



*Dear Readers, Dear Colleagues!*

This issue of our journal, like previous issues, is thematic, and is devoted to the topic of “Ideology and the Humanities.” In our opinion, this is a very relevant issue of deep and varied meaning for a country and culture that only a quarter century ago escaped from the clutches of totalitarianism, and now finds itself in a state of war, defending itself from an attack by the Russian Federation. We hope that for the rest of the thinking world this topic, so acutely important for us, is also significant!

Russia has seized our Crimea; for the third consecutive year countless units of Russian heavy military equipment, ammunition, and military personnel have been crossing the Eastern Ukrainian border, making up the core strength of the so-called “militants.” In August 2014 the first Russian “Hrad” and “Urahan” rocket systems began targeting Ukrainian lands from the bordering Rostov region. After Illovaisk Russian troops safely nested themselves in the Donetsk and Luhansk regions of Ukraine. These are undeniable facts verified by wide-ranging evidence, including surveillance by international satellite systems. No “rebels” are capable of waging war against Ukraine with heavy artillery for a third consecutive year without intensive arms and manpower support from Russia, which continues to lie to the world by bluntly saying that “it has nothing to do with this.” Hybrid war.

An important component of this “hybrid war,” which for Ukraine represents thousands of human casualties, millions of refugees, unimaginable destruction of cities and towns, factories and businesses (the most modern of which are simply dismantled and shamelessly and criminally exported to Russia), is an informational, psychological, and philosophical war being waged with everything Ukrainian, along national and ethno-cultural lines and concerning the independence and statehood of Ukraine.

Today, everything, absolutely everything symbolic of Ukrainian national-cultural and state independence (ranging from language to state symbols, from true history to the true nature and mechanisms of social movements in Ukraine) is branded by official Russian thought in the humanities and by the Russian media as “nationalism,” “Banderitism,” and “fascism” (an especially favoured label, the logic of which Kremlin ideologists correlate with the cultivation of the now essentially morbid concept of “our grandfathers having fought...”). Such “brainwashing” has been taking place 24 hours a day, 365 days a year, for over a decade now. Moreover, this overt lie is continually spread in the world, undermining Ukraine’s moral and political positions, already weakened by internal strife and, although it’s shameful to admit, the moral degeneration of Ukraine’s ruling elites.

In such circumstances, the issue of whether the word in the humanities — communicative, artistic, historical, informational, research, nonfictional, polemical, etc. should uphold an ideological “purity” to maintain its own effectiveness is exacerbated. Or, on the contrary, should it inevitably remove some of the gradations of the ideological and philosophical landscape in which it emerges? This issue is extremely complex and leads us into almost impenetrable depths of modern thought in the humanities at the intersection of many branches of knowledge.

We could begin with the real uncertainty and huge blurring that surrounds the concept of “ideology.” One of its edges grows naturally into a particular dimension of a certain cultural-educational imperative, ranging from education, instruction, and didacticism to coarse propaganda with its manipulative brain-washing techniques (gradation of the first type). Its other edge naturally grows into a dimension of ideology, worldview, philosophical and ethical intentionality, moral judgment of the observer and narrator/recipient, right up to its broadest moral and axiological orientations (gradation of the second type). And although the maxims of gradation of the first type are more or less clear (course propaganda is undoubtedly deadly for each of the above types of “words”), the gradation of the second type leads us to the further complication of the question itself.

For example, should a work of art (an author’s historical image/vision, aesthetic analysis, presentation of fact, communicative message, etc., and, moreover, a work of art) be entirely free (“purged”) of a certain philosophical or ideological configuration? Should a literary work of art be absolved of inherent to it claims (or intentions) an expression of fact/truth? Is this at all possible in the realm of language, moreover in artistic expression, and in view of the intentionality of human speech itself, as postulated by Edmund Husserl?

Also worth taking into account is the exceptional multidimensional aspect of the concepts of “truth” and “factuality”/truth in literature, as argued by Roman Ingarden in his book *The Literary Work of Art* (pp. 378–83, Warsaw edition, 1960), with a return to the subject immediately after the end of World War II in two papers presented at an aesthetics seminar at the University of Krakow (“On Different Understandings of Truthfulness in a Work of Art” (“O różnych rozumieniach prawdziwości w dziele sztuki”), and “On So-Called Truth in Literature” (“O tak zwanej prawdzie w literaturze”). The scholar farsightedly identifies a complex multifaceted plurality that we usually strive to grasp with a single key of “artistic truth” or “truth” of the work, when a conceivable and desirable “consequence” (or “sequentiality” for Ingarden) applies to each of the four main layers of an artistic work and can take on the nature of a linguistic, stylistic, subject-historical, ethno-cultural, emotional-psychological, moral-ethical, ideologically-philosophical, etc. “factuality”/truthfulness.

At the height of the radical neoliberal convulsions at the beginning of the 21st century literary criticism postulated (and widely implemented in its own practice) the principle of “non-evaluative judgment,” thus by “default” implying these principles for the creative act itself. Is this right? Should artists renounce expressing their own ideological and worldview positions, their understanding of the given and proper, good and evil, beauty and ugliness, value and lack of value, the shameful and the noble, in achieving artistic success? Perhaps the “materialist-spiritualist” can think in this manner: this is how the philosopher Merab Mamardashvili describes those who seek any means to provide material expression to things immaterial (see his *Psychological Topology of the Path (Lectures on Proust)*). We can agree that “ready-made” nature has not provided for us the “noble,” or the “nice” or “good,” that they could at anytime be transferred in an altered state from their natural environment into the human sphere. Even the source of life — water — can kill, if utilised in a certain way.

In other words, are we not depriving the human world of invisible, intangible, immaterial, and yet so-needed purely human essential things and essences when we insist that they should not be revealed in human linguistic-intellectual constructs — in humanities research, programs,

concepts, observations, visions, and works of art? How do they in this case emerge in the human sphere when they cannot be and never will be found in nature? Or, God love them, can we do without them?!

To the surprise of many, Ukrainian singer Jamala triumphed at this year's Eurovision Song Contest, performing her tragic and patriotic song "1944." Is this a win for "political speculation" in the holy realm of pure art as, choking in hatred, endlessly repeat followers of "The Russian World"? Or is it a win for pure human empathy evoked by a beautifully sung quality song deep in moral and philosophical content? A triumph of empathy, finally agreed to by a European majority, thereby confirming its rootedness in the fundamental values of arts culture from antiquity to the present?

In today's criticism we can come across the reasonable thought that in one of its obvious aspects Tolstoy's *War and Peace* is an outright apology for the Russian nobility. Truthfully, that's how it is. But does this blemish this exemplary for the genre epic novel? Because of this apology will Tolstoy's novel no longer be a canonic European epic novel? Of course not. Conversely, many modern examples cause one to say that an author's desire to avoid a more or less expressive (obvious, certain, accessible) ideological worldview or moral-ethical position leads to the emasculation of art forms and depreciation of the arts text itself.

Thinking of this, we cannot rid ourselves of a metaphorical feeling that for an arts text well-graded "ideologization" is a kind of source for its "vital mass," that long sought and finally found in the microworld "Higgs boson," which in itself is almost imperceptible, but imbues all other particulates in our universe with real weight. In the language of physics, with "mass."

We are aware of the infinite complexity of the topic and do not deceive ourselves with the illusion that we are supposedly capable of fully describing or exhausting it through our selection of articles. But we are confident that we can at least re-emphasize the importance of understanding these issues here and now. In the end, everything that relates to the dimension of "subtle bodies," to the intangible, but applicable to humanity constructive nature, is always concretized personally and contextually *hoc et nunc* in each historical moment. It is now our turn. It is important to be on the path, although the path itself is indeterminable.

The current topic is important for us institutionally. The Departments of Literature and Philosophy at the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy (NaUKMA) are now conducting research work in the framework of "Ideology and Literature." NaUKMA Professor and member of the research team Mykhailo Minakov has been pursuing a similar project online for some time now. Another team member, Professor Taras Lyuty, will soon publish a monograph entitled *Ideolohiia: matrytsia iluizii, dyskursiv i vlady* (Ideology: Matrix of Illusions Discourses, and Governance).

In other words, intellectuals in the NaUKMA community have for a long time now concerned themselves with this fundamental topic. In the third issue of our journal we offer Oksana Klymenko's original musings on ideology and memory; a study of the ideological aspects of an iconic 20th century American film by noted American cultural studies experts Daniel Belgrad and Ying Zhu; Natalia Shlikhta's examination of the interaction between social consciousness and the Orthodox Church in Ukraine; Cyril Hovorun's observations on the relationship of ideology and religion; Roman Horbyk's reflections on ideologies of the self; Oleksandr Pronkevych's

research devoted to the image of Don Quixote in the context of ideological mythmaking in our time; Olga Bertelsen's deconstructivist analysis of the contemporary Russian national historical narrative, and other investigations.

We hope that these and other materials will attract the attention of specialists in the humanities to the methodologically important problem of ideology in the humanities, and the studies presented here will be useful to researchers in relevant fields and disciplines. Finally, I would like to offer my special gratitude to all our authors who responded to our invitation to participate in re-thinking this topic, and express the hope that our readers will offer their input, which we will gladly post in our e-journal!

*With true respect and genuine wishes for peace and well-being,  
Professor Volodymyr Morenets  
Editor-in-Chief*