

When I was asked to look into the situation in the Ukraine which resulted from the protests intended to force their president Viktor Yanukovich to take steps to join the European Union I had already been watching from the sidelines. Having Russian and Ukrainian friends made me concerned about the developing situation. But first lets take a step back to gain a proper perspective.

## The historical perspective

Modern Ukraine emerged from the Tsardom of Russia and the Habsburg Austro-Hungarian empire after World War I and the Russian communist revolution. Russian dominance over the Ukraine was not accepted and led to a 15 year long insurrection by Ukrainian nationalists. Never the less the Ukraine became one of the founding members of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In 1924 large sections of eastern and northern Ukraine were ceded to Russia, in the period from 1939 to 1948 huge parts of Poland and Romania were added to western Ukraine and in 1954 the Crimea was ceded to the Ukraine by Russia. All in all the borders of the Ukraine have been shifting considerably over the past century, with a strong Russian influence in the east, but strong western influences in the west. The Ukraine also has a history of Stalin era atrocities, which cost millions of lives, associated with Russian dominance. As a result of it's history the Ukraine contains a diversity



of cultures and significant cultural minorities in their border regions. Each has it's own distinct identity and goals, besides the Polish, Romanian and Russian cultures there are also smaller minority groups such as the Cossacks and Tartars who desire independance and return of their government seized property.

When the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics ceased to exist the ruling elite following the capitalist ideals decided to distributed all wealth among themselves rather than being old fashioned communist and give control over it back to the people as is done in Chinese privatization. The US sponsored Russian mafia effectively took control over all trade and business. When finally Russian president Putin broke the power of the Russian mafia much of the former USSR was in a state similar to that before the communist revolution where most of the population had been reduced to abject poverty, had to work without wages while a small elite bathed in luxury. Capitalism and even to a degree feudalism had returned. To quote a friend of mine, "In Soviet times we all had enough money, but the stores were nearly empty. Now the stores are overflowing with wonderful goods, but our wallets are empty."



## The situation in 2013



The current crisis did not start out as an ethnic one. It was the result of people seeking protection from their corrupt kleptocratic government. In the Ukraine, like in most countries facing instability, the people elected a 'Strong Man'. The instinctive motivation to surrender their own freedom to a strong leader who will protect them in a time of crisis is common to people all over the world and usually creates a shift towards right wing nationalism. Sometimes this 'Strong Man' is indeed like a father to his people, but in this case his love and loyalty was mostly to his family and friends at the expense of his citizens, especially the more wealthy ones. Instead of opting to maintain the oligarchy he sought to transform it into a monarchy with himself as supreme dictator. Naturally the remaining oligarchs and some concerned citizens sought protection, which they hoped to find in rule by the laws of the European Union. The European Union of course welcomed this opportunity to spread its influence eastward having been rebuffed earlier in its attempts to incorporate Georgia. The Russian government however was less than enthusiastic about this eastward expansion of the EU into what it considered its sphere of influence. The Ukrainian president Viktor Yanukovich found himself caught between his Russian supporters who wanted to keep the EU out and his rebelling population who pushed for allowing an EU rule of law.

So how did the ethnic problems start? Well due to the cultural differences and the significant number of votes these minorities represent various presidential candidates positioned themselves as champions of various ethnic groups. A sure recipe for civil unrest, but to many presidential candidates the lure of power is great enough to make them follow this strategy. Unfortunately voters also tend to think of the short term profits they will reap by having a person in power who favours their group rather than the country as a whole. Any conflict has a tendency to widen the rift between the two sides and sees a disappearance of middle ground in favour of extremism. Anything which is identified as being part of the other side becomes unacceptable and so what was one becomes split and any separate group in conflict naturally tends towards extremism so as to define itself and make itself more coherent with the passing of time.

This scenario has been repeated many times over in former colonies all over the globe and the end result has always been civil war, subjugation of the minority culture or at the very least decline in prosperity due to lack of cooperation. The imperialist decisions to divide cultural groups between different countries to keep them from uniting was an effective one in breaking the power of the local population, but has left a legacy of independence movements and rebellions. Stalin used the same strategy in his deportations with similar after effects of displaced people hoping to regain a home land for their people and culture. Unfortunately the Western-European powers favour keeping the colonial system of division into nations composed of various different cultures intact ensuring a future filled with civil strife and bloodshed to maintain their dominance over the unfortunate internally divided nations. The only bloodless option in such a situation is granting local authority and ensuring democratic and legal process to keep the minority groups satisfied and effectively moving the administration closer to a confederacy rather than centralized power. Alas relinquishing power is not a skill many politicians possess. The more bloody outcomes are genocide and independent nations splitting away usually after a civil war. These bloody options do provide a lasting peace, while suppression of the minority culture is a temporary solution at best.

So we can conclude that by the very nature of Ukrainian politics, centralized control, rampant abuse of power, popular voting behaviour and the existing cultural divisions the country was already headed for disaster. Personally I hoped that elections would be held before calamity would strike,

but it was not to be.

The president had set himself up as the champion of the ethnic Russians in the Ukraine. A group which with their champion ousted found itself without protection from the government. This vulnerability coupled with a revanchist movement which sought to avenge the injustices visited upon them by the ousted president paved the way for ethnic violence. The revanchist and neo-fascist movements identified the Russians as a whole, those from the Donbas region in particular, rather than merely their president as the culprits and started a persecution of the ethnic Russians.

### **The ethnic troubles**

The persecution of ethnic Russians was quite violent with scores of them burned alive and being attacked and killed in the streets in broad daylight, but since the emerging interim government was pro-EU and a future ally the West-European press and propaganda machine decided not to report these crimes and criticisms of the interim government which decided to keep their police force contained to their barracks in the middle of this violence. Although it has been stated that this extremist anti-russian faction is only a bit over 5% of the Ukrainian population and therefore not indicative of either the Ukrainian people, nor their government these minority groups were given an inordinate amount of power and control over the situation. Hardly a democratic state of affairs, nor rule by law. It is understandable that a newly fledged interim government does not wish to alienate its staunchest defenders, but to do so is to place its own interests over that of the country and its population. They chose power over principles, which is why allegedly they needed to replace the previous administration. To me at this point it seemed that as is usual after a revolution the structure would remain the same, but only the people profiting from it would be different.

Meanwhile I and others who were a bit more aware of what was going on predicted the disintegration of the Ukraine with the eastern Ukraine and the Crimea joining Russia and possibly even western Ukraine rejoining Poland and Romania. I had a hope people would rejoin countries in which their culture would be mainstream and so be safe from persecution. Before this dissolution could complete itself however a new president was elected who desired to keep the Ukraine's borders intact.

### **Who is behind it all?**

As to who was behind the ethnic violence I am still unclear. It could have been Russian agent-provocateurs who were creating conditions so a Russian military intervention would be accepted, but it is equally likely to have been people in the employ of Western Europe or the US who wished to tear the Ukraine apart. Smaller states are less of a danger and more easily controlled. Also the western border regions might be reannexed back into Poland and Romania to protect the people living in those regions from the chaos and reign of terror. It is also possible that the violence was mostly home grown Ukrainian nationalists who sought to drive out 'foreign' influence through a reign of terror. To me the last option seems the most likely since none of the greater powers managed to seize the opportunities the situation offered them.

Which ever side or sides were behind it, the result would be a Russian military intervention or a fragmentation of the country along ethnic borders. As to the Ukrainian claims that the reports of ethnic violence were no more than Russian propaganda I can report that alas many innocent civilians were senselessly and unexpectedly killed. I have channeled several of the deceased reported in the Russian media and the accounts of senseless unprovoked violence against them are true in their experience. As to the Russian media claims that the anti-government protests were

nothing more than a coup attempt staged by Western European powers and the USA this is very likely. The very same technique has been used by the US to attempt a coup in Iran by funding anti-government media and enticing student revolt and certainly funding of anti-government media by the USA and Western European countries has taken place in the Ukraine. Unlike in Iran the protestors benefited from (former) oligarchs supporting their movement and existing ethnic tensions which might explain their success in the Ukraine as opposed to their failure in Iran. I had a look at some of the influential people involved in the uprising. Most of them seem honest people upset by the state of their country, but Oleksandr Turchynov who became the interim president and is now Secretary of the National Security and Defence Council of Ukraine is a man who is heavily influenced by foreign powers rather than a true nationalist. It may be that he is the 'grey eminence' behind the recent troubles. I sense both direct and indirect links to foreign intelligence agencies and governments. Logical for a man in his position you might say and although the power of these links has increased recently they have already been in existence for a good many years.



I also scanned the aura's of several key players in the founding of the independence movements in the Donbas region and found them to have more ties to Moscow than to the region itself which does give credence to the Ukrainian claim that the independence movements are tools of the Russian government for annexing the region. I recently learned that Alexander Borodai who was instrumental in the founding of the Donetsk Republic has stepped down so a Donbas native can take a control. So even though the independence movements may have been started or catalyzed by Russia, they are under local control at the moment. Whether the influence of Moscow is merely in response to the ethnic violence or preplanned I could not say. Given the state of the energy bodies of those involved in founding the movements I find it likely they were instructed to act as catalysts with little time to prepare so an impromptu reaction is indicated.



## **The new order**

So now we find ourselves in an odd situation. The original goal of protection from their kleptocratic president has been achieved by the Ukrainian people, but new ethnic problems are emerging. The US and West-European powers who denounced the kleptocratic government now find themselves backing an interim government which is supporting an ethnic cleansing of the civilian population. The same interim government also attempts to blackmail Western Europe and the USA to provide support threatening to use its nuclear arsenal if they do not.

As to the civil unrest: one of the stated reasons for non-intervention was that the police were not allowed out of their barracks since they were loyal to the former president and the new government feared a counter coup should the police seize control. I decided to do some aura reading of some of the police chiefs involved and found only their frustration at not being able to do their job keeping peace and order and bringing criminals to justice. So either the interim government made an error in judgement inspired by their fear of losing their new found power or had other reasons to allow the violence to continue. Personally I expect the latter, since this gave them more leverage for international support and recognition, which they may not have gotten as easily if there was no state of emergency in the country.

Fortunately for the USA and Western-European powers their media propaganda machine quickly transformed the civilian casualties and ethnic freedom fighters into terrorists trying to plunge the



Ukraine into chaos and civil war if not downright Russian occupation. By quickly switching the victim and perpetrator roles around the populations of the USA and Western-Europe support their government's policy of backing the interim government and pressuring Russia to withdraw it's influence. In the Ukraine itself government censorship and control over the media keep the Ukrainian people from realizing what is really happening in their own country. The purges by the ultra-nationalist militias are kept hidden from the rest of the population and the Ukrainian, West-European and American press start their propaganda campaign against Russian 'terrorists'.

But the situation is still quite volatile. Neither Russia, the US nor Western Europe is willing to risk a military confrontation with oneanother on behalf of the Ukrainian people. The slow, uncertain, hesitant and lacklustre response of the European Union would make me suspect that either they are not orchestrating events or they are doing it exceedingly poorly without a strategy. After all the bloodshed it is unlikely the nation can be reassembled easily so any realist would have to accept at least partial autonomy of the ethnic Russian regions or forceful occupation of those territories, which is unlikely to be acceptable by Russia. Much to my surprise the newly elected president, Petro Poroshenko, in his inaugural speech made it clear he will try just that. military occupation of the rebellious territories. Rule by force of arms, rather than respecting the will of the people of those regions. This move took me by surprise. I knew he as well as his whole administration are deeply endebted to the EU and IMF and therefore probably not able to make policy decisions freely but what would they or he gain by such a move? And why so heavy handed? Using artillery on your own cities rather than police style actions against 'terrorists' make it clear the war is against the people of the region, not just a few militants.



What could be his motivation? He doesn't want to be known as the president who lost large parts of his nation's territory or is this some secret repayment in exchange for support or for having attained his position? To me it seemed most likely that the end result would be the partial autonomy anyway, but that after the right amount of bloodshed it would be welcomed by all as a desirable compromise, rather than grudgingly accepted. A bloody investment in popularity and future stability when finally a cease fire would be declared. Now after more than 5000 people have died a deeper purpose emerges.

### **The MH 17 disaster**

Now the story becomes more personal and my investigation intensifies with the loss of a civilian airplane with Western-Europeans onboard over the eastern Ukraine. Although the thousands of victims up to now have hardly made any stir in the Western media the papers and tv are full and roaring when several Dutch people perish including some personal friends of clients of mine. Within hours of the incident Dutch civil servants are on the radio demanding action against the terrible Russian terrorists. Oddly enough the other nations involved, Australia and Malaysia immediately dispatch investigators to the scene to find out what happened, but the Dutch government sends no-one. It doesn't have to investigate anything since it has already come to the conclusion that more anti-Russian measures are called for. In fact the Dutch government keeps on delaying sending rescue workers and investigators until it's demands for more anti-Russian measures are met. Only when this is done it is willing to find out what really happened. As a friend of mine always says when confronted with a mystery: 'Follow the money'. Who profits by this event? Russia becomes more technologically and economically isolated. People cheer as the USA breaks it's agreement with Russia not to build military bases in former Warsaw Pact countries and announces it will build a base in Latvia. Under the pretext of protecting the people from Russian intervention the US places

Europe back in the firing line between the two cold war adversaries. The 'doves' get shoved out of positions of influence in the EU and the US administrations and the pro-US 'hawks' take control over policies. So if we look at who profits we would suspect that the US hawk faction is behind the loss of the airplane. In US history there is certainly precedent. Blowing up their own battleship to provide a casus belli for starting their war with Spain to seize her colonies. Blockading Japan to elicit an attack on their own pacific fleet, which they do not warn even though they broke the Japanese code and most recently 9-11 to legitimize their pre-planned invasions of Afghanistan and Irak. But events of the past are no guarantee that the same thing has happened here.

The energetic situation now becomes really interesting. Usually when people die violently their spirits are in a low energetic state filled with fear, anger and attachment which increases their risk of becoming earth bound rather than ascending normally. This is also what was happening to the Ukrainians dying in the ethnic violence. As a result of several of my clients having personal friends aboard the flight I was asked to see if the plane crash victims require assistance. I was much surprised to find that the spirits were not merely earthbound, but held captive. For those new to necromancy: a newly deceased spirit has much more power than one which has been dead for longer. Still it was strange that this was done only to those who died in the plane crash and not to others who perished in the conflict. It did bring to mind the events on 9-11 over the USA. The second airliner flown into the world trade center was also shielded astrally to prevent spiritual travel. The other planes used at 9-11 I was unable to check.

### **The end game?**

The energy drawn from the captivated spirits was taken to Washington DC. This in itself is still no reason to suspect responsibility for the accident because the art of necromancy is practised more in the USA than in any other country so it is only natural that if such magic is practised on any disaster it should go there. But what happened next does make it look like a conspiracy. The energy taken to Washington DC is then relayed to Brussels and Moscow with small subsidiary flows to other capitals. Also in the material world the USA and the Dutch government immediately seize the initiative with a clear set of predetermined political and policy goals which they pursue immediately and they have a media campaign in place within hours to back it up. This is in stark contrast to the lackluster and directionless blundering about which has characterized Western government response to the Ukraine crisis up to the crash. This seems to be the well prepared final push to achieve victory, but the real enemy are not the Russians, the Ukrainians or the 'terrorists'/freedom fighters. The push is aimed at those within their own governments who oppose their policies and at the population of their own countries whose wealth and freedom will be diminished.

So we now have an action in the physical world which has a big energetic impact on centers of power. But who is behind it all? Such events are usually orchestrated by so called 'choirs'. These are spiritual groups consisting both of spirits and humans inspired by them who wish to shape the course of spiritual evolution on our planet. They are the spiritual equivalent of political parties. Both are trying to take control over seats of power and use the governmental and media apparatus to shape society according to their ideals.

Just like in politics a coalition of parties is often needed to seize power. In the spiritual world there are roughly four ideological groups. Those who believe in hierarchy and bureaucratic process. Those who believe in competition and self improvement. Those who believe in collectivism and social cohesion. Those who believe that we should be led directly by higher powers.

In the USA and Western-Europe the competition and self improvement coalition is dominant, but in the former Soviet Union territories society has shifted from collectivism to a mix of hierarchic/bureaucratic and competition and self-improvement. As a result of the political changes and laws which were put into place as a result of the Ukrainian crisis people all over the world are

losing a lot of rights and freedoms. The USA is reaffirmed in its role as world-police, more becomes hidden from the people and decision making power becomes more centralized and less democratic.

So although outwardly it may seem that Western-European and US competition and self-improvement mentality is moving east into the Ukraine the effect is actually opposite. The whole world has become more hierarchical/bureaucratic. An ideology of which facism is just one possible manifestation. I hope that now that this policy shift has been achieved there is no need for further bloodshed in the region and differences can be resolved peacefully and without further breaking of words as is characteristic in both ceasefires and government guarantees.

My conclusion is that when the civil unrest in Georgia failed to result in such a power shift the same groups decided to try again, but now on a larger scale with more allies, better preparation and with a more direct link to the West in the form an airline crash. To me the war in the Ukraine is not merely a war between the Ukrainian government and its ethnic Russian population, nor a conflict between Russia and the Western powers. It is a fight over the very path mankind will follow. Over what kind of world we will live in. A world where "Big Brother" will watch over us or a rat race. I do not know which is better, but I do know that unless we as a people become aware and take control over our own thoughts and emotions we will be guided by shadowy ideological groups rather than chose our own path.

Star Hawk Dreamer  
[www.forgottenway.club](http://www.forgottenway.club)  
25<sup>th</sup> of March, 2015