



3-2023

## The Soul of Russia and the Soul of Ukraine

David Wilkinson

University of California, Los Angeles, [dow@ucla.edu](mailto:dow@ucla.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/ccr>



Part of the [Comparative Literature Commons](#), [History Commons](#), [International and Area Studies Commons](#), [Political Science Commons](#), and the [Sociology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Wilkinson, David (2023) "The Soul of Russia and the Soul of Ukraine," *Comparative Civilizations Review*. Vol. 88: No. 88, Article 5.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/ccr/vol88/iss88/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Comparative Civilizations Review* by an authorized editor of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact [ellen\\_amatangelo@byu.edu](mailto:ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu).

## The Soul of Russia and the Soul of Ukraine

David Wilkinson

Department of Political Science, University of California, Los Angeles  
dow@ucla.edu

### Abstract

This essay addresses the issue of two contemporary state identities — that of Russia and that of Ukraine.

### “Soul Talk”

In the violent struggle of Russia in Ukraine that began on February 24, 2022, among the issues that have arisen is: are Russia and Ukraine one country? Two? Two-and-one? One becoming two? Two becoming one?

This issue was brought to general notice by the contention of Russia’s President Vladimir Putin: “During the recent Direct Line, when I was asked about Russian-Ukrainian relations, I said that Russians and Ukrainians were one people — a single whole.”

As indicated in the article, this position is not an offhand or casual remark: see the referenced “Direct Line” of June 30, 2021, where Mr. Putin said, “I have noted many times, and I can repeat once again that, in my opinion, Ukrainians and Russians are a single people.” (All references are appended.)

President Putin elaborated upon this view in an article of July 12, 2021, entitled *On the Historical Unity of Russians and Ukrainians*. He wrote: “Russians, Ukrainians, and Belarusians are all descendants of Ancient Rus’, which was the largest state in Europe.” Referring to cultural developments of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, he speaks of “the greater Russian nation at that time, which united the Velikorussians [“Great Russians”], the Malorussians [“Little Russians”] and the Belorussians [“White Russians”]. But later, Putin contends, Soviet policy “secured at the state level the provision on three separate Slavic peoples: Russian, Ukrainian and Belorussian, instead of the large Russian nation, a triune people comprising Velikorussians, Malorussians and Belorussians.”

And shortly before the invasion of Ukraine, the President of Russia, in an address of February 21, 2022 said, “I would like to emphasize again that Ukraine is not just a neighboring country for us. It is an inalienable part of our own history, culture, and spiritual space.”

President Putin’s view however is vigorously disputed!

Can we approach that dispute analytically rather than polemically?

There are various ways of formulating the issue. One possible approach lies in substituting a more rarefied and intellectualized question, using the term “soul.” Russia and Ukraine — two “souls” or one?

The language of “soul” is by no means arcane. A Google search of 8-12-2022 for “Soul of Russia” returned about 676,000 hits; a search for “Soul of Ukraine” returned about 366,000. And such “soul talk” is not merely casual jargon. Socrates (in Plato’s *Phaedo*) taught the immortality of the human soul. Plato (*Timaeus*) asserted the existence of a world-soul, and Aristotle (*On the Soul*-[*Peri Psychēs*; Latin: *De Anima*]) analyzed the elements of the human “psyche.”

Learned books and articles have been published under the title of *The Soul of Russia*, as by the Baptist chronicler Charles T. Byford; by the prolific author and translator Winifred Stephens; and by the religious Hélène Iswolsky.

And on the other side of the “soul-line” we find BBC Culture and “The Stories that Reveal the Soul of Ukraine.”

Indeed, there are people with power in America who freely converse in soul-talk. US President Joe Biden on September 1, 2022 proclaimed, not for the first time, that he was doing battle for “the Soul of the Nation.”

In Biden’s words: “I believe the soul is the breath, the life, and the essence of who we are. The soul is what makes us ‘us.’ The soul of America is defined by the sacred proposition that all are created equal in the image of God. That all are entitled to be treated with decency, dignity, and respect. That all deserve justice and a shot at lives of prosperity and consequence. And that democracy — democracy must be defended, for democracy makes all these things possible.”

But despite the pedigree of national-soul-talk, there will be not a few who will wonder what such talk actually means — if it means anything. Many Westerners tend to be skeptical of talk of souls, especially of collective shared souls. Reservations arise, in particular, from the philosophical positions of individualism, scientism, and materialism.

Individualism: individualists may be able to accept individual souls associated with human bodies. Much Western soul-talk simply assumes that souls belong to and only to individual human persons. The discussion then partitions over the possibility or the immortality of the soul and its association with the resurrection of the body, and the reality or unreality of disembodied souls (ghosts), of reincarnation, and of transmigration.

Lately we have been introduced to the issue of whether algorithms can have or be minds or persons; will the question of the ensoulment of computers not follow? But collective souls do not really enter into such discussion, and individualists tend to balk at the idea of collective souls.

Scientism: The scientific attitude seeks some procedure whereby to validate propositions about “Souls”: as, “Russia and Ukraine share a single Soul” or “Russia and Ukraine have different Souls.” Scientists wonder how to operationalize and measure a “soul,” seen as poorly defined, non-quantified and perhaps immeasurable. Can there be a protocol for the measurement of soul-ness or ensoulment, or for the dimensions and boundaries of souls, even individual souls?

Materialism: for materialist thinkers, soul-talk is meaningless. “Soul” and even “mind” are seen as but misnomers for the fluctuating (and measurable) electromagnetic patterns of brain activity. There being no National Brain, there is no National Soul.

A more sweeping and commonsensical dismissal of collective soul-talk might simply borrow the language of Ebenezer Scrooge: “National Souls? Bah, Humbug!”

To attempt to evade such skepticisms and preserve the substance but not the appearance of soul-talk, one might join the German Idealists of the Enlightenment and substitute for talk of Soul (German: *Seele*) the language of Spirit (German: *Geist*) and thereby join hands with Herder and Hegel, to converse about “*Volksgeist*” (National Spirit), or for that matter “*Zeitgeist*” (Spirit of the Age), and “*Weltgeist*” (World-Spirit). But this “spirit” evasion seems to invite the very same skeptical reservations as does “Soul.”

Less controversial substitutes for collective “soul” or “spirit” are “collective consciousness,” “collective identity,” or simply “culture.”

There are, however, three civilizationists who do not balk at using the term “soul” to denote some form of collective consciousness. They are Nicholas Berdyayev, Arnold J. Toynbee and Oswald Spengler. Berdyayev published a pamphlet called “The Soul of Russia” in 1915. Toynbee we shall speak of later. Spengler next. Spengler speaks of “Culture,” and also repeatedly and centrally cites “Soul.”

So, who might Oswald Spengler be?

Spengler is a most unpopular civilizationist, seen as an implacable pessimist — at least in the West. His two-volume magnum opus is titled *The Decline of the West* — or more accurately, “The Downfall of the West” (German original: *Der Untergang des Abendlandes*). “In a few centuries from now, there will no more be a Western Culture....” (Spengler, *Decline*, I.167). Groups seldom look with pleasure on prophecies of their own decline and fall.

On the other hand, Spengler has a certain appeal outside the West — for instance, in Russia, which Spengler saw as due for a thousand years or so of growth and florescence (e.g., II.196).

### **Spengler on Soul and Culture**

Spengler asserts that individual Cultures have Souls. Culture-Souls are rural in origin. Each Culture is born upon a “mother-landscape” (I.174), and that landscape forms its Soul. So, the Soul of Egypt springs from the Nile Valley and that river’s journey through the desert; the Soul of China arises from its intensively cultivated and fertile soils. The “Magian” Soul of the Arabian Culture grows in the sun-stricken desert east of Egypt and west of India; the Soul of Russia rises from the Steppes.

Each Culture has a “prime symbol”: its “kind of extension” (I.174) which “is and remains” the symbol of the life of its soul.

Thus, the Soul of Egypt, born of the landscape of the Nile Valley, has as its Prime Symbol the Way: the narrow and fixed path of the Pharaoh from throne to temple-tomb, and of the peasant from birth to divine judgment. “The Egyptian soul saw itself as moving down a narrow and inexorably prescribed life-path to come at the end before the judges of the dead (I: 188). The Egyptian “treads to the end a way that is prescribed for him with an inexorable necessity...” (I.190). Its behavioral expression is the “resolute march down the path once entered.” (I.174)

The Soul of China also has as its Prime Symbol the Way; but for China, this Way is a curving and winding path that allows endless free “hither-and-thither wandering” through a garden filled with “gate-buildings, side-buildings, courts and halls,” with “hills, water, trees, flowers and stones,” as well as “gates, walls, bridges and houses.” The garden Way nevertheless at last reaches its goal when it debouches into the entrance to the temple or to the ancestral tomb. (I.174, 189-191)

Each of the historical Prime Symbols “is capable of forming a complete world out of itself” (I.179-180). Each culture’s Prime Symbol is “inherent in the form of the state, the religious myths and cults, the ethical ideals, the forms of painting and music and poetry, the fundamental notions of each science...” (I.175).

Accordingly, each Culture-Soul has its own particular “mathematic” (I. Chapter 2), its own art (I.191-214 and chapters 7-8), its own psychology and morality (“soul-image and life-feeling” — (I. chapters. 9- 10), and its own science (“nature-knowledge”— I. Ch. 11).

Spengler gives special attention to three Cultures and their Souls: the “Arabian” Culture of the Middle East with its “Magian” Soul, the Classical Culture of Greece and Rome with its “Apollonian” Soul; and the Western Culture with its “Faustian” Soul (I. Ch. 6).

The Magian Soul, its achievements spanning the first millennium A.D., is Spengler’s own term for what unites those whom others would term the “peoples of the Book,” Persian, Jewish, Christian and Muslim and more than twenty other sects, schools, and subsects (See C.F. Atkinson’s “Tables illustrating the comparative morphology of history,” at the end of Spengler’s first volume, especially the last section, “Winter,” in Table I, “Contemporary Spiritual Epochs.”) (See, there also the column under the heading Arabian.”)

And what do these diverse and conflicting beliefs and sects and cults and truths have in common? For Spengler, it is the dualism of Good and Evil, ourselves as Good, the Other as powerful and Evil. Against the power of evil, the community of the good seeks the form-refuge of the Cavern. The Magian Soul has as its prime symbol that Cavern, the covered space, dark within even when burning hot without; its architectural expression is the covered space of temple, church, or mosque (II. Chs. 7-9).

The Classical Culture of ancient Greece and Rome possessed an “Apollonian” Soul whose extension is the point-present here-and-now and whose Prime Symbol is “the near, strictly limited, self-contained Body,” the sensuously present individual body, as of the Apollo Belvedere (I:324) and Praxiteles’ Aphrodite of Cnidos (I:268).

### Western and Russian Souls

To Spengler, Western Culture possessed, or was possessed by, a “Faustian” Soul whose extension was infinite time and space, its proper landscape everything everywhere. We may counterpoise to Classical Apollo and Aphrodite the West’s mathematical symbol for “infinity”:



And the Western Soul’s human embodiment is Faust — Dr. Faustus, Johan Georg Faust (1480-1540), a once real but thereafter a legendary person, whose equally legendary desire for infinite wealth, infinite power, and infinite pleasure, was fulfilled and paid for merely by his soul.

Faust (the Legend) can be found in Christopher Marlowe’s 1592-1593 play *Doctor Faustus*, in Goethe’s 1772-1832 *Faust*, and in F.W. Murnau’s 1926 film *Faust*. Or one may seek “Faust” on Wikipedia and prepare to spend the day contemplating infinity!

A perhaps less extreme version of the Western/Faustian quest for the Infinite can be found in the 1945 Report to President Roosevelt by Vannevar Bush, *Science: The Endless Frontier*. The Report's promise of infinite learning led to the creation of America's National Science Foundation and much expense and many striking achievements in the three-quarters of a century that followed.

Contrary to the Faustian expectation of an infinite future or an endless frontier, for Spengler, it is Russia, and not the West, which has a long future ahead of it. In its inescapable aging process, the West is nearing the end of its achieving life, and has about two centuries of coherent existence left, in which its mark will be left mainly by imperialism, wars of annihilation, plutocratic "democracy," Caesarist force-politics, and imperial display. (See Atkinson Table I, section "Winter," and Tables II and III, section "Civilization.")

So we come to Russia, which for Spengler remains in a "pre-cultural period," in that it has not yet found its real role. (The phenomenology of "pre-cultural periods" is discussed at the beginning of Atkinson's Tables II and III.) Russia's source landscape Spengler designates as the steppe, imaginatively conceived as infinite. But infinite only in two dimensions — the Endless PLAIN, whose abstract and mathematized version is the Endless PLANE. And Russia's human embodiment is the band of brothers, ever working together, ever striving together, in endless brotherly service, one for all and all for each. "That 'All are responsible for all' ... is the metaphysical fundament of all Dostoyevski's creation. Mystical Russian love is the love of brothers under equal pressure all along the earth, ever along and along" (II:295n2).

I have taken the liberty of selecting an artistic embodiment of the Spenglerian Russian human ideal: the Volga barge-haulers, *burlaki*, endlessly hauling their barge upstream. Their painterly representation is Ilya Repin's *Burlaki* (whose less accurate but more common translation is "The Volga Boatmen"). Their songsterly representation is the work-song collected as "Burlatskaya" and published by Mily Balakirev in his 1839-1840 *Collection of Russian Folksongs*. This chant has many times been sung since then (though usually as arted up with extra verses) by many, notably by Fyodor Chaliapin.

### **The Soul of Russia and the Soul of Ukraine**

However, having traveled thus far with Spengler, I must now fall into a more critical view, which leads into a discussion of the Soul of Russia vis-à-vis the Soul of Ukraine. While the Steppe and the endless plain/plane may serve as suitable symbols for Kievan Rus' (989 - 1237) before the Mongol conquest thereof (1237 - 1242), the successor states, the Muscovite Tsardom and Russian Empire (from the 14<sup>th</sup> century), are not "of the steppe" but rather "of the forest and the forest rivers." Moscow was founded as a forest fort-city. If there is a single symbol of Muscovy, it should be the Kremlin or the Volga River rather than the Ukrainian steppe.

Indeed, are not the *burlaki* hauling their barges full of the bountiful produce of the steppe's "black earth" upriver toward the extractive power of the Tsardom of Moscow? The Steppe is never a "Mother," but the Volga is to Russia "Mother Volga" as in Chaliapin's version: "Down Mother Volga." The Steppe has meaning to Kievan Rus' and today's Kyivan Ukraine, the forest, rivers and forts to Muscovy and today's Russia.

### **Toynbee and "Schism in the Soul"**

This thought leads more or less naturally to a key idea of Arnold Toynbee's — that of the "schism in the soul" (and a corresponding "schism in the body social"). In brief, Toynbee (XII: 300-307) sees the voluntary unity of giant social bodies like "civilizations" (and of lesser social entities as well) as maintained by the endless activity of social elites in solving social problems (often problems created by their solutions to prior problems). As long as these creative elites are able to maintain their creative spirit in the public interest, their solutions carry along the rest of their societies by attractive fascination. We willingly pay to charitable entities and performing artists because we admire their accomplishments and hope to see more. We even impose, or at least accept, taxes upon ourselves, if these are seen as serving the public good.

But, for Toynbee, every creative elite eventually loses its creativity, usually having been so intoxicated by its past successes that it fails to adapt to new challenges. But such elites do not lose their desire to enjoy the fruits of the creative admiration they can no longer earn. Failed creative minorities may turn into "dominant minorities" who use force to retain their no longer earned privileges.

Creators receive donations; dominators extract taxes. And at some point, the dominant minorities may so alienate and inspire their spiritually dispossessed internal and external "proletariats" as to provoke a schism in the soul, and perhaps the formation of a new civilization. (Toynbee does not use "proletariat" in its class-restricted Marxist sense. Toynbeean "proletariats" are those who are penalized economically, politically, or socially; they include displaced persons, subject peoples, insurgents, mercenaries, "barbarians." Today one might mention the incarcerated, the victims of modern slavery, and those persons or states under threats by deterrence or compellence.)

One may reasonably ask whether the Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2022 will eventually be seen by Toynbeean as a source of "schism in the soul" that will contribute to a new and distinct Ukrainian civilization.

Without being so definite, I think we can at least say that, in addition to the shared human embodiment of Spengler's Russian Prime Symbol we can find also two contrasting Prime Symbols for Russia and for Ukraine: the Autocrat and the Cossack.



### Mazepa, Makhno, Shevchenko

Three historic figures may be cited as in different ways exemplary of a “schism in the soul” evoking a Ukrainian variant of Rus’ consciousness: Ivan Mazepa/Mazeppa; Nestor Makhno; and Taras Shevchenko.

Mazepa (1639-1709) was Hetman (military commander) of the Zaporizhian Cossack Host (army) in 1687–1708. Mazepa chose to resist the demands of Peter I the Great of Russia for obedient service, joining instead the invading armies of Charles XII of Sweden in the Great Northern war (1700-1721), and sharing their defeat at Poltava (1709).

Mazepa has since served as a subject of dueling histories and of dueling poetries. For the dueling histories, one may consult the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia* and the *Encyclopedia of Ukraine*. For dueling poetries, one may consult Pushkin’s *Poltava* and Byron’s *Mazeppa*. Pushkin may be seen as the patron of Russia patriotic poetry; Byron is certainly the patron saint of universal national liberation, well remembered in Greece, Albania — and Ukraine.

So, Mazepa: traitor to Russia or loyal to Ukraine? Best judge for yourself! However, Mazepa/Mazeppa surely contributes to a Russo-Ukrainian “schism of the soul.”

Next, Makhno. Nestor Makhno (1888-1934) may best be known as the briefly successful commander-in-chief of an Anarchist movement and a “Revolutionary Insurgent Army” in Ukraine. Makhno’s army rejected all would-be overlords and autocrats, be they Austria, the short-lived Ukrainian Republic, the White Russian Army, or the eventually victorious Bolshevik Red Army. The memory of such resistance endures, to promote a “schism in the body social.” Though no Cossack, Makhno’s anarchic character and anarchist doctrine are diametrically opposed to the Autocrat’s demand for “obedient service”!

Last of the three is Taras Shevchenko (1814-1861). For his view, let us simply inspect his own poetic epitaph:

“The Testament of Taras Shevchenko”

When I am dead, bury me  
 In my beloved Ukraine,  
 My tomb upon a grave mound high  
 Amid the spreading plain,

So that the fields, the boundless steppes,  
 The Dnieper's plunging shore

My eyes could see, my ears could hear  
The mighty river roar.

When from Ukraine the Dnieper bears  
Into the deep blue sea  
The blood of foes ...  
then will I leave  
These hills and fertile fields—

I'll leave them all and fly away  
To the abode of God,  
And then I'll pray....  
But until that day  
I know nothing of God.

Oh, bury me, then rise ye up  
And break your heavy chains!!!  
And water with the tyrants' blood  
The freedom you have gained.

And in the great new family,  
The family of the free,  
With softly spoken, kindly word  
Also remember me.

(Translated by John Weir)

### **Hohol/Gogol**

So those three — Mazepa, Makhno, Shevchenko — may be seen as having taken the separatist or schismatic road and rejected the autocrat. But for a clearer case of Toynbee's "schism in the soul," perhaps we should choose the internationally known Ukrainian writer, Mykola Hohol.

Mykola Hohol? Perhaps you may know him better as the Russian writer Nikolai Gogol?

The schism in the soul, or perhaps in his case the doubleness and versatility of soul-survival, is best to be seen in his book *Taras Bulba*. This is a tale of one of the Cossack struggles against foreign domination, in this instance the domination of Poland. The story appeared in two editions, one of 1835 and one of 1842. The 1835 edition, which we may choose to style the "Hohol edition," is a paean to the unruly Cossack spirit of independence. The 1842 edition, which we may then style the "Gogol edition," is a paean to the glory and goodness of Russia.

One must note, and it may have future resonance, that Taras Bulba is a xenophobic, jingoistic, anti-Semitic, domineering patriarch whose patriarchal soul compels him to murder, and justifies him murdering his own son for insufficient anti-Polonism. He would show poorly in any other light than that of unrelenting rebellion against domineering Autocracy.

### Russian vs. Ukrainian Soul-Imagery

I think we have by now seen enough of the Russo-Ukrainian “schism of the soul” to conclude that, in addition to their shared human ideal (Brotherly Service), Russia and Ukraine also have contrasting human ideals: for Russia, the near-divine Autocrat and his most humble and obedient Subjects; for Ukraine, the individual Cossack, armed and ready; and in Brotherly Service, the Cossack Horde, practitioners and enforcers of armed collective liberty; a band of brothers in struggle, but now united in struggle against a demanding but undeserving, Toynbeean would-be dominant minority and its executive Autocrat.

For Autocrat imagery we may cite the Moscow Tsar Ivan IV, as represented in Sergey Eisenstein’s film *Ivan the Terrible Part 1*, especially the scenes which portray the tsar chastening his rebellious but fearful boyars and judging his displeasing but repentant populace.

For Cossack imagery, there have been figurines since the 17<sup>th</sup> century displaying Cossacks, uniformed, armed, and ready for action; but there is some more dynamic imagery available.

For instance: the mournful Russian music of “Burlatskaya” can be counterposed to the joyful Cossack war-dance, the “Hopak.”

Or we could approach *Taras Bulba* Hollywood-wise, since in 1962 it was made into a 122-minute film of that name, starring Tony Curtis and Yul Brynner as Polish vs. Cossack frenemies. The film is noted for hyperbole, and almost requires beer, popcorn, pizza and conversation for proper enjoyment.

Those without the time for the full filmic treatment may at least enjoy a taste of the film in its three-and-a-half-minute official trailer. Or for more specialized dynamism, take a look at how an anarchic population remakes itself as an anarchist cavalry: the 3:22 *Taras Bulba* trailer “The Ride to Dubno.”

So, in conclusion — or, better, in *inconclusion* — The Soul of Russia and the Soul of Ukraine — One? Two? Both one and two? One become two? Or — “National souls? Bah! Humbug!”

Judge for yourself!

## References in Subject Order

### President Putin's Case for Russo-Ukrainian Unity:

Russian President Vladimir Putin's "Direct Line" on Ukraine:

<http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/65973> and  
[en.kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/66181](http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/66181)).

Vladimir Putin's July 12, 2021 article "On the Historical Unity of Russians and Ukrainians: <https://www.prlib.ru/en/article-vladimir-putin-historical-unity-russians-and-ukrainians>

(<http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/transcripts/66181>

Vladimir Putin's Presidential Address of February 21, 2022

<http://en.kremlin.ru/events/president/news/67828>

### Soul-Talk: Russia, Ukraine, America:

Charles T. Byford, *The Soul of Russia*. London: Kingsgate, 1914.

Winifred Stephens, ed., *The Soul of Russia*. Macmillan, 1916.

Hélène Iswolsky, *The Soul of Russia*. NY: Sheed and Ward, 1943.

BBC Culture, "The Stories that Reveal the Soul of Ukraine"

<https://www.bbc.com/culture/article/20220322-the-stories-that-reveal-the-soul-of-ukraine>

President Biden on the battle for the soul of the nation.

<https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/speeches-remarks/2022/09/01/remarks-by-president-bidenon-the-continued-battle-for-the-soul-of-the-nation/>

### Berdyayev:

Nicholas Berdyayev, *Dusha Rossii*. Moscow: I. D. Sytin, 1915.

Translated by Fr. S. Janos and published by Berdyayev Online Bibliotek Library as  
 N.A. Berdyayev (Berdiaev), *The Psychology of the Russian People: The Soul of Russia*. Moscow, I. D. Sytin, 1915

[http://www.berdyayev.com/berdiaev/berd\\_lib/1915\\_007.html](http://www.berdyayev.com/berdiaev/berd_lib/1915_007.html)

Nicolas Berdyayev, *The Russian Idea*. Boston: Beacon, 1962.

### Spengler:

Oswald Spengler, *The Decline of the West*. Authorized translation by Charles Francis Atkinson. 2 vols. Volume 1, *Form and Actuality*. Volume II *Perspectives of World-History*. London: George Allen and Unwin. 1926-1928.

Three "Tables Illustrating the Comparative Morphology of History" are to be found at the end of the original edition of Charles Francis Atkinson's translation of Volume I

of *Decline*: Table I, “Contemporary” Spiritual Epochs (of Indian, Classical, Arabian, and Western Cultures); Table II, “Contemporary” Culture Epochs (of Egyptian, Classical, Arabian, and Western Cultures) ; Table III, “Contemporary” Political Epochs (of Egyptian, Classical, Chinese, and Western Cultures).

The Tables are not to be found in the German original (*Der Untergang des Abendlandes: Umriss einer Morphologie der Weltgeschichte*, Munich: C.H. Beck, 1920) and so seem creditable to Atkinson. I have found them accurate in their summations, and so feel fairly at ease in relying upon them; others may well prefer Spengler’s own text, or its translation.

Spengler’s views on “the soul of Russia” have been examined by K.R. Bolton ([http://www.ijors.net/issue5\\_2\\_2016/pdf/\\_\\_\\_www.ijors.net\\_issue5\\_2\\_2016\\_article\\_8\\_bolton.pdf](http://www.ijors.net/issue5_2_2016/pdf/___www.ijors.net_issue5_2_2016_article_8_bolton.pdf))

#### America’s Faustian Consciousness:

Vannevar Bush, *Science: The Endless Frontier. A Report to the President*. United States Government Printing Office, Washington: 1945.

#### The Volga:

Mily Balakirev, “Burlatskaya,” no. 40 in *Sbornik Ruskikh Narodnykh Piesen* (*Collection of Russian Folksongs.*) St. Petersburg: A. Iogansen (sc. Johansen), [1839-1840?].

Fyodor Chaliapin, “The Song of the Volga Boatmen.”  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I3Ys37dFXuY>

Fyodor Chaliapin, “Down Mother Volga.”  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nuavWfHpTv8>

#### Toynbee:

Toynbee’s discussion of civilizational breakdown, disintegration and possible rebirth or partition appears at several locations in his long, variously abridged, and twice updated magnum opus, *A Study of History*. In approximate order of publication, the following are the versions of the *Study*:

Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History*. 10 vols. Oxford University Press: 1934-1954.

Arnold J. Toynbee, *A Study of History*. Abridgement by D.C. Somervell. 2 vols. Oxford University Press: 1947, 1957.

Arnold J. Toynbee, *Reconsiderations: Volume 12 of A Study of History*. Oxford University Press: 1961.

Arnold J. Toynbee and Jane Caplan, *A Study of History: Abridged One-Volume Edition*. New York: Weathervane Books, 1972.

It is recommended that the dedicated reader examine first the "Argument" found at the end of the Somervell volumes; then the Somervell abridgement; then the 10-volume original; then *Reconsiderations*; and finally, the Caplan abridgement.

Accordingly, the following reading order is recommended for consideration of breakdown, disintegration and possible retrieval:

1. Argument: Somervell vol. 1, pp. 578-587.
2. Somervell abridgement: vol. 1, pp.558.
3. 10-volume original: volumes IV-VI.
4. *Reconsiderations: passim*.
5. Caplan abridgement: pp. 141-254.

#### Mazeppa/Mazepa:

“Nurturing nationalistic ideas about the independence of the Ukraine and separation from Russia, Mazepa conducted secret negotiations with the Polish king Stanisław Leszczyński and then with the Swedish king Charles XII.” *The Great Soviet Encyclopedia*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. 1970-1979. s.v. Mazepa, Ivan Stepanovich, as translated at <https://encyclopedia2.thefreedictionary.com/mazepa>

“Although there have been controversial assessments of Mazepa, he has remained a symbol of Ukrainian independence.” *Internet Encyclopedia of Ukraine*; s.v. Mazepa

<http://www.encyclopediaofukraine.com/display.asp?linkpath=pages%5CM%5CA%5CMazepaIvan.htm>

#### Muscovite Imagery: Autocrat and Subjects:

In the IMDb Photo Gallery of Eisenstein’s 1944 film *Ivan the Terrible, Part I*, [https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0037824/mediaviewer/rm1298115073?ref\\_=ttmi\\_mi\\_all\\_sf\\_50](https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0037824/mediaviewer/rm1298115073?ref_=ttmi_mi_all_sf_50)

we can see the Great and the Small as the Autocrat contemplates his displeasing but now repentant subjects.

#### Ukrainian imagery: Cossacks:

A productive online search string will seek “17<sup>th</sup> century Cossack figurines,” and should bring up many armed and uniformed images, as such figurines are collectibles and much marketed.

#### Ukrainian dance imagery: the Hopak:

Virsky Ukrainian National Folk Dance Ensemble:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A0gdrzOi1A> (12:22)

Voloshky Ukrainian Dance Ensemble):

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SlwgnTWJPUY> (6:28)

American version (Brigham Young University International Folk Dance Ensemble) thoroughly prepared for video:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TM5QYZ3OfQw> (5:02)

Taras Bulba:

*Nikolai Gogol, Taras Bulba and Other Tales* (1835 edition).

<https://gutenberg.org/files/1197/1197-h/1197-h.htm>

Saera Yoon, "Transformation of a Ukrainian Cossack into a Russian Warrior: Gogol's 1842 'Taras Bulba.'" *The Slavic and East European Journal*, Vol. 49, No. 3 ( Fall, 2005), pp. 430-444

"Taras Bulba 1962 film ((plucked from TV including commercials!)

<https://tubitv.com/movies/302259/taras-bulba> (2:04:03)

Taras Bulba 1962 film original trailer:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CGIJM4aO0hw>

Taras Bulba 1962 film trailer "The Army Gathering: The Ride to Dubno"

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n8G6S6fQQ4I>