in Galicia, but slipped around Dnieper area where it was brought in 1941 by OUN groups and German tanks. It is not that Dnieper Ukrainians did not have national pride feelings, rather they expressed them differently and did not hate "Poles", "Moskals" or "Hebes" and everything related to them.

The year of 1991 when Ukraine acquired independence saw a surge in nationalism of the Western Ukrainian style in all spheres of life ranging from radical street politics to rewriting history school books. The 2003-2004 Orange Revolution unconditionally supported by all nationalist organizations of the country strengthened the trend. The Euromaidan in exactly a decade waved the OUN black and red flag, which symbolized the transformation of Ukrainian nationalist revolution from the political into the military realm.

Ukrainian neo-Nazi statements about their peaceful activity for the well-being of the nation and the state soon degenerated into threats to use of force against the ideological opponents ("separatists", "collaborationists", "the fifth column", etc.) and later brought about heavy losses. A greater threat soon added to the threat to territorial integrity – that of a full scale civil war.

In the fall of 2012, after the parliamentary election, world media commentators regarded the Svoboda Party victory as stronger Nazi sentiments in Ukrainian society.

Thus, New York Times wrote about an unexpected rise in support for the ultra right-wing party with the leader known for his anti-Semitic and racist views.

L'Indipendenza pointed out that the election brought about “yet another new face causing concern, which the Svoboda Party and its leader Oleh Tyahnibok who is sure that the country must get rid of Russians and Jews. For Ukraine that would mean a sad regress to the great violence of 1919 and widely spread collaborationism with the Nazi occupants”.

Bloomberg said that it the parliamentary election, “a neo fascist party achieved the most impressive success”. The publication ran that “The Svoboda Party advocates ardent nationalism and hatred for Polish, Russian, Jewish and homosexuals. Such attitudes are deeply entrenched in Ukrainian history, and there is danger disappointed voters will once again mix nationalism with xenophobia”. Washington Times called the Svoboda an «extremist party».

In December 2012, the European Parliament called on the Supreme Rada parties committed to the principles of democracy not to cooperate with the Svoboda Party. The resolution of Ukraine said that the European Parliament “recalls that racist, anti-Semitic and xenophobic views go against the EU’s fundamental values and principles and therefore appeals to pro-democratic parties in the Verkhovna Rada not to associate with, endorse or form coalitions with this party”.

However, with Ukraine entering political turbulence in the fall of 2013, when even more radical groups than the Svoboda Party came to the fore in the confrontation with the government, any criticism of the Ukrainian nationalism on the part of official or non-governmental structures of the EU or the US strangely ceased. Moreover, the Report of the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights published in April 2014 stated a lack of violations of rights of the Russian speaking population of Ukraine after

the regime change. Readers of the book can make their own conclusions about the level of objectivity of the Report.

We are convinced that there is still a chance to avoid such a scenario. To do this, all political forces of the country must with no delay or preliminary conditions sit side by side at the table for peace negotiations about the present and the future of the country. If needed, representatives of third countries should be involved. However, participants in negotiations must understand that no third countries, if “democratic” (or vice versa “authoritarian”) will build a new democratic Ukraine for them. This is Ukrainians’ business.

APPENDIX

Manifesto of the Social National Assembly – Patriots of Ukraine

The organization advocates a monoracial society based on the principles of Ukrainian national greatness and social justice.

Tryzub is a sacred symbol of Our Nation and Organization that symbolizes the trinity of our tasks in the All-Planet, National-Racial and Individual spheres:

I. Modern “civilized” society savagely ravages the Planet. At the same time, exploitation of natural resources only leads to concentration of material resources rather than reaching high purposes. Such approach to the Planet is fraught with a catastrophe of the planetary scale. Such practice can only be stopped by a Force that would be able to impose its own will on the population of the entire Planet and that would be guided by Morality, – using its dominance to the benefit of all humankind and the Planet. It is only the community of the White people led by the Ukrainian Nation that can become such Force. Only we heading the Planet will be able to limit access to the bowels of the Earth, stop their looting and start using the resources of the Planet to achieve Harmony and Justice.

II. The European Race is the creator of human civilization and culture. All the highest, most valuable and the best on the Planet is related with the White Man. However, a European at the moment is on the verge of biological extinction. A well planned war against the White Race is under way on the physical, spiritual, cultural and civilization levels. Throughout its history, Ukraine has been the avant-

garde of the White Civilization. It is now time to fulfill its main purpose – to become the sword of the White Europe rather than its shield, to save the White Man from extinction, to create new Ideals, to become the new Sun that would shine for the European Nations.

III. Harmony of the world can only be achieved by a higher Civilization. It is only the Ukrainian Nation that can resume development of the White Civilization. The latter will become possible only through comprehensive maximum development of Ukrainian Man who will come to be a Man of a new type – physically, intellectually and spiritually perfect.

Implementation of these tasks will be possible when the following principles of the Organization are met:

Form of Government

1. Organized Ukrainian Nationalism seeks to establish political, social and economic system of the Ukrainian State based on the principles of Natiocracy that has to ensure comprehensive maximum development of the Ukrainian Nations and all its representatives.

2. Natiocracy is government of the Nation in its own State that is based on organized and unanimous cooperation of all socially useful strata united – in accordance with their social, professional and economic functions – in government bodies.

3. The main principles of Natiocracy are as follows: National unanimity (supra-class and supra-party organization), authoritarianism (individual responsibility of leaders of all levels for their action), qualitative social hierarchy and discipline, civilian oversight, self-organization and self-government.

4. Natiocracy in political terms is a system where political power fully belongs to the Ukrainian Nation through her talented, ideal and nationally altruistic representatives who are capable of ensuring proper development of the Nation and its competitiveness.

5. The Ukrainian State does its best to contribute to individual growth of every Ukrainian Person and their creative abilities and pro-

motes all forms of self-organization within professional groups and territorial communities. At the same time the Ukrainian State prohibits political parties, groups, organizations and ideological groups.

6. The principle of direct interdependence of rights and obligations is introduced on all government and social levels. Failure to fulfill obligations before the Nation and the State entails the restriction of rights or termination of citizenship.

7. The supreme power (executive, legislative and judicial) of the Ukrainian State belongs to President of State who is personally responsible before the Nations with his blood and property.

8. The power of the President of State is executed through the Government accountable to and headed by the President.

9. The President of State convenes and dissolves the State Council and the Supreme Economic Council.

10. The President of State is the Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of Ukraine.

11. The State Council is the legislative body of the Ukrainian State. It is based on the principles of equal representation of all socially useful strata of the population.

12. Members of the State Council cannot buy or rent public property, do business, have shares or bank accounts or private property beyond Ukraine.

13. The State Council consists of professional commissions that are its working bodies made up of lawmakers in specific professions. It is only professional skills that entitle them to lawmaking activity in respective sectors.

The President of State and ministers of the Government also have the right to legislative initiatives.

14. Review of government financial economic system is conducted by the State Control headed by Main State Accountant who submits to the State Council annual reports about all public revenues and expenses, government funds and the general financial standing of the State.

15. The economic policy of the State is implemented through industry-specific Economic Councils and the Supreme Economic Council as professional estates bodies that directly reflect economic needs and interests of both individual working groups of the population in particular and the Nation in general.

16. Strict centralization of public administration at the same time involves broad autonomy for local communities in economic and social spheres.

Economy

1. The Organization is against signing international agreements and Ukraine's membership in any supranational economic and financial structures that oblige Ukraine to surrender part of its sovereignty.

2. Dismantling the economic system of capitalism as such, for it ensures robbery of working groups of the population by economic and political parasites.

3. Elimination of all institutions and forms of political democracy as a political system that provides for the economic system of capitalism.

4. Removing grounds for resurrections of the system of speculative capital through the introduction of non-inflationary money, prohibition of interest and trade of land

5. Nationalization of all strategic sectors of economy.

6. Resource nationalization.

7. Creation of autonomous production cycles in the sectors of economy that are vital for the National security, independence and sustainability of the Ukrainian state.

8. Prohibition of non-governmental monopoly.

9. Support for medium and small enterprises, protection of national producers by any means.

10. Return (also by enforcement) of all capital taken out of Ukraine.

Innovation Technologies

1. The military industrial sector, small business and research institutions are the key sources of innovation.

2. All the above mentioned sources of innovation are united into a single system through an economic council or committee.

Agriculture

1. Agriculture is a matter of priority for the Ukrainian Nation, which is not reduced to solely economic efficiency, but rather is a central element of ethnic health and social stability.

2. Property right to land in Ukraine belongs exclusively to Ukrainian peasants who work on the land.

3. A Ukrainian peasant receives land from the State for lifelong use.

4. It is only the Ukrainian State that is entitled to expropriate land into government funds for deeds that are not worthy of a Ukrainian peasant (improper farm management, violation of environmental safety standards, grave offense).

5. Key forms of farm management include farmers' cooperation and individual farming.

6. Recognizing the importance of the country as a foundation for the Nation, the Ukrainian State undertakes to provide investment into the country, as well as to introduce fixed non-speculate price of agricultural goods.

7. In order to introduce cutting-edge technologies, the Ukrainian State undertakes to finance R&D agricultural projects, as well as to create agricultural academies and training programs where farmers will be able to upgrade their level of proficiency free.

8. The State supports domestic producers through harsh protectionist policy in all sectors of agriculture.

Social Policy

1. The Ukrainian State views labor as ethical and social obligation before the Nation and citizens as creators of spiritual and material values.

2. Property rights to all material values belong to the Nation and its working social strata.

3. All kinds of physical and intellectual labor have a significant public value and are worthy of respect when they serve the interests of the Nation. Taking that into account, Natiocracy introduces the principle of justice and parity in compensation for physical and intellectual labor.

4. Any socially useful labor is evaluated by its quality rather than so called “prestige”. Honest implementation of one’s duties guarantees a person and their family decent and comfortable life.

5. The Ukrainian State undertakes the task of elaborating and implementing all-Ukrainian programs to raise the material well-being regardless of social status (people’s car, people’s house, etc.).

6. Creating social cities – perfect in environmental, social and economic terms – instead of the currently polluted industrial uninhabitable and unhealthy settlements.

7. Creating healthcare and sport facilities, parks and recreation areas. A most comprehensive state program for active leisure and healthy lifestyle that will embrace all Ukrainian people.

8. Creating Ukrainian territorial and professional organizations of mutual help that will promote a new type of interpersonal relationships and upbringing of a responsible citizen.

Foreign Policy

1. The Organization advocates a great power status of Ukraine, which is why it is against Ukrainian membership in any block or supranational structures, except for those initiated by Ukraine and those where it plays a leading role.

2. In foreign policy, Ukraine pursues exclusive its national interests, relying on a strong Army and Fleet, economic and cultural dominance.

3. Initially Great Ukraine's priority will be to set up under the auspices of Kiev the Central European Confederation (a block of countries located within the Baltic-Balkan-Caucasus geopolitical triangle), which will ensure geopolitical domination in Eurasia through establishing control over all important transport and energy supply routes.

4. The next step will be to join with the Central European Confederation countries that will be liberated beforehand from the dictate of democratic liberalism and financial capital.

5. Integrating a Russian nationally arranged state into the Central European Confederation. This will enable maintaining the Ukrainian-European domination in Eurasia.

6. The world domination is the ultimate goal of Ukrainian foreign policy.

Military Doctrine

1. A strong Army and Fleet are Ukraine's most reliable allies. The Ukrainian Army must become the most powerful military force on the planet.

2. Returning nuclear weapons.

3. Creation of a professional army – the National Guards that will be made up of 150-200 thousand soldiers and will be the avant-garde of the Ukrainian Forces.

4. Creation of an all-Ukrainian defense forces based on universal military training and the principle of territory-based army units.

5. Modernization of the Ukrainian Army up to a state-of-the-art level, relying on the national military industry and breakthrough scientific research.

6. Formation of Airspace Forces that will include satellite fleet and squadrons of Lozino-Lozinskiy space bomber aircrafts and fighter jets.

7. Creation of the most powerful Fleet of the Black Sea and the Eastern Mediterranean, as well as a squadron of mid-ocean aircraft carriers for prompt action in any part of the world. Creating Ukrainian military bases in allied countries.

8. To achieve a self-sustaining military, creation of the sectors of military industry that modern Ukraine lacks: aircraft engineering (fighter aircraft), construction of military short-wing helicopters and marksman guns.

9. Defender of the Fatherland – Ukrainian Soldier will be the supreme status in the State, which will be achieved through propaganda of the central role of the Military Forces for the Nation, through the highest salary and social security (accommodation, education, car, etc.).

10. Preparation for military service will start from childhood through a number of youth paramilitary organizations that will be provided with camps and equipment at the expense of the State and will encompass all Ukrainian youth.

11. Introduction of maximum civilian armament in the Ukrainian State for the sake of increasing the potential of external and internal security.

Information Policy

1. Prohibition of all commercial and private mass media as cells of dissemination of biased, one-sided and manipulative information.

2. Information society that provides a lot of information (without a real possibility to comprehend it) aimed at manipulation has to be replaced with a society of Knowledge.

3. The State undertakes to provide its citizens with a full range of real Knowledge and prevent dissemination of disinformation and use of manipulative technologies.

4. Media and journalists enjoy all professional rights to freely spread objective information in society. At the same time media

will be deprived of the unnatural privilege to manufacture so called “public opinion” which is a means of a larger manipulation of public consciousness and amid political democracy serves parasitical goals of oligarchic clans of financial speculators – current media owners.

5. The Ukrainian State does its best to defend the independence of its information space. Dissemination of information on the Ukrainian territory through foreign media is prohibited.

Language policy

1. True rather than formal Ukrainization. Introduction of the Ukrainian content as well as language into all spheres of life, such as education, science, culture, literature, art and media.

2. Money compensations to the Ukrainian population, while learning the Ukrainian language. Creation of compulsory courses of Ukrainian for all groups of the population at work and at working hours with obligatory indemnification by the State.

Education and Science

1. The goal of upbringing and education in the Ukrainian State is to create a social type of person capable of creative life and endeavors.

2. Dogmatism, narrow specialization and imbalance between intellectual and physical development are not allowed in the sphere of education. A healthy society requires a harmoniously developed and all-round personality capable of adequately perceiving reality and taking responsibility for one’s deeds.

3. Commercial education has to be fully prohibited. The State undertakes to provide free and good-quality education at all levels as well does its best to promote intellectual development of each and every Ukrainian.

4. Ukraine introduces absolute freedom of scientific research as well as government support for its practical application.

5. The State provides a full-scale support for fundamental scientific research and cutting-edge technology development that must guarantee the well-being of Ukrainian citizens and advanced positions of Ukraine in the modern world.

6. Creation of Ukrainian science towns that will provide an opportunity to ensure decent living and working conditions for the Ukrainian intellectual elite as well as to accumulate the intellectual potential of the Nation.

Justice

1. Implementation of legal reform with shifting the responsibility for judicial decisions onto the judges, which will ensure the spirit rather than the letter of law.

2. Resumption of capital punishment for especially grave offenses as a means of the recovery of society.

3. Strengthening punishment for the crimes against the Nation and the State.

Health of the Nation

1. Introduction of a punishment system for infliction of harm to Ukrainian citizens and environmental pollution.

2. The State promotes the introduction of environmentally friendly clean technologies.

3. Prohibition of importing any harmful substances or transgenic products into Ukraine.

4. Introduction of real free medicine through proper finance for healthcare institutions and specific categories of citizens (the elderly, Chernobyl veterans, etc.).

5. Prevention of illnesses through broad propaganda and government support for healthy lifestyle.

6. Introduction of severe punishment (including death penalty) for drug trafficking and deliberately transmitting STDs and AIDS.

Youth Policy

1. The youth is the biggest value for Great Ukraine and the foundation and the pillar of the Nation.

2. The Ukrainian Nations invests all its effort to form an active, creative, all-round young Ukrainian citizen developed intellectually, physically and spiritually.

3. Strong youth organizations that must embrace all spheres of social life are a means of creating such a person.

4. The State is obliged to finance such organizations taking into account that such expenses are the best investment into the future.

5. Introduction of a variety of contests, competitions and tests to reveal among the youth future representatives of the Ukrainian elite and born leaders.

6. Guarantees of utmost promotion of young people in the political, scientific, military and economic spheres to ensure dynamic development of the country and prevent recession.

Demographic Policy

1. Preservation of our life is the most important task of the Nation.

2. Given that, a radical rise in the birth rate among Ukrainians must become National program №1.

3. Ukrainians as a Nation are dying out at the quickest rate in Europe.

4. A National program of increasing the birth rate is designed to not only stop extinction, but also ensure growth and strength of the Ukrainian Nation, provide every Ukrainian family with an opportunity to have 3-5 children.

5. The Program will include unprecedented social guarantees: “accommodation for the youth” program, financial and material help by the State, arrangement of a broad range of medical and recreational institutions called “Healthy Mothers and Babies”.

6. The demographic policy of the Ukrainian State involves transformation of the public opinion regarding family and children from liberal (“every next child is a burden for the family”) into National (“every next child is the pillar of the family”). The biggest families will be socially and economically protected in Great Ukraine.

7. The State does its best to promote traditional family values, sanctity of marriage and motherhood, as well as to prevent the spread of amorality, feminism, sexual deviations and liberalism in society.

8. Abortions have to be fully prohibited, except for the cases of medical necessity.

Culture and Art

1. The State undertakes the task of ensuring the maximum rise in the cultural level of its citizens.

2. Relevant government bodies are obliged to expose the maximum number of citizens to the masterpieces of Ukrainian and world culture.

3. The State cherishes idealistic views, commitment to moral maxims, the cult of heroism, self-sacrificing attitudes and politeness among its citizens.

4. The State opposes all decadent and decomposing art movements, as well as materialistic worldview and egoism.

Religion

1. Promotion of traditional and nationalist religious movements of Ukraine.

2. Creation of single Ukrainian Apostolic Christian Church with the center in Kiev.

3. Prohibition of religious cults and sects that advocate anti-national, anti-state or satanic principles and whose centers are located beyond Ukraine.

The Program of Implementation of Ukrainian National Idea in the Nation-Building of the Stepan Bandera Tryzub All-Ukrainian organization (summary)

Introduction

Over the centuries, the Ukrainian people have been fighting for its national and social liberation, for the right to be the master of its fate in the motherland and for its own state. It was quite realistic to achieve this goal in the 20th century.

However, the first attempt of the Ukrainian people to establish their own state after the collapse of the tsarist regime in Russia failed because the social liberal political leadership of that time did not manage to unite the people and the Ukrainian People's Republic bled to death on both domestic and international fronts, while Ukraine was divided between four occupation forces.

The Act of Proclamation of Ukrainian Statehood (Restoration of Ukrainian Statehood) on the 30th of June 1941 was the second attempt.

For over a decade and a half, the best sons and daughters of Ukraine led by the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists had been pursuing a heroic armed fight for freedom and statehood of Ukraine against Nazi-German and Communist Russian Empires. But the confrontation was uneven. The corrupt West with its non-interference policy set Moscow butchers loose, and the second attempt to achieve the Ukrainian statehood also drowned in blood.

The third wave of Ukrainian national liberation struggle, this time led by Liberal-Democrats, took place in the late 1980s – early 1990s and resulted in the declaration of independence of Ukraine and the establishment of the cosmopolitan State of Ukraine. However, the Ukrainian nation on its own land has remained stateless

and dependent, robbed and exterminated by internal and external predators, while the State of Ukraine has been consistently degenerating into a powerless neo-colony, with a constant imminent threat to once again become a part of the Russian Empire.

Why did that happen?

The main problem of the current nation-building is a lack of legitimate national ideology that would be realized by the whole society and would define social goals and ways to achieve them.

The second central problem is that, from the very beginning, the Ukrainian state has been based on imported doctrines (social democracy, liberalism, pseudo-civil society, cosmopolitanism, capitalist market, etc.) that have been legitimized as priorities, rather than the **Ukrainian national idea**, that of the Ukrainian nation statehood.

The will of the people has not come to be the decisive force, while the people themselves failed to become the key player of the national politics.

It is a matter of great urgency to create a comprehensive **system of Ukrainian national government of the people**.

That is why the struggle for power in Ukraine has not yet become the struggle for Ukraine, for its revival, development and well-being of the Ukrainian nation, for its self-assertion in all spheres of life with no exception, for government guarantees of its decent futures.

Our goal is to implement the Ukrainian national idea, to acquire, secure and develop the nation-state – the state of the Ukrainian nation on Ukrainian lands that would guarantee the Ukrainian nation its development, all citizens of Ukraine – comprehensive freedom, justice and well-being.

Ideological World-View Premises

Our fundamental and defining triune slogan is “God! Ukraine! Freedom!”

Our supreme national duty is to cultivate and implement the Ukrainian national idea, which is the idea of the assertion of

state of the Ukrainian nation, creation of Ukrainian nation-state with national authorities and functional system of Ukrainian national government of the people.

The national idea is an ideological formula that is deduced not only from the pressing issues of society, but also from permanent interests of the people. It directs at a more general central and fundamental problem the solution to which determines solutions to current problems and implementation of all aspirations and plans of the people, which is its continuance over time.

All Ukrainian woes have in fact single reason – statelessness of the Ukrainian nation. The key to resolution to all Ukrainian problems for the benefit of the people is single – to create a Ukrainian nation-state. Taras Shevchenko gave an ideal poetic interpretation of the Ukrainian national idea: “Only in your own house can you have your truth, your strength, and freedom”. Any substitution of this idea for something else is a deliberate or unconscious crime against the Ukrainian people.

A nation-state is a social and political system created by the people to solve its current problems, pursue its interests and ensure its future. A nation-state is run by the national government chosen by the people.

National government is power that is the bearer of the national idea of the people and acts in the name of the entire nation and all the citizens of the nation-state rather than in the interests of a certain class or social group.

National government of the people is a legitimate system of the defining role of the title people in the nation-building and state operation, with only the people’s choice – the best from among the bearers of the national idea of the people – entitled to make laws, run society and judge citizens.

Our ideology is Ukrainian nationalism, which the ideology of defense, protection, preservation and assertion of the state of the Ukrainian nation. It is both the idea and the cause in the name of Ukraine.

Our policy involves a struggle for Ukrainian Ukraine rather than an opportunity to rule our own people.

Our government is that of the people rather than over the people.

Our ideological and political stance is that we are always with the people, while with the authorities – only as long as they pursue the interests of the nation.

Our method is putting the cross on the devil and giving a sword to an enemy!

Our principle is “Who else, if not me? When, if not now? You can, if you need!”

The field of our activity is in all regions, communities and groups of Ukraine, in the streets and squares, in all Ukrainian settlements rather than only in session halls, rooms and lobbies of the power.

Our attitude to non-Ukrainians is:

- **Friendly** – to those who are struggling together with us for the Ukrainian nation-state;

- **Tolerant** – to those who are positive about our struggle for the right to become masters of our fate on our land: “There is enough room for all of us” (Bandera);

- **Hostile** – to those who oppose the process of the Ukrainian national revival and state-building.

Our enemies are imperialism and chauvinism, communism and Nazism. Democratic liberalism and cosmopolitanism, globalism and pseudo-nationalism and all other evils that tries to sponge on the blood and flesh of Ukrainians or to sidetrack them from their main track of their own nation-state.

Our double task is to carry out quality revolutionary transformations in the interests of the Ukrainian nation while not diminishing or putting at risk the very existence of the Ukrainian statehood and independence. It is realistic to achieve through pro-government and pro-state effort of the Ukrainian politics and the people united by the Ukrainian national idea.

We are convinced that until the Ukrainian people solves its main problem of establishing its own national powerful state, legitimizes

its right to create a state, to form and oversee the government, until then none of its problems (political, social, economic, international, military, religious and confessional, educational, cultural, environmental, etc.) will be solved to the benefit of the Ukrainian people and alien truths, strengths and freedoms will rule the Ukrainians on their own land.

Political Platform

Ukrainian Path

Over 15 years, our political forces have traditionally offered Ukrainian society only two ways of national development: ruling and pseudo-oppositional

The idea of each regime is reduced to maintaining the power at all costs, to preserving the existing system of robbing the people and the country, to prevent a full-scale revival and political assertion of the true master of Ukraine, the Ukrainian nation. With this purpose, they put forward and sell as breakthrough and revolutionary some ideas, whether it be imported political doctrines, or anti-Ukrainian constitution, or meaningless referenda, or criminal reforms, or occasionally elections devoid of any message or ideology. This all is meant to distract Ukrainians from creating their own state.

Against this background, every statement against corrupt, non-Ukrainian and even blatantly anti-Ukrainian regime is perceived as oppositional and saving for the people. But this is far from true; for every such statement has the same objective and the same message as that of the regime.

Our platform is essentially oppositional since it advocates something qualitatively and revolutionary new for the modern Ukrainian politics – the Ukrainian national idea as eternal goal of the Ukrainian nation and the Ukrainian path to achieve this goal.

The Ukrainian path is a continuation of centuries-old ideological and political struggle for implementing the Ukrainian idea-goal.

This struggle is for the Ukrainian nation-state and Ukrainian national government of the people rather than for yet another “promiser” or a herd of “promisers”.

Nation-State

A state is a political system that can function in only two regimes: either to the benefit of the people, or against the people. The history and modern political practice of humankind has never known a case when a non-nation-state would pursue people’s interests. However, both the ruling regime and the “opposition” have always offered Ukrainian something different.

We are for the Ukrainian Nation-state. In any nation-state, it is only the people’s choice – the best from among the bearers of the national idea of the people – who are entitled to make laws, run society and judge citizens. And this right of the Ukrainian people to their national rule of the people, to form their own national government and national ruling elite must be legitimized.

Nation-state is a natural aspiration of every developed people; it is the end of the people’s political assertion that results in becoming a full and sole master of its fate on its land, its state and government in it, its country and all its resources.

Nation-state is a political formation of the title nation on its own territory to pursue its interests in all spheres of life, to guarantee the revival and development, prosperity and continuance of the nation.

Nation-state is a political system in which the power (all its branches, structures and officials) is a bearer of the national idea and a consistent defender of the interests of the people both in the country and on the international arena.

Nation-state is a permanent organized and powerful influence of the power through a comprehensive mechanism of Ukrainian national government of the people that guarantees Ukrainians that every power will act only in the Ukrainian national interests; otherwise it will immediately cease to be the power.

Nation-state is a state whose social and economic policy is pursued in accordance with the formula: “From creating and strengthening the nation-state – through defending economic interests of the nation – to independence of every citizen”.

Nation-state is a state where the benefit of the nation is the key and defining criterion for assessing the activity of every citizen.

Nation-state is a state that does not confuse “rights of national minorities” with “claims of former occupants and colonizers and where citizens of other nationalities recognize the title nation as the master of the country and have both rights and obligations equal to it, know and respect its language, laws and history, have all the necessary conditions to preserve and develop their national identity, act as full-right representative of the culture of their people, rather than a fifth column of foreign states and transnational predators.

Nation-state is a state that acts in the name of all the dead, alive and not yet born¹ in Ukraine and abroad genuine Ukrainians and all honest citizens of Ukraine.

National Government of the People

The current cosmopolitan democracy is based on a mechanical majority devoid of a national idea or ideology and, therefore, politically disorganized that can easily be used by different political regimes and money fraudsters and villains in their interests. The mechanism of this democracy is fully controlled and “turned on” by the political regime or “moneybags” in accordance with their very goals. The people do not enjoy any true power and do not influence what is happening in the state. What is more, even the formerly constrained abilities of the people to at least from time to time affect the formation of the government (presidential or parliamentary elections) are taken away from the people in favor of the parties that are estranged from the people.

1. “The dead, alive and not yet born ...” are lines from a famous poem by Taras Shevchenko.

Our goal is to transform Ukraine into a nation-state with a real system of national government of the people and to consistently broaden the power of the public in all spheres of government life.

For, no matter how “popular” the regime is – genetically, which is according to the background of the people in power, or according to the way of its formation (through elections or by appointment) – it will anyway be a closed system which as such tends to close on itself and to be guided by its own interests and act to its own benefit.

The “good” regime is the one that is under permanent everyday control by and pressure from – through a comprehensive system of national government of the people – the people united by a national idea rather than the one that consists of good people.

Domestic Policy

It is only the Ukrainian nation-state – the state of the Ukrainian nation on the Ukrainian land that can be legal and legitimate in Ukraine.

The task of the domestic policy must be to create and develop the Ukrainian nation-state, to politically structure society in accordance with the goal of the state and to unite the citizens under the flag of the Ukrainian national idea. The domestic policy of the state must be aimed at implementing the Ukrainian national idea and the system of Ukrainian national government of the people in all spheres of social life with no exception.

National Security and Defense

Both the ruling regime and the “opposition” view guarantees of security of the state only in the international recognition of Ukraine, its membership in European and world structures, partnerships with the NATO, CIS, SES (Single Economic Space), EU, etc. This is both a dangerous and harmful policy for Ukraine.

It is based on deliberate or unconscious confusion between “security of the nation” (elimination of everything that prevents comprehensive revival, development and assertion of the state of the Ukrainian nation), “national security” (resisting internal and external factors that contradict the interests of the Ukrainian nation in all spheres of all and threaten its future) and “security of the state” (reliable defense of the state from potential threat, occupation or attempts of unconstitutional regime changes).

We are convinced that:

a) it is only the Ukrainian people united by the Ukrainian national idea and only within its own nation-state that can reliably guarantee Ukraine’s security;

б) if the regime does not reveal and does not punish the enemies of the nation and the state, then it is itself the enemy of the nation and the state.

Economic Policy

Economy is a system of pursuing material interests of those who have the power. In developed nation-states the people have conquered a solid share of power and, along with it, a right to a significant share in the distribution of profits from economic activity.

Our economy not only fails to ensure material interests of the people but is transformed into a sophisticated system of robbing the people and the state and is the main constituting part of the system of eliminating the Ukrainian nation. At the same time, at all electoral campaigns, both the regime and the “opposition” promise to improve this system to make it even more efficient.

The key to transform the economy into a system of pursuing material interests of the people is national and pro-state policy of establishing our own nation-state.

That is why it is only the economy of a nation-state that is both efficient and beneficial for the people because such an economy is based on and developed according to the formula: **“From creating**

and asserting the nation-state – through governmental protection of the economic interests of the nation – to the well-being of every citizen”.

We are guided by the national principles: “One of us goes to one of the ours for what is ours”, “Ukrainian money must go to Ukrainian hands for a Ukrainian cause”, “You do not let us live, that is why we will not let you rule!”, etc.

Social Policy

Nation-state is the guarantor of efficient and future-oriented social policy and protection of the citizens. Our approach to social policy is based on inherent nation-state principles of national solidarity, justice and responsibility in relationships of the citizens with the state, employers with employees, labor force and the unemployed. Nation-state is meant to solve all problems, including social ones, to the benefit of the people. Promising to solve all the current social problems of the people without creating the Ukrainian nation-state is either a political dilettantism of the illiterate or a blatantly anti-Ukrainian political fraud.

Agricultural Policy

The country is not only a producer of bread and commodities for the city food industry, as both the regime and the “opposition” thinks. **The Ukrainian country has established over entire millennia, an efficient and unique system of comprehensive material and spiritual sustainability of life, national creation of a man and preservation of the nation.**

The country does not know any “not promising” villages because each of them is a part of the Ukrainian national world and the nation needs each of them. Every village must be revived, developed and preserves not only as a production unit, but above all, as a living and irreplaceable cell of the national entity.

It is only within the Ukrainian nation-state where the Ukrainian country can develop successfully. All the government agricultural policy and effort must be directed at its preservation, revival and comprehensive development and creation of such conditions that would stop emigration from the village and would reverse the process to ensure the return of former peasants and resettlement of some citizens into the country. This is the central idea of the agricultural policy and effort of the Ukrainian nation-state.

Education

The system of education in Ukraine requires dramatic changes that must meet the Ukrainian national idea.

Educational systems of Ukraine must be aimed at developing and enriching the intellectual and creative potential of individuals and the entire nation, forming well-educated and highly trained cadres of the nation-state and bringing up active, selfless and self-sacrificing citizens committed to the Ukrainian nation-state.

Moreover, education is only at first sight a treasure of knowledge to acquire. However, its true essence is that education is a school of understanding, thinking and creating. That is why it has to bring up not an erudite nerd but rather a person with a highly sophisticated culture of thinking who is capable of discovering, comprehending and creatively applying the acquired knowledge and skills in the name of prosperity of their nation and state.

To implement this complex goal, the government must elaborate and put forward for public deliberation a nation-centered government program of development of education in Ukraine which the Supreme Rada must legitimize and adopt.

Culture

Cultural policy of the nation-state must be aimed at preservation and revival, development and augmentation of cultural achievements

of the nation, transformation of the system of culture into a powerful and permanent factor of cultivation in society of higher aesthetic, spiritual and moral national values and formation of national ethical and aesthetic consciousness of society, as well as formation of immunity against Russian and Western cultural imperialism.

Science

Science is a generator of the power of reason of the nation. It is an ever-living source of new ideas and technologies and the foundation of the national economy. It is the defining factor of social progress and the key to the future of the nation.

the national system of scientific institutions must be the core and the source of the intellectual potential of the nation and the central factor of development, strengthening and progress of the nation-state.

Religious Policy

Our religious policy is aimed at religious revival of the Ukrainian nation and creation of a single national Christian Church.

A national Church is perceived as, above all, a religious union of Christians whose clergy and authorities take responsibility before God and the people for leading them to God the way God created them, rather than various occupants and their successors – apparent servants of Satan – have been trying to make them.

The Church that thinks that God can understand a Ukrainian's prayer only in Russian is not a Church for us.

The existing religious factionalism in Ukraine has been created by a man rather than God. It, therefore, should be overcome by the people. God has bequeathed spiritual and religious unity of all Christians, which is why it cannot be subject of political debate. One can only discuss ways, plans and practical steps to achieve it.

Youth Policy

The modern Ukrainian youth have been abandoned by the state and have fallen victim to imposed and cultivated perversions: drug and alcohol addiction, homosexuality, violence, despiritualization, denationalization, political apathy, etc. The anti-Ukrainian regime recruits obedient servants from young Ukrainians. Non-Ukrainian politics consists of careless votes, while cosmopolitan business is made up of plain servants, the criminal world – blind executives, the foreign capital – powerless and cheap slaves.

The prospects of the rest are even worse, which is why they are destined to drink themselves to death, demoralize and degenerate turning into a faceless and helpless biomass that is easy to keep under control.

Thus, the idea of the anti-Ukrainian internal and external forces is that the Ukrainian nation must first lose its youth to later lose the future.

The Tryzub organization whose members are mostly young people resists these intentions and regards the youth as its key driving force in the struggle for the assertion of the state of the Ukrainian nation. The younger generation must fulfill the dream of the predecessors, continue their cause and ensure a decent future of the nation, the state and themselves.

Physical Education and Sport

The Ukrainian nation is on the verge of extinction. The current regime lacks a meaningful all-Ukrainian program to promote physical education of the population and to develop sport and let things take care of themselves. Ukraine is basically experiencing genocide against the Ukrainian nation. Certain figures have already been put in circulation in society: like, allegedly only 2 million peasants are enough for Ukraine and a population of 30 million people would also be enough.

Our goal is to revive the spiritual and physical health of the nation.

Healthcare

Healthcare is the unconditional duty of the state. However, the current state policy has resulted in an overwhelming majority of the citizens being robbed by the oligarch-clan regime and both internal and external predators, deprived of an opportunity to maintain proper health.

Our task is to defend, assert and implement the right of the people to free and highly efficient healthcare and to ensure medical workers have necessary working conditions and a decent standard of living.

Environmental Policy

Environmental protection is, above all, the protection of the health of the present and future generations. Ukraine has inherited from the Moscow Empire a huge complex of environmental problems, including the consequences of the nuclear explosion at the Chernobyl nuclear plant. However, the uncivilized and merciless attitude to nature, its depletion and negligence to the problems of environmental security remain.

Our task is to stop the killing of nature, create conditions for its recovery and preserve the environment for our successors.

Information Policy

An information space of a state is an inherent element of its sovereignty and the system of national security. Whoever controls it basically rules the country.

Throughout the years of independence, the information policy of the regime has led to Ukraine's information space being shaped

by non-Ukrainian, anti-Ukrainian, cosmopolitan and pro-Russian oligarchic clan and used not in the interests of the Ukrainian nation, society or state, but rather to implement the ill-natured plans of the former.

For example, the media have become a powerful and permanent factor in imposing despiritualization and denationalization of Ukrainians, demoralization and ideological and political disorientation of society.

The clan nature of the information space of Ukraine has been the reason for bodily harm to journalists, which badly affects the image of the state. Ukrainian journalists are destined to serve the clans and (publicly!) act in the interests of “their” clan to later die not for their convictions, but rather as victims of interclan wars.

That is why overcoming the preponderance of clans in the information space of Ukraine and its essential Ukrainization must become a priority task of the authorities.

The information policy of the Ukrainian state must result from the Ukrainian national idea and tasks to implement it.

Ukrainian Diaspora

A third of Ukrainians – at least twenty million – live abroad. Part of them leave on ethnic Ukrainian lands that have been left within the territories of different counties. Others were forced to leave Ukraine by impenetrable misery and occupants and have been dispersed around foreign countries. Altogether they constitute a surprisingly resistant and patriotic Ukrainian Diaspora.

After the December 1991 referendum, Ukrainians from Diaspora started to selflessly come back to the State of Ukraine on a mass scale genuinely believing that it was going to the nation-state many generations of Ukrainians had been craving .

However, none “Ukrainian” regime developed understanding of the problems of the Ukrainian Diaspora, used the colossal pro-state potential of the twenty-million Ukrainian Diaspora. Instead, all of

them brought about the “fourth wave” of emigration, with millions of Ukrainians leaving the motherland again in search of some earnings. In the meanwhile, Ukraine has been flooded by uncontrollable non-Ukrainian immigrants.

The Ukrainian Diaspora will once again go back to the motherland, provided Ukraine becomes both de jure and de facto a Ukrainian state – state of all the dead, the alive and the not yet born Ukrainians in Ukraine and abroad.

Ethnic Policy

The Ukrainian nation, even within the independent state has still remained hostage to Imperial nationalities policy whose main rule was to prevent representatives of the title nation from ruling the republic, its science, education, culture, information, finances, industry, agriculture, legal system, military questions and medicine. If there was no suitable non-Ukrainian candidate, a Ukrainian was appointed, then he was only a non-local one and never a nationally conscious one.

Such policy has been carefully preserved in the independent Ukraine as well. The removal of the “nationality” line from our passports and other documents is designed to legalize national foreignness of the regime and with the help of this seemingly purely bureaucratic, “Western”, “democratic “ and “innocent” method to conceal from Ukrainians this non-Ukrainity of the ruling elite.

At the same time non-Ukrainians in Ukraine comprise only 20 percent, with an absolute majority of them having nothing against Ukrainians or our right to have our own nation-state to pursue our national interests and aspirations. At the December 1991 referendum, 92% of the population voted for independence meaning that the majority of non-Ukrainians supported the independent Ukrainian state.

Our organization advocates Ukrainian nationalism, which is why our nationalities policy is aimed at making Ukraine our own nation-state rather than getting rid of all non-Ukrainians. Organically inte-

grating ethnic minorities into Ukrainian social life is only possible basing on the Ukrainian national idea and only within the Ukrainian nation-state.

The foundation of our common future can and should be laid right now – while struggling for implementing the Ukrainian national idea. That is why the future of ethnic minorities in Ukraine is bound to be defined, after all, by the Ukrainian nation and will be conditioned by their smaller role in the state and society as well as their participation in the Ukrainian nation-state building.

Crimean Tatars

The problem of repatriation, national revival, state assertion and integration of the Crimean Tatar people into Ukrainian society requires an urgent and special solution.

Crimean Tatars beyond Ukraine do not have a nation-state. Ukrainian land is their only and mother land where they were deported from forcefully by the Communist Imperial regime. Therefore, they are entitled to return to their motherland. Crimean Tatars in Ukraine are not an ethnic minority, but rather an indigenous population of this part of Ukrainian land where they became a nation.

It is only in Ukraine that the Crimean Tatars can concentrate as a people and take care of their comprehensive national revival, state assertion and their future.

Such aspiration can only be implemented: a) only on the territory of Ukraine, b) only under the flag of the Ukrainian national idea and within Ukrainian nation-state, c) only with the participation and help of the Ukrainian nation, d) only in the form of **Crimean Ukrainian-Tatar autonomy**.

Any attempt to ignore or postpone the problem of Crimean Tatars or to solve it without Ukrainians or to the detriments of Ukrainian national interests are bound to cause new woes – for both Ukrainians, and Crimean Tatars, and representatives of ethnic minorities, above all, those that live in Crimea.

Foreign Policy

It is only through creating and comprehensively strengthening their nation-states that peoples can resist contemporary globalist trends, marginalization and elimination of nations, erosion of national sovereignty and neo-imperial claims.

Foreign-policy activity of the Ukrainian state must implement the Ukrainian national idea on the international arena while the main principles of Ukrainian foreign policy must stem from natural needs, interests and aspirations of the Ukrainian nation.

Strategy and Tactic of Organized Nationalism

Organized nationalism, hence our organization, is aimed at implementing the Ukrainian national idea, or building a Ukrainian Independent Inclusive State. It is this goal that unites us into a consolidated, dedicated, nationalist organization and defines our activity. It is a tangible contribution to the common Cause of implementing this goal that is our key criterion of assessing our every member, every nationalist and every nationalist union. It is only by the attitude to the national idea and to our struggle that we assess Ukrainians and non-Ukrainians, civil and political unions, all branches and structures of power and officials, policy of foreign countries and transnational forces and define our attitude to them.

Strategic Tasks:

a) in the sphere of ideology – to make nationalism the basis of Ukrainian national thinking, public behavior of the people, the state and government;

b) in organizational sphere – to seek an organizational unity of politics, the environment and the camp under the flag of the Ukrainian national idea, on the basis of Ukrainian nationalism and under

the leadership of the revived and united Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists;

c) in the sphere of politics – to seek to create the core of the future system of Ukrainian national revival and state idea in the form of a national patriotic forces block to take part in the political process.

Tactic of Nationalist Unions:

Every nationalist organization operates autonomously but seeks ideological and world-view, organizational and political contacts and consolidation of the nationalist circles.

Every nationalist organization takes part in elaborating a shared political platform and adopts it as the basis for planning its activity given the character and capabilities of its union.

Nationalist organization can act independently or within different political unions if it contributes to their approaching the task of implementing the Ukrainian national idea.

Every organization informs about its political intentions and actions other nationalist structures in order to avoid misunderstanding or confrontations or to work out a common position.

Nationalist organizations refuse to practice public debate and competition: we must act as allies in our shared struggle for implementing our common goal rather than as political rivals.

We do not monopolize either the national idea, or our platform, or its separate parts or statements.

On the contrary, our task is to stimulate other Ukrainian political and civil unions, their electoral blocks and candidates to include the nation-state ideas into their manifestos.

Alexei Semenov
**“Chronicle of the Crimes Committed
by the Right-Wing Radical in Ukraine
in February-March 2014”¹**

The months-long political crisis in Ukraine, accompanied by a violent confrontation between the regime and the opposition, has resulted in the actual suspension of full-scale work of the law enforcement bodies in a number of regions. Kiev and other regions of the country have witnessed the heyday of banditry and frequent vigilantism.

Amid inactivity of the law enforcement bodies, grave crimes have been committed on a mass scale against the person, including assault and battery, torture, rape and threat of homicide. These crimes have been both criminally and politically motivated; many of them have not only been stopped by the inactive law enforcement bodies but also not even registered according to the procedure. Officers of law enforcement bodies have also fallen victim to battery and have been threatened by the criminals.

February 18, 2014 saw a dramatic escalation of the situation and came to be called “bloody Tuesday”. Confrontations between the Euromaidan radicals and law enforcement bodies in the center of Kiev resumed on the day of a session of the Supreme Rada when the opposition demanded an immediate return to the semi-presidential system of government and the 2004 constitution. To support the demand, the leaders of the opposition arranged a “peaceful

1. The chapter is written in collaboration with Information Group on Crimes against the Person (IGCP): www.igcp.eu.

march” to the Supreme Rada in an attempt to block it, with several thousand armed Euromaidan activists taking part.

The march headed by Members of Parliament Andriy Ilyenko, Oleh Tyahnibok, Oleh Lyashno and Andriy Parubiy lost its “peaceful” character when the column led by Euromaidan self-defense militia stopped at trucks 100 meters away from the building of the Supreme Rada that the police had used to block Shelkovychnaya Street. Faced with the police cordon, demonstrators attacked it, broke and set on fire several cars and trucks that blocked the motorway, broke into buildings, burnt tires and threw stones and incendiary bottles at the policemen.

The center of Kiev saw violent clashes between the law enforcement bodies defending the Supreme Rada and the protesters.

The protesters took over and burnt the office of the Party of Regions. Two employees of the office died – one was shot, the other suffocated with the smoke of the fire¹.

Berkut and the police pushed the militia from Grushevskogo Street, from the European Square and from part of the previously taken over buildings. By night, Berkut Special Forces and the police pushed the protesters back to the Independence Square and launched the active stage of Euromaidan dispersal.

Over the day, hundreds of civilians and law enforcement officers asked for medical attendance and were hospitalized. The violent confrontations between Euromaidan militia (the Right Sector) and Berkut Special Forces killed 13 militia (240 hospitalized) and 10 policemen (350 hospitalized, of them 74 with firearm wounds). 28 journalists were injured. Some policemen were shot in the neck, some of whom died².

On February 19, the radicals took over many administrative buildings in Lviv, including the city council building, as well oblast

1. TSN, <http://ru.tsn.ua/politika/pri-zahvate-ofisa-partii-regionov-ubili-dvuh-sotrudnikov-carev-349697.html>

2. Vzgljad, <http://www.vz.ru/world/2014/2/18/673194.html>

offices of the Security Service of Ukraine, Attorney General, fiscal administration, road police, oblast and city offices of the Ministry of the Interior, local offices of the Ministry of the Interior, namely Galitskiy, Frankivskiy, Shevshenkoskiy, Lychakoskiy.

The takeover was accompanied by the destruction of equipment and documents, with 30% of the police car park ruined.

They attacked the №4114 military unit of the Internal Military Forces of Ukraine.

The radicals also took over the ammunition of the military and burnt the building of the unit, with at least one of the military burning to death. The fire later caught on the armory.

The Lviv mayor said that guns were stolen from local police offices during the night takeovers. The People's Rada assumed the responsibility.

On the whole, over 1170 items of firearms (nearly a thousand Makarov guns, over 170 Kalashnikovs and sniper guns, over 18 thousand of bullets were taken by the radicals in Lviv and Lviv oblast¹.

In the regions in the west of Ukraine, the militia kept taking over administrative buildings and police offices using violence against officials. Crowds of young militia with baseball bats defeated the political and law enforcement administrations in Ternopol, Lviv, Ivano-Frankivsk, Volyn, Rovno, Zhytomyr, Uzhhorod, Chernovtsy, Khmel'nitsky, as well in the Sumy in the east of Ukraine².

In Lutsk, Oleksandr Bashkalenko, the Volyn governor who refused to resign, was enchained with handcuffs to the scene of the local Euromaidan and was wetted with water. The radicals also threatened to take his family to the local Euromaidan³.

In Ivano-Frankivsk, the insurgents took over the local SSU administration and stole three machine-guns, 268 guns and 90 grenades⁴.

1. Vesti.Ru, <http://www.vesti.ru/doc.html?id=1302160&cid=9>

2. Vesti.Ua, <http://www.vesti.ua/lvov/38405-na-zapade-strany-zhdut-novyh-nochej-gneva>

3. LifeNews, <http://www.lifenews.ru/news/127561>

4. Censor.Net, http://censor.net.ua/news/271549/v_ivanofrankovske_vosstavshie_zahvatili_tri_pulemeta_268_pistoletov_i_90_granat_sbu

In Khmelnytsky, during the riots at the SSU building, fire was opened at the protesters, with 2 people seriously injured¹. In response, the protestors assaulted the SSU building with “Molotov cocktails” which started a fire, with another activist killed by a head-shot².

In Zhytomyr, after the police refused to side with the protestors, the radicals stormed the oblast city council building and assaulted the local office of the Ministry of the Interior with incendiary bottles.

Recruitment of students into self-defense militia was under way in regions. The militia of the west of Ukraine was coordinated by Oleksandr Muzychko, also known as Sashko Biliy, who took an active part in the First Chechen War from the UNA-UPSD and 1994-1995 headed Dzhokhar Dudaev’s personal guard³.

In the meanwhile, Kiev continued the siege of the Euromaidan camp – they were pushed out of the third part of the Square and out of the previously taken over building. However, the militia stormed new building to compensate for the lost and burnt ones.

The night of February 19 saw a fire in the Trade-Unions Building, with an unknown culprit, during which, according to Sergei Sobolev, the deputy head of Batkivshchyna parliamentary group, over 40 people were burnt alive. The fire was fought for over a day, with four rescue workers injured by the nearby protestors. 41 people were rescued from the roof of the building by the fire brigade. The fire was still smoldering as late as the morning of February 20.

The Security Service of Ukraine declared a counter-terrorism operation.

1. Факти.ІСТV. Працівники СБУ розстріляли у Хмельницькому жінку (оновлено), <http://fakty.ictv.ua/ua/index/read-news/id/1504593>

2. UNIAN. Під час штурму Хмельницької СБУ застрелили людину, <http://www.unian.ua/politics/886801-pid-chas-shturmu-hmelnijskoi-sbu-zastreliili-lyudinu.html>

3. Cots. A Why Maidan Needs Dudaev’s Bodyguard // Komsomolskaya Pravda. 2013. December 16, <http://www.kp.ru/daily/26172.5/3061204/>

On February 20, unknown persons arranged a sniper assault on the Euromaidan participants and law enforcement officers, with over 100 people killed on both sides. The snipers also shot at medical workers who extracted casualties from the Maidan Square. The rival parties exchanged mutual accusations of organizing the sniper attack.

Member of Parliament Hennadiy Moskal claims¹ that the snipers who shot people on Institutska Street were law enforcement officers and acting at the order of Oleksandr Yakimenko, former Head of SSU, and Vitaly Zakharchenko, former Minister of the Interior of Ukraine.

Brigadier-General Oleksandr Yakimenko who headed the SSU under President Viktor Yanukovich said that the unknown snipers aimed at both rival parties from the Conservatoire building that was under full control of the opposition forces, for example, Andriy Parubiy, a so called commandant of Euromaidan.

The phone talk between Catherine Ashton, High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy for the EU, and Urmas Paet, Estonian foreign minister, the recording of which was posted on March 5 on YouTube, suggested that the snipers could have been hired by someone from the opposition².

According to the Canadian Global Research paper, the snipers who shot at the people on Maidan allegedly belonged to the Ukrainian National Assembly-Ukrainian People's Self-Defense organization (UNA-UPSD)³.

Russia Today journalists also were attacked by the sniper fire in the center of Kiev, with a bullet barely missing RT correspondent Alexey Yaroshevsky while he was getting ready for a live broadcast-

1. Джерело тижня. Геннадій Москаль: «Водночас снайпери отримали від влади вказівку розстрілювати не тільки протестантів, а й міліціонерів», <http://gazeta.dt.ua/internal/gennadiy-moskal-vodnochas-snayperi-otrimali-vid-vladi-vkazivku-rozstrilyuvati-ne-tilki-protestantiv-a-y-milicioneriv-.html>

2. Breaking: Estonian Foreign Minister Urmas Paet and Catherine Ashton discuss Ukraine over the phone, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZEgJ0oo3OA8>

3. Global Research. Ukraine: Secretive Neo-Nazi Military Organization Involved in Euromaidan Sniper Shootings, <http://www.globalresearch.ca/ukraine-secretive-neo-nazi-military-organization-involved-in-euromaidan-snyper-shootings/5371611>

ing on the balcony of a hotel. As a result, the RT camera crew found themselves blocked in the hotel a few levels of which were controlled by armed opposition members in balaclavas.

Fighters of the Interior Force battalion deployed in Ivano-Frankivsk gave away their equipment to the radicals: shields, helmets, bullet-proof vests, etc., on the whole, over a hundred equipment packages. Interior force armories were burgled in Ternopol, with explosives and impact ammunition stolen.

The Ternopol Griffon special unit announced they were no longer taking orders from the regime.

The 7th Self-Defense Force hundred destroyed an expensive clothes store “Юнкер” (“Junker”) right within the Independence Square area¹. In response, the revolutionary leadership headed by Andriy Parubiy just admonished the fellow members calling on the 7th hundred to stop looting.

A bus with Crimea fiscal police employees going to Kiev was assaulted. The bus was set on fire by the militia armed with guns and sticks, with seven passengers injured².

On the night of February 21, armed militia of the Cherkassy region burnt six buses in which Crimeans were coming home from the anti-Maidan. Many passengers were battered, threatened with guns; some were taken away in an unknown direction. 31 people were missing, with some still not found.

During the days of February 18-20, according to the Ministry of Health of Ukraine, 75 died, 571 people asked for medical attention from 10:20 on February 18 to 21:00 on February 20, of them 363 were hospitalized³.

1. Подробности.уа, <http://www.podrobnosti.ua/society/2014/02/20/960281.html>
2. Комментарии.уа, <http://crimea.comments.ua/news/2014/02/20/141555.html>
3. RBK-Ukraina, <http://euromaidan.rbc.ua/rus/minzdrav-zayavlyaet-o-75-zhertvah-besporyadkov-s-18-fevralya-20022014221500>

On February 21, after the negotiations between President Yanukovich and opposition representatives mediated by the EU and Russia, the sides signed the “Agreement on the Settlement of Crisis in Ukraine”.

The Agreement was signed by President Viktor Yanukovich and Opposition leaders Vitali Klitschko (UDAR), Arseniy Yatsenyuk (Batkivshchyna) and Oleh Tyahnibok (Svoboda). The agreement was witnessed by Germany and Poland foreign ministers Frank-Walter Steinmeier and Radoslaw Sikorski, as well as Director at the Continental Europe Department of the French Foreign Ministry Eric Fournier. Vladimir Lukin, Russian President's special envoy to Ukraine, who participated in the negotiations refused to sign the Agreement.

The Agreement implied restoration of the 2004 constitution, i.e. semi-presidential form of government, snap presidential election to be held until December 2014 and a national unity government to be formed. It also stated withdrawing from administrative and public buildings and unblocking streets, city parks and squares, stopping violence and surrendering arms by the Opposition. The Supreme Rada adopted a law granting amnesty for all detained during the protests. Berkut Special Forces and Internal Security troops left the center of Kiev.

On February 21, while leaders of the parliamentary opposition publicly announced details of the Agreement with Yanukovich, the Right Sector representatives said that they were unhappy with the gradual political reforms stipulated in the document and demanded immediate resignation of Yanukovich¹. Otherwise they were willing to take over the President Administration and the Supreme Rada. Dmytro Yarosh, the Right Sector leader, said that the Agreement lacked any clear commitments regarding the President's resignation, Rada's dissolution, punishment for law enforcement heads and perpetrators of “criminal orders that killed about a hundred Ukrainian

1. RBK-Ukraina, <http://euromaidan.rbc.ua/rus/-pravyy-sektor-nazval-soglashenie-s-yanukovichem-ocherednym-21022014160600>

citizens". He called the Agreement "yet another eye soaping" and refused to comply with it.

Afterwards, Dmytro Yarosh announced from the Euromaidan stage that the Right Sector would not put down arms and would not take off the blockade of the administrative buildings until the key demand – Yanukovich resignation – was met. Soon after the agreement was signed, the police left the streets of Kiev, while on the night of February 22, Maidan Self-Defense activists took control over the administrative quarter: the buildings of the Supreme Rada, Presidential Administration and the Government. Yanukovich himself fled Kiev.

Also on February 21, Ukraine saw mass destruction of Lenin statues ("Leninfalls"). The statues were demolished in a number of cities: Poltava, Chernigov, Khmelnytsky, Skvira, Zhytomyr, Slavuta, Boyarka, Kalinovka, etc. Over six hours, protesters had been trying to topple a Lenin statue in Dnipropetrovsk, with a few people injured.

February 22 saw a gunned clash in the Luhansk oblast administration. It started over an insult to the memory of Berkut soldiers who fell in battle when militia in helmets with sticks ruined commemorative candles in the center of the city. "Luhansk Guards" activists opposed them. Armed Berkut officers came to the scene of conflict. Three injured were hospitalized by the ambulance.

Over 200 offices of the Party of Regions were burnt since the beginning of the riots.

The Kiev office of the Communist Party of Ukraine was destroyed by unknown perpetrators¹. The people who attacked left the office which was later occupied by Euromaidan activists who called the police but at the same time expropriated the equipment and documents from the office.

February 22 saw a Rostislav Vasylo, a Lviv communist, was attacked by a group of vigilante in the center of Kiev not far from the Ukraine hotel. He was tortured with needles, hit with sticks, fists; his right lung was collapsed, three ribs, his nose and a facial bone

1. Observer, URL: <http://www.obozrevatel.com/politics/90814-kievskij-ofis-kpu-razgromili-neizvestnyie.htm>

were broken. He also suffered a second-degree concussion. His documents, money and a golden chain with the cross were taken away from him. According to his words, his mother, children and partner wife are being persecuted and threatened. He was assaulted under the pretext that he was allegedly a sniper¹.

Moreover, the police have recorded cases of battery of Maidan Self-Defense fighters wearing civilian clothes by their fellow fighters. Cars of Kiev city dwellers accused of “provocations” were damaged.

On February 23, the Right Sector militia attached Sergiy Kharchenko, head of Chopskaya Customs, with tape to a whipping post and made him admit corruption schemes².

The house of Pyotr Simonenko, head of the Communist Party of Ukraine, was taken over. He said his family was not hurt and added: “But remember, when they are done with us, they will come for you”³. The house was burned after the demolition.

Odessa saw clashes between the Right Sector activists and the “Anti-Maidan”. A few journalists were injured⁴.

Serhiy Tihipko, a Member of Parliament, said that vigilantism was taking place all over central and western Ukraine against members of the Party of Regions, that their house were set on fire and they were made to write letters of exiting the party⁵.

What is more, the Supreme Rada annulled the law “On the principles of the state language policy” allowing granting the Russian and other non-official languages the status of a regional language⁶.

1. ГолосUA, http://ru.golos.ua/politika/14_02_27_samosud_nad_kommunistom_kakuyu_stranu_myi_stroim

2. iPress.ua, http://www.ipress.ua/ru/news/praviy_sektor_arestoval_ukrovodytelya_chopskoy_tamozhny_y_prymotal_ego_skotchem_k_stolbu_pozora_49258.html

3. UNIAN, <http://www.unian.net/politics/889311-neizvestnyie-vzyali-shturmom-domsimonenko-v-kievskoy-oblasti.html>

4. Комментарии.ua, <http://comments.ua/life/454177-pod-odesskim-gorsoveto-dralis-praviy.html>

5. Корреспондент.net, <http://korrespondent.net/ukraine/politics/3310033-chlenov-pr-zastavliauit-pysat-zaiavlenyia-o-vykhode-iz-partyi-tyhypko>

6. Lenta.Ru, <http://lenta.ru/news/2014/02/23/language/>

232 out of 450 lawmakers voted for its cancellation. The decision was supported by most lawmakers from oppositional UDAR and Batkivshchyna parliamentary groups. All members of the nationalist Svoboda parliamentary group voted for it.

The law on languages was initiated in 2012 by the Party of Regions on the eve of the 2012 parliamentary elections. It stipulated that in the regions of Ukraine where an unofficial language was native for at least 10% of the population, it was granted a regional language status. This status implies that the language is allowed to be used in courts, schools and other institutions as well as in communication between citizens and government bodies.

After the law was adopted, the Russian language was given the official status in a number of cities and regions of Ukraine. In some regions the status was given to other languages, like Romanian or Hungarian.

Around midnight on February 24, incendiary bottles were thrown at the Jewish Community Center of Zaporizhia that is comprised of a synagogue and various cultural and educational facilities¹. The violators did not resolve to attack the front of the building as it was guarded by the security and threw in the incendiary bottles at the backdoor. The building was damaged, although the “Molotov cocktails” did not reach the inside of the building where people pray and study. Shortly before the incident, a Torah class finished in the synagogue. But by the time of the assault, there were no people in the building.

A group led by Sashko Biliy entered a fiscal police policy of the Rivne oblast located at 12 Vidinskaya Street, Rivne, took the keys to steal a Nissan Terrano microbus, started it and left. The activists justified their deed by “the needs of the revolution”². That same day this group visited S. Zhupanyuk, head of the Dubenskiy Driving

1. Polemika, <http://polemika.com.ua/news-139668.html>

2. Galnet, <http://galnet.org/news/113038-neodnorazovo-sudymyj-urodzenets-rosiji-sasha-bilyj-teroryzuje-rivnensku-oblast>

License Testing Center located at 184 Grushevskogo Street, Dubno, made him a letter of resignation and took \$10,000 for the “needs of the revolution and the injured” in return for a promise they would not go to his place and would no more disturb him. The same happened with G. Dobrinskiy, head of the Rovno Driving License Testing Center.

On February 25, about 100 officers of the Lviv Berkut Special Forces were brought to knees on the stage of the Euromaidan begging for forgiveness for having defended the Yanukovich regime¹. The Berkut officers were shouted at “Disgrace!” and small objects were thrown at them.

In Rivne, Sashko Biliy, a Right Sector activist, came to a session of the Rivne city council with a Kalashnikov² and demanded a full lustration of the authorities in the oblast. On the same day Biliy and a group of his followers entered the territory of TAKO (“TAKO”) Limited located at 62 bld. A, Kurchatova Street, Rivne, and made the leadership give him away two Mitsubishi L-200 and a Volkswagen microbus justifying the deed with the “needs of the revolution”. Afterwards, Biliy and his accomplices visited the owner, who is a Chechen, of the “Chayka” Trade Center (Gagarina Street, Rivne) and demanded \$100,000 for national development³.

Alla Ivoilova, deputy president of the Rivne city organization of the Party of Regions, said that the radical Maidan activists had been putting pressure on members of the party and their families⁴. Young people armed with bats and wearing masks broke into homes

1. Lenta.Ru: Львовский «Беркут» покаялся на коленях перед жителями Львова. URL: <http://www.lenta.ru/news/2014/02/25/bendedknees>.

Видео на YouTube: www.youtube.com/watch?v=-b2GILtgA1k

2. <http://politica-ua.com/aktivist-pravogo-sektora-prishel-na-zasedanie-chinovnikov-s-kalashom-bog-sozdal-lyudej-raznymi-kolt-urovnyal-shansy>. Видео на YouTube: www.youtube.com/watch?v=XtxbGjkkpF8

3. Galnet, <http://galnet.org/news/113038-neodnorazovo-sudymyj-urozhenets-rosi-ji-sasha-bilyj-teroryzuje-rivnensku-oblast>

4. UNN, URL: <http://www.unn.com.ua/ru/news/1308991-radikalni-aktivisti-na-rivnenschini-chinyat-zhorstkiy-tisk-na-chleniv-partiyi-regioniv-i-yikh-simiy-zayava>

of the leaders of the party cells, threatened people, for example, demanding that they should give them member lists of the cells, as well as lists of the party members who took part in the so called “Anti-Maidan”. In the event of refusal to give them the lists, the leaders of the Party of Regions were threatened with bodily harm and arson.

Employees of the Prosecutor’s Office of the Volyn oblast were pressurized in the same way: the Right Sector members entered the building of the government offices showing guns and demanded their resignation, in the event of refusal, threatening them with reprisals¹.

On February 26, in the town of Irpin of Kiev oblast, the Right Sector activists forced members of the city council with reprisal threats to vote for the early termination of the powers of the city president, his first deputy and all the executive board. The lawmakers complained that they were threatened: “if you do not raise your hand (when voting), we will cut it off; we will come to your home, we will hurt your families and damage your property”². In Sophievskaya Borshchagovka a group of people calling themselves as “the Right Sector” broke into the village council and trashed the building demanding an immediate resignation of the head of the council³.

Sashko Biliy, a Right Sector activist, and his accomplices visited V.V. Karpenchuk, former head of Rivne oblast city administration, and demanded \$700,000 in return for not raising the question of numerous abuses of power by Karpenchuk while redistributing lands in the Rivne oblast. Karpenchuk was scared to go to the police because Biliy “declared that he was the law in the oblast”. Karpenchuk decided to leave the oblast.

The office of the disbanded Berkut in Rivne was decided to be given away to the Right Sector and other organizations that were

1. UNN, URL: <http://www.unn.com.ua/ru/news/1308989-chleni-pravogo-sektoru-chinyat-tisk-na-prokuroriv-ta-pidporyadkovanikh-pratsivnikiv-na-volini-zayava>

2. Факти.ІСТV, <http://fakty.ictv.ua/ru/index/read-news/id/1505791>

3. Вести.ua, <http://reporter.vesti.ua/41323-stop-gop-stopu>

“in charge of the law enforcement”¹. Police Colonel D. Lazarev, head of the Ukrainian Ministry of the Interior of the Rivne oblast, gave away the Berkut base in Rivne (located on Vidinskaya Street, Rivne) to the Right Sector in return for loyalty. Such loyalty resulted in Biliy’s attending all of Lazarev’s daily meetings. It went so far that a police operative unit detaining people for disorderly conduct brought them to the People’s House (Petlyura Street, Rivne) where Bilit decided if they were to be brought to a police office or left with Biliy for “correctional education”. In return for such loyalty, Biliy forced Maidan activists and the city council leaders to sign a request to leave Lazarev as head of the Rivne oblast Police office. The “Armor” information record system of the Department of Internal Affairs deleted all their records on Biliy, including criminal, which allowed him to buy guns he paraded with in Rivne.

When surrendering the building of the Rivne regional government administration, A.I. Yukhimenko, deputy governor, paid Biliy \$10,000 for protection, which is to say for not destroying the place and leaving the equipment and document in place. Even though Yuhimenko is the father-in-law of V. Nazaruk, deputy head of the Rivne SSU administration².

On February 27, Police Colonel-General Hennadiy Moskal, a Batkivshchyna Member of Parliament, said that Maidan Self-Defense fighters were involved in looting and banditry³. He said many of them set up illegal armed groups that mostly operated in regions. Armed Self-Defense fighters wielding arms and bats broke into residential compounds and other buildings belonging to former authorities. According to the lawmaker, Maidan Self-Defense representatives went even further and looted abandoned buildings, detained cars to ter-

1. Новини Рівного, <http://www.charivne.info/news/Bazu-rivnenskoho-Berkutu-zaymatime-Praviy-sektor>

2. Galnet. Неодноразово судимий уродженець Росії Саша Білий тероризує Рівненську область, <http://galnet.org/news/113038-neodnorazovo-sudymyj-urodzenets-rosiji-sasha-bilyj-teroryzuje-rivnensku-oblast>

3. The Kiev Times, <http://www.thekievtimes.ua/society/330709-moskal-prizyvaet-ostanovit-banditov-s-evromajdana.html>

rorize passengers and extorted money for the cause of the revolution. Hennadiy Moskal outspokenly called them a “criminal gang” who discredited the entire Euromaidan. Among the criminals, he specified the 31st and the 33d hundreds of the Maidan Self-Defense Force and Sasha Bunker, head of the 31st hundred. He also added they 33d hundred had 10 Kalashnikovs.

People wearing balaclavas and military suits also stopped by Dovzhenko’s film studio. They called themselves “Vikings” and demanded the heads of the studio to resign. The police came but did not intervene¹.

Oleksand Muzychko, also known as Sashko Biliy, the Right Sector coordinator in the west of Ukraine, hit and insulted Andriy Targoniy, the Rivne region Attorney². The Right Sector came to his office because a woman was killed in Stavki village; so they violently demanded explanations.

On February 28, in Kharkiv, a 65 year-old woman’s body with numerous stab wounds was found. It was later found out that the victim was Maria Blomerius, one of the active defenders of Lenin Statue. She was a member of the Party of Regions and sister of Henrih Altunyan, who was a former dissident. At the defense of the statue, she said the monument was “more than an idol for the Kharkiv city residents who were born in this city. It was our history. It is our memory and it can’t be destroyed”³. Since Bromerius was many times a member of the Party of Regions campaign offices, it was easy to find out her address.

An armed group of 20 people calling themselves the Right Sector broke into the Football House⁴. They demanded an immediate resignation of the president of the Football Federation of Ukraine, threatening to take over the building and to draw blood. However,

1. InPress, <http://www.inpress.ua/ru/society/26235-samooborona-i-samozvantsy-ischem-desyat-otlichy>

2. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jDxKuC4GNjk>

3. MIGnews, <http://www.mignews.com.ua/ru/articles/156833.html>

4. forUm, <http://for-ua.com/ukraine/2014/02/28/235208.html>

later the Football Federation said those were not the Right Sector activists. Who were they has never been discovered.

Sashko Biliy, the Right Sector coordinator, was investigated into in Ukraine. An investigation started after the incident in the Rivne Prosecutor's Office. In response, Muzychko warned that the Right Sector and UNA-UPSD militia were already on high alert.

On March 1, the Right Sector leaders called on the terrorist Dokka Umarov to support Ukraine¹. "Blood shed side by side unites the Ukrainian people and the peoples of the Caucasus. Many Ukrainians fought for the liberation struggle of the Chechen and other Caucasian people. It is time now to support Ukraine", said the Right Sector statement in the Vkontakte social network².

On March 2, around 2 am, unknown perpetrators shot three road police officers dead at the Brovarckiy Avenue checkpoint³. The killers approached the checkpoint and shot at close range two inspectors who were in a police car and another one standing beside the checkpoint. They also stole service guns. On March 6, the acting Attorney General of Ukraine said that the suspects were part of the Euromaidan and were identified⁴.

On March 4, Euromaidan radical supporters battered Anton Davydchenko, the Odessa Anti-Maidan leader, in Odessa⁵. The assault took place at the oblast council when Davydchenko came with his followers to submit demands by the protests to Volodimir Nemirovskiy, the newly appointed governor of the oblast. When the activist's car was leaving, Serhiy Gutslyuk, a member of the Odessa's UDAR started shouting: "A Pro-Putin provocateur is driving, come

1. Gazeta.ru, http://www.gazeta.ru/politics/news/2014/03/01/n_5985005.shtml

2. The Right Sector Vkontakte page, <https://vk.com/public62043361>

3. <http://www.podrobnosti.ua/criminal/2014/03/02/961986.html>

4. Vesti.ua, <http://vesti.ua/kiiev/41244-gpu-zajavili-o-prichastnosti-podozrevaemyh-v-rasstrele-sotrudnikov-gai-k-evromajdanu>

5. <http://topor.od.ua/odesskie-evromaydanshtiki-izbili-lidera-antimaydana/>

here, guys!” An angry crowd of the Euromaidan activists attacked Davydchenko’s car, broke the windows, cut Davydchenko’s leg and battered his bodyguard.

On March 5, armed people calling themselves the Right Sector disrupted the meeting of the Vasilkov city Rada¹. Gunmen broke into the administration conference room and surrounded the podium. They took the speaker and demanded that the Party of Regions lawmakers should leave the party parliamentary group and “give back everything they have stolen”. The gunmen also said the Rada’s composition will change, with more “deserving” people entering it. What is more, the activists brought with a picture of Sergey Aksyenyov, Crimea’s Prime Minister, with a black ribbon on the right side. They fixed the picture and placed flowers below it.

During a mass fight in Boryspol, with nearly 200 people taking part, a Makarov stolen from the Galicia region police office of Lviv was used².

The German Tagesspiegel published an article that says that members of the people’s self-defense committees attempted to take over German enterprises, according to the Chamber of commerce of Germany in Kiev. One of the heads of a German company confirmed the information³.

The Quarzwerke Gruppe factory in Vinnytsia oblast received a letter from a people’s self-defense committee accusing the company of “corruption and abuse towards employees” and demanding “immediate appointment of the specified person as the company’s new head”. Otto Hieber, head of the company, said they politely re-

1. Online.ua, <http://news.online.ua/635108/vooruzhennyye-lyudi-vorvalis-na-zasedanie-rady-v-vasilkove/>

2. GolosUA, http://ru.golos.ua/social_problem/14_03_06_orujie_pohischennoe_vo_lvove_uje_proyavilo_sebya_v_kieve

3. Der Tagesspiegel. Ukrainische "Volkskomitees" wollten deutsche Fabriken entern, <http://www.tagesspiegel.de/wirtschaft/revolutionswirren-ukrainische-volkskomitees-wollten-deutsche-fabriken-entern/9564004.html>. Перевод InoPressa, <http://www.inopressa.ru/article/05Mar2014/tagesspiegel/fabriken.html>

ferred to the constant external audit and refused to change the administration. The alleged authors of the letter came to the factory and attempted to take it over but were forced away by the police. Hieber said the new oblast and Kiev government both guaranteed to support the company against “such unfriendly acquisitions”.

A similar incident took place in Zhytomyr oblast. According to Rainer Lindner, CEO of the Committee on Eastern European Economic Relations of the German economy, “uncertainty among German companies has significantly risen”. He pointed out that the Euro-maidan activists consist of both supporters of closer relations with the West, and nationalist and hooligans.

Lviv paper journalists studied cases of violent takeovers of Lviv market administrations and concluded that the city was run by raiders hiding behind revolutionary slogans and Maidan¹.

Over a hundred citizens of Ivano-Frankivsk asked the mayor to establish order. The people were concerned, among other things, that armed people in balaclavas calling themselves the Right Sector or the People’s Self-Defense were threatening people².

Businessman Boris Filatov, appointed deputy governor of Dnipropetrovsk oblast called for first giving the Crimeans any promises but later “hang” them: “No assaults from Maidan, no extremist statements. We need to give the bastards any promises or guarantees and to make any concessions... But as for hanging, we will do that later”, he wrote on his Facebook account³.

In Rivne, at request from the Right Sector activists, the new head of police office was sealed, since his candidacy had not been approved by the local Maidan⁴. On March 6, several dozen activists

1. У Львові під революційними гаслами відбувається банальне рейдерство – «Львівська газета», http://vgolos.com.ua/news/u_lvovi_pid_revolyutsiynymy_gaslamy_vidbuvaetsya_banalne_reyderstvo__lvivska_gazeta_137599.html

2. Западная информационная корпорация. У Франківську представник ПС погрожував журналістам розбити камери, http://zik.ua/ua/news/2014/03/06/u_frankivsku_predstavnyk_ps_pogrozhuвав_zhurnalistam_rozbyty_kamery_468104

3. Vzglyad, <http://www.vz.ru/news/2014/3/6/675943.html>

4. Тиждень. У Рівному за ініціативою активістів опечатали кабінет новопризначеного начальника обласної міліції, <http://tyzhden.ua/News/104282/PrintView?attempt=1>

came to the office of Vyacheslav Chaika, the head of local police appointed on March 4, and demanded he resign by the next night.

On March 7, true gallows were installed in the center of Cherkassy right where gallows were set during the fascist occupation in 1942 to hang people. Other symbolic gallows were erected in Dnipropetrovsk for dissidents and undesirables. Effigies of Oleh Tsarev and Vadim Kolesnichenko, the Party of Regions lawmakers, were hung¹.

In Lviv, the Right Sector and Afghan veterans sabotaged the official presentation of Volodimir Gural, the new prosecutor of the oblast. They took him outside by force. Ihor Kotsuruba, the Lviv Right Sector leader, justified this by saying that the new prosecutor was well known as a person “with a corrupt lifestyle”².

In the Storozhinetskiy region of Chernivtsi oblast, people in balaclavas calling themselves the Right Sector activists attacked lumbermen³.

In the Boryspol international airport, during the check-in, two Crimea resident passports were torn. The men were to go abroad to work on a foreign ship⁴.

On March 8, after an anti-fascist march in Kharkiv was over, a microbus approached a group of protesters who were going home, ten people got off and opened fire from non-lethal weapons at the activists⁵. They later battered other activists with bats and sticks, which resulted in five people hospitalized.

Volodimir Bondarenko, the newly appointed president of Kiev city state administration, said that looters were working in Kiev that

1. <http://polemika.com.ua/news-140715.html>

2. Ukrainskaya Pravda, <http://www.pravda.com.ua/rus/news/2014/03/7/7018073/>

3. Западная информационная корпорация. На Буковині псевдоактивісти у масках нападають на лісників, http://zik.ua/ua/news/2014/03/11/na_bukovyni_psevdoaktyvisty_u_maskah_napadayut_na_lisivnykiv_469316

4. Seafarers Journal, <http://www.seafarersjournal.com/news/view/v-ae-roportu-borispolya-samooborona-porvala-pasporta-moryakam-i-lishila-ih-raboty>

5. <http://dozor.kharkov.ua/events/chp-criminal/1148508.html>

“hang out somewhere out there [in the center of Kiev, ed.] pretending to be those who made the revolution”¹.

On March 9, unknown assailants hit with hammers and stabbed people guarding a Lenin monument in Novomoskovsk of Dnipropetrovsk oblast².

On the same day, Chyhyryn of Cherkassy oblast saw an act of vandalism towards a monument to Hasidic rabbis at the old cemetery, with the vandals throwing incendiary bottles at the Jewish monument³.

On March 10, in Luhansk, a group of militia headed by Oleh Lyashko, Member of Parliament, took hostage Arsen Klinchaev, the Party of Regions member of oblast council. Lyashko himself wrote about it on his Facebook account: “At night, we detained Arsen Klinchaev, leader of Luhansk separatists and the Party of Regions member of oblast council, and Efremov, his assistant. Yesterday I incognito arrived in my native Luhanshchina to head this special operation. Bastard Klinchaev will be held responsible for his deeds – we detained him and gave him to the law enforcement bodies. I sincerely thank all who helped to arrange this”. On the morning of March 10, the police freed Klinchaev who said Lyashko threatened his family and promised to hang and cut for Russian flags.

On March 11, the Supreme Council of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea banned the Right Sector and its constituent nationalist organizations, as well as the Svoboda All-Ukrainian Union. According to the Supreme Council, their activity threatened the life and safety of residents of Crimea⁴.

1. Ukrainskaya Pravda, <http://www.pravda.com.ua/rus/news/2014/03/8/7018162/>
2. 112.ua, <http://112.ua/obshchestvo/v-dnepropetrovskoy-obl-izbili-dezhurivshih-upamyatnika-leninu-carev-31789.html>
3. <http://glagol.in.ua/2014/03/09/v-chigirine-zabrosali-kokteylyami-molotova-pamyatnik-hasidskim-ravvinam/>
4. RIA Novosti, <http://www.ria.ru/world/20140311/999030908.html>

In Ternopol oblast, journalist Volodimir Yakymiv, a member of the local “revolutionary resistance office”, was battered. He said the attackers accused him of “taking too much on himself and not having any right to say anything about the Right Sector”¹.

On March 12, the Volyn Right Sector demanded that Leonid Shvydkoy, the newly appointed head of the ministry of the interior administration in Volyn oblast, should resign. In response to his refusal, Pavlo Danilchuk, the leader of the Volyn Right Sector, threatened to take people to Maidan and to do “the same as what happened to Bashkhalenko” (the Volyn governor battered by Maidan activists)².

The Zaporizhia Right Sector put the leaders of the Anti-Maidan on the wanted list posting online information on them, including plate numbers, personal websites and social network accounts³. For example, the Right Sector leaders were unhappy with Artyom Tymchenko, editor-in-chief of Iskra paper; Volodimir Rogov, the head of Slavyanskaya Gvardiya (Slav Guards) civil organization and Oleksandr Potoman, one of the leaders of the local Cossack movement.

On March 13, Maidan Self-Defense militia took over the Ukrainian Business Bank in the center of Kiev. They were armed with bats, knives, and a gun was noticed. The bank security forces were blocked on the third level of the bank building. The Alfa special force unit came to the building, and following negotiations, the attackers released the guards and agreed to surrender and free the bank. A bus was driven to the bank to take the militia and a corridor was arranged for them to leave. According to the Kiev Head Office of the Ministry of the Interior, the police arrested 38 armed attackers. Oleh Makhnitskiy, the acting Attorney General of Ukraine, said that the attack-

1. http://zik.ua/ua/news/2014/03/11/na_ternopilshchyni_chetvero_nevidomyh_pobly_zhurnalista_469409

2. Правий сектор – Швидкому: буде так само, як з Башкаленком. Оновлено, <http://www.volynnews.com/news/authority/volynskyy-pravyi-sektor-vkazav-avakovu-na-yoho-pomylku-zvernennya/>

3. <http://glagol.in.ua/2014/03/12/zaporozhskiy-pravyiy-sektor-obyavil-v-rozyisk-liderov-antimaydana/>

ers would be held responsible for the assault on the bank. They were taken to the regional police office where the arrested said they were the “Warriors of Narnia”, which is one of the “Maidan Self-Defense” gangs, and that they came to defend the bank, with some of them just passing by or finding themselves in the bank by accident. They all were soon released¹.

Oxana Kaletnik, the Communist Party Member of Parliament, asked the Minister of the Interior for help to handle the Maidan Self-Defense that, in her opinion, was involved in the racket. She said that four men arrived at about 21:30 at the Tripolye restaurant and hotel complex. They entered the restaurant and demanded the administrator saying they came on behalf of the Maidan Self-Defense to nationalize the complex and demanded that during 24 hours all papers were ready to “give the complex away to the people”. Showing a Kalashnikov, they gave the administrator two bottles with “Molotov cocktail” demanding that he should give it to the bosses.

On the night of March 13, Rabbi Hillel Cohen, the Hatzalah Ukraine Chairman, was attacked in Kiev by two young people when he was going to the 10th city hospital to visit a patient. The attackers called him a “Hebe”, shouted other insults and stabbed him. After the assault, the hooligans left by car².

On March 14, the Kiev mayor administration officials that they were afraid to appear in the Kiev Rada where the Maidan Self-Defense forces stationed. The troops divided into two groups. The one was self-defense hundreds (militia units), while the other was represented by different organizations, such as the “Warriors of Narnia” that were not under the self-defense control. Alexiy Davydenko, Kiev Rada UDAR member, wrote on his social network accounts about fe-

1. According to UNIAN, Vesti.ua, Capital.ua and the website of the Attorney General of Ukraine, <http://www.unian.net/politics/895894-neizvestnyie-voorujennyie-lyudi-zahvatili-bank-v-tsentre-kieva.html>; <http://prokuratura.org.ua/?p=23270>; <http://business.vesti.ua/42283-nochnyh-grabitelej-banka-v-centre-kieva-vypustjat-iz-milicii>; <http://www.capital.ua/ru/news/15134-bank-v-kieve-mogli-ograbit-marodery-vydavshie-sebya-zasamooboronu-makhnitskiy>

2. NEWSru.co.il, http://www.newsru.co.il/world/14mar2014/cohen_kiev_105.html

male employees of the Environmental Commission and Youth and Sport Commission. “I was threatened with a Kalashnikov in my office. They promised to put me up against the wall only because I asked where my computer was and asked to take books that I myself have written. Pointing the gun in my face, they said that I was a bitch and demanded to knock it off”, Davydenko cited one of the young women from the Commissions.

Another female employee said that from December to mid-February she had been working in an occupied mayor administration building and until a certain point she “had not had any problems with the public”. “But now there are two parallel realities there. On the one hand, the hundreds, who are mostly ok. On the other, young lads who wear balaclavas and wield guns even among fellows. I was detained for over two hours as a looter for taking back Churchill and Einstein pictures from my office. During that time, they all quarreled, bragging how they were shot at but survived and how some of them burned an armored vehicle. There are some sincere and ok guys among them, while there are also Sharikovs and Shvonders¹”, a female worker of the mayor administration told Vesti.ua².

In Kiev, on 23/1 Lva Tolstogo Street, after residents of the house decided to clean the basement that allegedly belongs to one of the regional lawmakers, 10 gunmen with the Right Sector symbols arrived. They battered three residents and after the police came, they barricaded themselves in the basement. Serhiy Pashynskiy, the acting Presidential Administration Chief of Staff, came in person. He held negotiations with the self-defense after the people with the Right Sector symbols left the building in an unknown direction without turning in weapons³.

A Jewish married couple was assaulted in Kiev when going to the Kiev synagogue for a Shabbat prayer. The couple was surrounded by aggressive people who shouted insults. The couple tried to escape

1. Characters of Mikhail Bulgakov's novel Heart of a Dog (translator's note).

2. Vesti.ua, <http://www.vesti.ua/kyiv/42409-chinovnikam-kyivskoy-mjerii-ugrozhajut-oruzhiem>

3. Факти.ІCTV, <http://fakty.ictv.ua/ru/index/read-news/id/1507907>

by taxi that was standing beside but the attackers hurried to break the windows of the taxi. The taxi driver took them to the synagogue and saw them off to the very entrance.

The Chief Rabbi of Kiev and Ukraine Yaakov Dov Bleich said that he was very concerned by the incident. “To my deep concern, I have to say this was the first true anti-Semitic attack on Jews. These lads were not going to stop...”, he said¹.

The Darnitskaya regional state administration in Kiev where the Maidan Self-Defense office is located, witnessed shooting. Around 23:30 representatives of the 3d self-defense hundred arrived at the building. A fight broke out between them, with one of the members taking out a gun and starting a shooting spree that injured two self-defense fighters². The Svoboda party activists were involved too³.

On March 15, the Right Sector activists opened fire at representatives of the pro-Russian Kharkiv self-defense forces in Kiev who were on duty on the Freedom Square. A blue Volkswagen microbus, which previously shot at the self-defense activists on March 8, passed by the guards on duty, which started a pursuit that finished at Rymarskaya Street where the Patriots of Ukraine’s office is located. Here the Right Sector advocates opened fire at the self-defense fighters⁴. The confrontation involved the use of live ammunition and sound-and-noise grenades. Two people died while five more, including a law enforcement officer, were hospitalized⁵.

The Right Sector office was blocked by the police. Negotiations with the militiamen were held by Ihor Baluta, the president of

1. <http://evreiskiy.kiev.ua/v-kieve-soversheno-napadenie-na-12914.html>

2. ТВі. У київській райадміністрації сталася стрілянина: є постраждали. Url: http://www.tvi.ua/new/2014/03/15/u_kyivskiy_rayadministraciyi_stalasya_strilyanyu_aye_postrazhdali

3. Observer, <http://kiyany.obozrevatel.com/crime/91365-strelba-vozle-darnitskoj-rga-konfliktovali-svobodovtysi.htm>

4. LifeNews, <http://www.lifenews.ru/news/129038>

5. <http://dozor.kharkov.ua/news/crime/1148730.html>

the Kharkiv oblast state administration; Hennadiy Kernes, the city mayor; Nikolay Fomenko, head of the investigation department, and Evgeniy Popovich, Kharkiv's prosecutor. At around 4:30 the people under siege agree to leave the building, and 40 people were taken to an investigatory detention unit. The following day Kharkiv residents burned the Right Sector office destroying their documents and property¹.

On March 16, in Rivne, after the end of the Popular Assembly, the protesters' column headed to the Prosecutor's Office of the Rivne oblast. The protesters demanded resignation of Serhiy Kubrik, the newly appointed prosecutor. Activists and representatives of the Right Sector demanded transparency of appointments and public discussions of candidates for the leading offices. To "refresh the memory and remind the Prosecutor of what society is expecting from him", the activists brought with a tire, a bag of cement and two bottles with "Molotov cocktail"².

On March 17, the Spilna Sprava organization, a radical wing of the Euromaidan, announced it was leaving the Independence Square in Kiev to launch preparation for a guerrilla war against Russia. According to Oleksandr Danilyuk, the movement's coordinator, Armed Forces of Ukraine are "too weak for a full-scale war with the Russian Army"; that is why the only efficient way to oppose Moscow could be to create a strong guerrilla movement³.

In Chernivtsi, Mikhail Romanov, the newly appointed head of the Chernivtsi oblast state administration, resign under the pressure of the Right Sector⁴.

1. <http://www.mykharkov.info/news/v-xarkove-sozhgli-ofis-pravogo-sektora-41962.html>
2. Чарівне, <http://www.charivne.info/news/U-Rivnomu-aktivisti-ta-Praviy-sektor-brali-shturmom-Prokuraturu-oblasti-VIDEO>
3. Polit.ru (Полит.ру), <http://www.polit.ru/news/2014/03/18/guerrilla/>
4. UNIAN, <http://www.unian.net/politics/897218-v-chernovtsah-novonaznachennyiy-predsdatel-oga-smog-porabotat-vsego-odin-den.html>

On March 18, the Svoboda Party Members of Parliament forced Oleksandr Panteleymonov, the acting president of the National Television Company of Ukraine (NTKU), to resign. Ihor Miroshnichenko, the Svoboda lawmaker, called him “Moskal” and accused him of permanent lies on the channel during the Euromaidan. The lawmakers forced Panteleymonov to take a set and hit him in the head. Afterwards, around 20 people pushed him in a four-by-four and took him in an unknown direction¹.

“I met him in the elevator after the battery. When the door opened, I saw Sasha with split forehead, lip and broken jaw. What you saw in the video are just innocent bonks! After the battery in the office, he had been hit for another half an hour outside...” published Komsomolskaya Pravda in Ukraine the words of a witness to the assault on Panteleymonov².

Dunja Mijatović, the OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media, denounced the actions of the Svoboda Party Members of Parliament. “I am appalled by this outrageous action, which goes against all media freedom values and cannot be tolerated”, Mijatović wrote in a letter to Oleksandr Turchinov, the acting President of Ukraine. “This is a particularly serious incident as some attackers not only represent the legislative branch of power, but also are members of the freedom of speech and information committee of the Parliament”, she added.

“I urge the government to strengthen journalists' safety, especially during the current crisis in Ukraine”, she said in the statement.

Mijatović pointed out that this was the second case in recent days where media managers are forced to resign. On 17 March, a group of individuals stormed the office of state television in the Chernigov region and forced its director, Arkadiy Bilibayev, to resign. “I call on the authorities to launch swift and transparent investigations and bring all those responsible to justice”, she added.

1. Zerkalo Nedeli, http://www.zn.ua/UKRAINE/deputaty-svobodovcy-siloy-zastavili-prezidenta-ntku-napisat-zayavlenie-ob-otstavke-141412_.html

2. http://www.kp.ua/Default.aspx?page_id=3&city_id=-1&date=200314&news_id=444410

The OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media called on the authorities to take steps to transform state television and radio into a true public service broadcaster, independent from political and business pressures.

On March 20, a group of people, allegedly members of the Right Sector, wearing camouflage and balaclavas gathered at the office of Inter Channel in Kiev and threatened to storm the office. The scandalous lawmaker Miroshnichenko was noticed among them¹.

On March 21, the police detained Vladislav Garanin, one of the leaders of the White Hammer² movement and suspect for the murder of three State Road Police officers on March 2 at the Brovary checkpoint³. A few days later, a 17-year-old Kiev resident was detained at the Ternopol bus station who was found to have a gun of one of the killed road police officers⁴.

The police said they detained a group of nine people six of whom had a whole arsenal of guns: rifles, Nagan guns, Kornets, one and a half hundred bullets, self-made explosive devices, etc. All the detained were Maidan activists from the White Hammer and Vikings organizations who took part in the confrontations of Grushevskogo and Institutskaya Streets.

The Maidan Self-Defense militiamen hit a camera crew of the Ukraine Channel in Kiev. A camera was broken; clothes torn, a journalist and camera man got injured. Correspondent Oxana Kotova and cameraman Yuri Melnichuk came to the local office of the Ministry of Agriculture to take an interview and waited for the main character in the hall of the building, which the local people's guards

1. http://joinfo.ua/politic/873850_Telekanal-Inter-evakuiruetsya-Praviy-sektor.html

2. The White Hammer is a union of "autonomous" nationalists that seeks to «assert Ukrainian Ukraine on the basis of national socialism»; it was established in September 2012 in Kiev and came to be famous in a number of regions advocating "direct action". Its first actions were assaults on illegal gambling venues.

3. Zerkalo Nedeli, http://www.zn.ua/UKRAINE/miliciya-zaderzhala-organizatora-ubiystva-sotrudnikov-gai-pod-kievom-141710_.html

4. Vesti.ua, <http://www.vesti.ua/kiiev/44129-podozrevaemyj-v-ubijstve-gaishnikov-priznalsja-v-sodejannom>

viewed as a provocation. The Self-Defense Main Office apologized for their colleagues and asked to understand that their behavior was an exception, not the rule. The Ukraine Channel filed a lawsuit with regard to the incident.

On March 22, the Right Sector disrupted a concert by the Kiev's Morphine Suffering musical band that was performing in the People's House in Rivne. "The Right Sector activists took to the stage with guns and told them to get lost. Or else they were going to do away with them", a witness reported¹.

On March 23, a group of people calling themselves the "11th hundred of Maidan" attempted to break into a building in Kiev rented by the Russian Federation for the Russian Center of Science and Culture. The people expressed their desire to use the building and the equipment that is the property of the Russian Federation to set up their own office. They also threatened the citizens of Ukraine who were there and warned them that "any cooperation with Russia is impermissible". Moreover, a car of the Center was stolen. It was only after the Central Office of the Ministry of the Interior of Ukraine intervened, at the request of the leaders of the Russian Embassy and the Russian Center of Science and Culture, that the above-mentioned people left the building and after a while returned the stolen car².

On March 24, a pro-Russian motor rally took place from Melitopol to Zaporizhia. When approaching Zaporizhia, they were assaulted by radical members of the Maidan Self-Defense who started to break their car windows, destroy lights and mirrors and attack the car passengers³.

1. «Правий сектор» зірвав у Рівному концерт важкої рок-музики, <http://vse.rv.ua/news/1395525374-praviy-sektor-zirvav-u-rivnomu-koncert-vazhkoyi-rok-muziki.html>

2. The Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Russia website, http://www.mid.ru/brp_4.nsf/newsline/C5D90A73BDBDAAEC44257CA50045780C

3. 112.ua, <http://112.ua/kriminal/v-zaporozhe-napalni-na-avtoprobeg-s-rossiyskim-flagom-razbity-avtomobili-est-ranenye-38726.html>

On March 25, Oleksandr Muzychko (also known as Sashko Biliy), the Right Sector activist, was killed in Rivne¹. The murder took place at the Tri Karasya café. It was later discovered that on the night of 24 of March, a special operation was held in Rivne oblast by the Main Anti-Organized Crime Unit and Sokol Special Force unit to detain and neutralize an organized crime group. A shooting broke out during the operation that killed Oleksandr Muzychko². The Right Sector accused Arsen Avakov, the Minister of the Interior, of Muzychko's murder and vowed revenge on the Minister³. Shortly before the death, on March 13, 2014, Oleksandr Muzychko released his address to the SSU where he blamed the leadership of the Ministry of the Interior of Ukraine and the Attorney General of Ukraine for preparing his elimination⁴.

In the light of the murder of Oleksandr Muzychko, the Right Sector coordinator in Rivne oblast, his fellows Roman Koval, Yaroslav Granytniy and Oleksandr Pantyukhov gave a press-conference. They said the blame for his death lies with not only Arsen Avakov, the Minister of the Interior, but also with Tetiana Chornovol, head of the not yet established Anti-Corruption Committee; however, they failed to explain why⁵.

On the night of March 25, unknown persons battered to death Timofey Steblyi, a 21-year-old Maidan activist, in the center of Kiev. He was killed with baseball bats by people wearing camouflage and balaclavas. It took place right at the barricades of Maidan⁶.

1. Ukrainskaya Pravda, <http://www.pravda.com.ua/rus/news/2014/03/25/7020184/>

2. UNN, <http://www.unn.com.ua/ru/news/1321508-sashko-biliy-zaginv-pid-chas-provedennya-spetsoperatsiyi-po-zatrimannyyu-yogo-bandformuvannya-mvs>

3. Zerkalo Nedeli, http://dt.ua/UKRAINE/praviy-sektor-poobicyav-pomstitsiya-avakovu-za-vbivstvo-sashka-bilogo-140358_.html

4. Четверта влада, <http://www.4vlada.com/rivne/34078>

5. ОРД 02, <http://ord-02.com/novosti-ukrainy/item/34941-praviy-sektor-obvinyayet-chornovol-v-prichastnosti-k-smerti-sashka-bilogo>

6. NBN, <http://nbnews.com.ua/ru/news/116555/>

On March 26, Arsen Avakov, the Minister of the Interior, made a statement about confrontations between law enforcement officers and gunmen calling themselves representatives of the Right Sector.

“Similar situations (like that in Rivne oblast) take place in two other regions of the country. In Zakarpacie, where a group of people called the Right Sector barricaded themselves in a private house, ... and we have a confrontation going on for two days. When on the one hand, we have law enforcement bodies with court sanctions and so on and, on the other hand, we have gunmen, sometimes using grenade launchers, and this situation has to be settled”, said the minister.

According to Avakov, the other similar situation took place in Zaporizhia oblast “where people appeared at the waste dump of, if I am not mistaken, an iron-ore factory and said they were from the Right Sector and were going to run the place”.

“And clashes again, with the law enforcement on one side and unknown people with guns on the other. This has to stop. If a political resolution does not suit, then the state must take measures. Otherwise, we will degenerate into Somali, with bandits ruling the streets and making all decisions. My task is to prevent this”, stressed Avakov¹.

On March 29, over a thousand Right Sector activists gathered for a demonstration at the Supreme Rada. They were aggressive, broke windows and tried to break in. they demanded the resignation Arsen Avakov, Minister of the Interior, and an investigation into Oleksandr Muzychko’s murder. The protesters did not leave until an investigation committee, including the Right Sector and Euromaidan representatives, was set up by the Supreme Rada to look into Muzaychko’s murder².

1. UNIAN, <http://www.unian.net/politics/900808-avakov-sravnil-pravyyi-sektor-s-bandami-iz-somali.html>

2. According to TSN, <http://ru.tsn.ua/politika/deputaty-sozdali-sledstvennuyu-komissiyu-po-rassledovaniyu-smerti-sashi-belogo-357501.html>; <http://ru.tsn.ua/politika/v-komissiyu-po-rassledovaniyu-smerti-muzychko-voshli-predstaviteli-maydana-i-pravogo-sektora-357585.html>

On March 29, Catherine Ashton, the EU High Representative for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, condemned the Right Sector: “I strongly condemned the pressure by activists of the Right Sector who have surrounded the building of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. Such an intimidation of the parliament is against the democratic principles and rule of law... They need to hand over any unauthorised arms to the authorities immediately. An impartial and credible investigation into the circumstances of the death of Oleksandr Muzychko during a detention attempt by the police is needed. I welcome the setting up of an ad hoc investigation committee in the Verkhovna Rada today”¹.

1. TSN, <http://ru.tsn.ua/politika/ketrin-eshton-osudila-pravyy-sektor-za-davlenie-na-verhovnyu-radu-357711.html>

Stanislav Byshok
Alexey Kochetkov

NEONAZIS & EUROMAIDAN

From democracy to dictatorship

[Second edition]

Translation
Anna E. Nikiforova, PhD in political science

www.kmbook.ru

ISBN