

Interview with Iryna Bekshkina (IB). Interviewer: Iryna Miniailo (IM). Place of record: Kyiv.

IM: So, our research method is oral and historical, or free story (report). Thus the first question is about you. How was your personality formed, I mean, with such a position and so on?

I.B.: It was formed spontaneously, absolutely spontaneously. It happened so. In general, I would say that my personal life story is a compensation for the failures. Because, for example, I finished the philosophy faculty and was writing works about the early Marks and Hehel. That was all concerning my sociology. But frankly speaking we did not have sociology at all at that time, as we understand it now. Yes, we had some kind of sociology, we had some practice on the factory “The Red Excavator” and I even wrote something good about the working staff, because we investigated them, but my attitude towards sociology was very dismissive. And, by the way, the topic was: the working staff, which was very popular at those days, and it’s a pity that we have absolutely forgotten about this topic nowadays, because it is worth studying. It was sociology of the young people and their professional orientation. I mean, there were topics which really deserved being studied. And on the philosophy faculty we had such a subject as sociology, but I forgot about it at the moment I got my “Excellent” mark.

IM: But why Philosophy? Not some other discipline?

IB: To tell the truth, at school I had only “Excellent” marks. And why Philosophy? Because I liked reading. Since five years old I went to the library, took books and read. Reading was my favorite hobby, and I liked sport very much. And in the library I always had some kind of “loading”, some additional brochures for complement. So I read a brochure about the Greek agnostics. I liked the way of their thinking, and I decided to read works by ancient Greek philosophers. I studied at the 10th grade at that time and I coped with the works of Um, and stopped at Kant. So I decided to enter the Philosophy faculty without having any doubts, in spite of the fact that competition was very high, 10 persons per place. Because at the time I was entering that faculty there were more than 80% of applicants with the working experience, and only 20% of applicants were the school leavers. So, the competition among the school leavers was

Influences
Work of
philosophers

10 persons per place. But I was sure I would enter, I was the first who passed the first exam with the “Excellent” mark and became a student.

IM: What was your family attitude to your choice?

IB: I have always decided by myself what I would do. As far as I remember no one argued with me, so I did what I wanted.

IM: Ok, if to speak about the valuables and about theCan you separate some stages?

IB: There was the philosophy stage, when I was a philosopher and vice head of the student’s scientific society, was engaged only in philosophy. As to the activity I must admit that I have always been an active person. I was a chieftain at first, than the head of cultural sector at school, but when I was in 10th grade I was excluded from this sector. Thanks God I was not excluded from Komsomol, they pitied me. Because I organized a rock group in the Soviet times.

IM: What year was it?

IB: 1969. Because I have always been very active, always.

IM: Ok. If to take your early years, what was your family environment? Were your parents on your side or there was some kind of discourse?

IB: I didn’t ask them. I simply told them that I had already decided to enter the Philosophy faculty. That’s all. I simply informed them.

IM: OK. You said that you have almost been excluded from Komsomol. Was there some misunderstanding between the family discourse and official? What was the attitude towards the history and situation?

IB: You know, there was not. I lived with my grandma in Kyiv at that time, because my father was a military man, he and my mother moved a lot, and when at last they settled down at one place they wanted me to come with them (I was 6 years old). But I liked Kyiv much more, so I told them “If you want to take me with you, I return to Kyiv. On foot.”

IM: And where did your mother work, if it’s not a secret?

IB: My mother at first worked as a teacher, and then she graduated from the Philology faculty in Sverdlovsk University and got married to my father. He was a military man, and was sent to Nikopol city where my mother very soon became a head of the kindergarten at the iron melting factory. She was a famous person in the city. I took after my mother; I mean she is very active too.

IM: Ok. Komsomol and you. You told that they wanted to exclude you. Why?

IB: You know, I did it on purpose, I simply didn’t know that the reaction will be so cruel. I wanted to be excluded from Komsomol.

IM: And why did you want it?

IB: Because I was a member of cultural massive sector. And from the early beginning, as an active person I got tickets, organized poetry parties (I adored poetry), but then I got tired. I was in the 10th grade, I had final exams, I had to prepare and I had to be an active Komsomol member. So I decided to blow the whistle on Komsomol. It was on the 23d of February, the Soviet Army Day, and I invited boys from the military vocational school. And in my school the discipline was very strict, and it was a very Soviet school. And I invited a rock group, my friends. At first sang soviet songs and everything was ok, but after that they have caught a high spirit and started singing the Beatles, and the whole school got on their legs and started shaking and dancing with the boys from the military vocational school. Teachers started to rush, tried to stop all this mess, but no one listened to them and there was a huge fuss, until our physical-education teacher who

Influences
Study at school;

was on the post of the secretary of the party organization, simply switched off the power in the whole school. Then I was claimed at the school meeting, but the decision was not to exclude me from school.

IM: What a failure!

IB: Nonsense, it was a success! And failure was in the fact that I was a graduate of the Philosophy faculty, I had a diploma with distinction, but I was not a member of any party. They really wanted me to stay at the faculty but as I was not a member of any party so this way was closed for me.

IM: What was your attitude to the membership in some Party?

IB: I really wanted to become a member of some party. Because the most active were in the Party or in exile. And if you wanted to influence voters in some way you should have taken the floor at the meeting. If to continue the topic and to tell you how did I get to the Philosophy Institute, the Philosophy Institute was the only place in Kyiv where the person could work not being at the same time a Party member. So I decided to try. Much more later I understood that I didn't have any chance because they already had a person, a Party member, who had already passed the candidate exams of the first level. They didn't want me, but took me in order to make some kind of competition. But I passed all the candidate exams excellently, and was the best in it so I was lucky enough and they proposed me the post of an editor in the magazine "Philosophska Dumka". So I became an editor at once and entered the circle of such a people as Popovych, Krymskyi. We were colleagues and we were at the same level. We were friends with Krymskyi, and it should be said that he loved being with young people, talking with them. He did not have children and I was the first at the time when he understood: If he had had children we would have been of the same age. So he took care of me, and helped me, and so on... To cut the long story short, it was a great success. But when I was going to the Historical Materialism faculty and I was promised they would take me on the postgraduate study department in three years, if I would stay and work there. But it was the main editor, who promised me to do this, and he was the vice-head of the faculty at that time too. But when the time came, he simply said "Sorry, I can't take you". And it

Influences Work

was my second failure. I shut the doors, and went away. But I already had a lot of friends at the Social Psychology department. I had never worked at this sphere before but I edited their works. So I decided to enter Postgraduate study department of the Social Psychology. It was an absolutely different sphere. At first I got the knowledge in one sphere, edited articles in the magazine. I was 23 or 24, and professors were coming to me and I taught them how to write articles for the magazine. I bought myself a wig because I wanted to look older. As a result I entered the Postgraduate study department of the Social Psychology and started learning psychology.

IM: So, what was next? What other events or stages influenced you?

IB: It was really difficult to continue development and my mental growth in the department, because our department was really big, and my character has always been like that. I am very thankful, really the vice head of the department Lilya Vasylivna Sokchan, and as far as I know she is still alive and she is 90 already. But she has always been very critical. I do understand now that I was not always right, but she has always been critical to me. I had defended my scientific work and it was high time for me to get the post of the senior lecturer but she had to go to the authorities, to ask, to beg. And suddenly the Sociology department at the Philosophy Institute made me an offer, And the head Saiko was offered to be the head of the department.

IM: What year was it?

IB: 1990, I think. The new sector had appeared – conflicting sector. The department was just being formed, the new staff was going to start working, and the head of the Department Khadush was trying to agitate me to join the department – we were friends. He was my opponent when I was defending my candidate thesis. And I told him: “Ok. I’ll join you, but under the one condition. I will never work as a sociologist.” And he agreed. “Nebozhenko and I will be engaged in sociology and you will be writing some theoretical materials”.

IM: Why did you say so?

IB: Because my way of thinking at that time was rather different from the way I am thinking now, even theoretically. I thought, it was not my business – mathematicians could do it, and I was a philosopher. I was flying in some higher spheres, with my head in the clouds. And then, step by step... any activity may catch me. When I start doing something. I think a human being was not born for doing only one thing in life. I'm sure I would feel freely in journalism, for example. Undoubtedly. I could be a teacher. A doctor. But the profession of business lady is not for me, I am not interested in this field at all. But there are so many things the person can do and can be engaged in. It is not right to be interested only in one thing.

IM: Ok, it's clear. How did you leave your department?

I.B.: I am still working at the Institute of Sociology, by the way.

IM: How did your career develop after you had moved to this department of the Philosophy institute? What about your interests, how did it influence you, why did you decide to work with the numbers? And what is your opinion concerning the role of sociologist in this process?

IB: There were some planned topics, the science of conflicts, so we had been working mostly with the conflicts. In the sociology department I started working as a sociologist because I became interested in this science. This process was going so naturally! At first I tried it because wanted to earn some money, and then simply continued doing this job.

IM: Do you mean, it's a kind of commercial sector?

IB: We had already had some orders.

IM: For the philosophy Institute?

I.B.: No, some personal deals. How did we live then? The salary was 15 dollars and I do remember sitting with Holovakcha, and my sofa was so old, but I have counted in my mind that I'll be able to buy a new one in 10 years if I am going to save one dollar from my salary. Suddenly the man came, and says, that he was from the Institute of Youngster Problems which been recently formed. And as they didn't have enough professional staff for doing the scientific work they have decided to act not very fair (they were ex-Komsomol members, though). To me work under the planned topic they involved colleagues from the Philosophy Institute, and I was addressed to the sociology of young people, which we worked. Balakireva was at the head of this network. So, we came to the mutual agreement and Holovakcha told me "Oh, your new sofa has already come to you!" There was a sum of money exactly for buying a new sofa. So that was a good reason to be on the initiative the next time. Once we were talking in our friendly company (including Holovakcha, Neboshenko and me – such a little sector), and Kokuchiyev came and told us about an interesting idea – to create the sociological center. And we agreed, why not? So it started, in the year 1992.

Influences
Work in Institute of
Youngster
Problems

IM: Can you tell me, that the Philosophy institute, sociology department and your entire environment was independent? On the one hand I heard that there Komsomol members in the circle and on the other hand the career dependent on the Party membership....

IB: The Philosophy Institute – it was a circle of independent people, in spite of the fact if they were party members or not. I wanted to be a Party member because there were meetings, and speeches, and there was an opportunity to criticize the administration, and so on, and I had to go home. So I became a party member.

IM: I understand. Why it was not possible at the beginning, what kind of barriers did you face and what did you get at the end?

I.B.: The main deficit existing during the Soviet times was the Party membership, because the Party consisted only of workers and peasants, and the amount of intelligent and literate people there was really very small. As workers so peasants didn't need it very much. Intelligent people

Influences
Activity of
Philosophy
Institute

needed it. Very much. So the line of applicants was very long. A long line was at the Philosophy Institute as well. Situation with me was simpler because there could work not only the Party members. Also there were a lot of people not standing in the line. I didn't stand in the line, too. We cooperated with the Scientific department of regional party committee, and they have evaluated my talent to write good reports.

IM: What do you mean by "We"?

IB: The Philosophy Institute. It belonged to the scientific department of the city committee, and of the regional committee. And it turned out that I was writing good reports concerning the education for the first secretary of the committee. My approach was a little bit different. Those who were writing before took the information at schools, everywhere and then wrote their articles. I went to the library, I took "Psychology" magazine and "School" magazine, read about the problems concerning school education, because I was sure, that every school had similar problems, as in Pechersk region so in the other one. And teachers were really excited. But I left the Party earlier than someone else.

IM: When?

IB: After the events in Vilnius in 1991 our whole sector left the Party.

History

Events in Vilnius in 1991

IM: How would you describe your motivation?

IB: We were excited by the democratic platforms in the Soviet Union Communist Party, when there took place reconstructions at the Party and so on. And after Vilnius we understood that this Party will not change anything and that it stops everything and it will be a moral mistake to stay in the Party and to be responsible for what it does. By the way, it was not clear at that time what will be at the end, so it was some kind of risk for me. Moreover, at that time I was at the head of the professional union, in fact, and what were we doing, for instance? We took the decision, that the professional union will not let firing people because of the political motives. Some people were

coming to me from the regional committee and they asked “What are you doing?! Do you think, anyone will ask for your permission?”

IM: It was after the events taking place in January?

IB: Before. It was when I still was a party member. Otherwise, why should they come?

IM: When was it?

IB: When it started with Rukh. We also had some group of Rukh Party participants at the Institute, and we also had some problems, and we were trying hard to solve them – we had decided that our group would gather on the weekends or after the work. Because during the working hours they can’t make a meeting, and at their free time, after work – ok, let it be. .

IM: Ok. What do you call the Rukh Party group at the Philosophy Institute? Who were the members and why?

IB: You know, there were many Ukraine-oriented people at the philosophy Institute, who were working under the topic of Ukrainian Philosophy even at that time. I would say, more than half of specialists was of that kind. It was such a protagonist to the Soviet authorities group.

History Rukh

IM: Clear. And what was the attitude of your environment, of sociologists to Rukh?

IB: Very positive! Someone participated, someone no, but we all supported Rukh. Sociologists, not like other people working there, were very young, because it was a new specialty. Mostly there were university graduates.

IM: But in what way did they differ from the other?

IB: In what way? They had the energy, the desire to do something new. For example, I perfectly remember that the chief had told me to go to the meetings, and after that I wrote the brilliant scientific work. It was under the title “Meetings Psychology”.

IM: Meetings were organized by Rukh?

IB: No, it was the election company. Now it’s hard to imagine something like that.

IM: What years you are speaking about now?

IB: About the end of the 1980s.

IM: Before the Revolution on Granite?

IB: It seems to me that it was in 1989, the elections were to the Supreme Council of the Soviet Union, and from Kyiv was some Masik, and I know that he didn’t want to be the one, Shcherbytsky told him “You know, you are not better than someone else”. So it was really interesting. For example, when we were conducting the telephone polling, there was such a foreword for people not to be afraid of it. Because we are sociologists, and we conduct polling, and it will be absolutely anonymously, absolutely. I mean, there was a written text. And when the person was losing its temper and asked us “What do you want to know? Will I vote for Masik? No, I won’t.” So Masik became a loser but only because he was the only candidate, and the majority was against any candidates at all. So, I do remember him laying on a bench on Lviv square absolutely drunk, and above him was a poster “Vote for Masik”. And he rose from the bench and told his poster “I won’t vote for you” It was in Kyiv. And afterwards it was like that: “Ok. You don’t want me? So do what you want”. So how many candidates were 24 or 27, where did they take the floor, may be on stadium. Was there the full stadium of people, or not, I do not remember. Who was there-I also do not remember, but Saliy stayed in my memory. At that time he was the first secretary of the Podilsk regional committee. And there was a question for him “What is your attitude to Ivan Mazepa?” And his answer was “Oh, I didn’t know that his name

History
Shcherbytsky

History
I.Mazepa

was Ivan! My name is Ivan too! Thank you for the information!” Enthusiasm was really great, and expectations were great, too. For example, what we did. Not I did, I simply wrote the text “Attitude to the national symbols”, to the yellow-blue flag. There was a very popular newspaper “Vechirniy Kyiv”, it seems to me that every citizens of Kyiv subscribed that newspaper. It was a very progressive newspaper. And the result of polling was published there. Simply two paragraphs concerning the fact that there was some kind of polling in Kyiv and that one third of the population speaks in favor of yellow and blue flag and one third is against it. And that was a real explosion! Ten thousands of letters came to the newspaper editing department: it was simply overloaded with the letters.

IM: For or against?

I.B.: For and against. Some people wrote that “damned Bandera’s”, the others were really surprised how anyone could be against such kind of flag, but sociologists were condemned by of them. And I tell you this for you to imagine the general level of the enthusiasm at that time.

Emotions
Enthusiasm

Part III 28:57

IM: So, in the year 1990, October. The Revolution on Granite. How would you describe your life situation in the context of the events which took place at that time? What was your attitude to the events, how did you feel the situation?

IB: You know, it passed almost not touching us. At the Institute we had signed one of the petitions supporting the demands of the revolutionary men on the granite, but such petition was not first, and was not the last one. Honestly speaking, the attitude to this event was not very special because we considered it as one in the chain.

Revolution on the
Granite
Activity
Without
participation

IM: With what kind of events could you compare such situation?

IB: With the elections. Sometimes there were different kinds of meetings, but truly not serious as during the revolution. But people went on the streets, participated in meetings. That's why we didn't understand at first that it was something much more serious, some extraordinary event. And the only thing I remembered that the guys were there and we pitied them. So we signed the petition. But it was not my initiative and I really do not remember who the initiator at the Philosophy Institute was.

Form of protest
Rallies

IM: From the facts you do remember, how would you describe his project? Form, organizations, what was common, or what was the difference from the other, or could be some tendencies traced down...

IB: Firstly, it had turned out that in Ukraine, even during the Soviet times it was possible for some people not to be punished, not to be beaten with sticks. For example, according to our sociological predictions the Revolution of Dignity didn't have to happen! And why did it happen? Because there was a fight and people were beaten! To tell you the truth it was the year 2001 and there was the Svoboda Party engaged, and they were considered to be nationalists, and it was an absolutely opposite thing. But people understood then – they could protest without any negative consequences.

Revolution of Dignity Events
Beating of students

IM: Yes, it's clear. But why do you say that the Revolution of the year 2013 didn't have to happen?

IB: Because there were no indicators showing the growth of the protest mood. Vice versa.

IM: Ok, let's come back to the Revolution on the Granite.

IB: Exactly then we saw that we could protest without any consequences. During the Soviet times people were really scared; it was not possible to protest at all, because we knew perfectly well how many people had been imprisoned only because they were trying to speak Ukrainian something like that.

Revolution on the Granite Emotion
Fear

IM: What do you think, how it could happen?

IB: Because people were afraid, they did not know how it all could finish. And it was really fair. If they would be beaten, so everything could be possible.

IM: Who were “they” and how could it finish?

IB: Who were “they”? Central Committee, KGB

IM: Were afraid of whom?

IB: Of people.

IM: How would you describe the mood of the people? What were people waiting for at that period in general?

IB: The mood was very positive. No one wanted to separate from the Soviet Union. I do remember the first Rukh meeting, and mostly they were speaking about the biggest independence from the Soviet Union and that Ukraine had to do something independently, but there were speeches about the complete separation from the Soviet Union in Rukh Party program.

History
Rukh's idea of independence of Ukraine

IM: Ok. Such sweet expectations. How was developing the public evaluation of the events?

IB: Everything was going down then. It could not be said, that we were wearing “rosy glasses” because we had a feeling that everything was going down. Empty shelves in the shops, even in Kyiv, the rise of prices, in Baltic countries some fights took place.

History
Events in Baltic country

IM: What would you say about the results of the Revolution on the Granite, what was the use for the society?

IB: For sure-the social activity growth. Without any doubts. It used to be absolutely under control before. For example, at the student's time we were taken to the KGB only because we published the literary almanac in five samples. There were no politics at all, but as we did it ourselves, there were different questions, such as: "Who is staying behind this all? How was it done?" The fact that we did it independently, without any help. Yes, we had printed it in five samples, and we spread it among the first year students. But there were no consequences at all because we all were among the best students and some even were the Party members.

Revolution on
the Granite
Internal Policy
"Policy" state

Outcomes
Growth of social
activity

IM: You think that they were afraid. And what were they afraid of? Why did their belief that everything would end optimistically, disappear?

IB: Because people were going to meetings, protested. Masik failed. It was for the first time. There was only one candidate, no other competitors. Usually – if there are several candidates then one can win. If there is the only one candidate - he wins. But not this time. It was the unique phenomena in the whole Soviet Union! For the first time there was such a situation. And he lost the game. But what was going to be the next? No one knew. Activity of the nation was very high. We read a lot. When I was young there was cruel censorship. Somewhere, somehow. I do remember reading "Doctor Zhivago" in the special secret library, in Moscow. And it seemed to me there was nothing special in this book for being forbidden. And suddenly all the forbidden became available! So we were reading and our consciousness had changed at once. There were so many questions to speak about, to argue. It was boiling, steaming. People gathered a lot, discussed a lot, argued.

Influences
Forbidden
literaturv

IM: How would you determine the role of Rukh in this period, and concretely during the Revolution on Granite?

IB: I don't know. I didn't know these people, and I had already said that the Revolution on the Granite is associated in my mind only with the signing of some paper to support the demands of the boys standing there on the granite. We signed the paper and that was all.

IM: Do you remember the demands?

IB: I do remember perfectly well. One of the main demands was the change of the government. And it seems to me they wanted an independent Ukraine, but I do not remember perfectly well what was asked to sign the paper and I signed. That's all.

**Revolution on the
Granite
Motivation
Change of
government**

IM: Why did you sign?

IB: Do you want to know why I signed even without reading it before? Because my friends signed it. For me it was enough.

IM: I understand. So, the environment had some meaning for you?

IB: Yes, of course. We had the Rukh circle, and we published our local newspaper, under the name "Obozrevatel". Popovuch was our main editor. Also Preluk worked there (he died some time ago) and Vyatkina worked with us.

**Influences
Environment**

Part IV 37:17

IM: Ok. The next actions of protest. What do you remember about it? Now we are speaking about the protest as a process. The next outburst, possibly, was "Ukraine without Kuchma". Can you trace any connections between the revolution on...and "Ukraine without Kuchma"?

IB: Generally, there is a connection between the all protests, because every such action shows that the protests are possible. It is not so important whether people participate in them or not, but somewhere and somehow it "lies down"/the other thing is that some protests ended without any results, but I mean "Ukraine without Kuchma"

IM: Do you want to say that it had no consequences at all?

IB: I can't say that there were absolutely no results. There were some, of course. But the results were mostly in our consciousness. We simply understood that Kuchma had to be "thrown out" as was clear as day. If it was said "Kuchma – go away", so Kuchma had to go away. And if Kuchma had some plans to stay for the third term, all the sociological polling had shown that he had no chances, so he simply didn't apply for the third term. He simply could not.

History
Ukraine without
Kuchma

IM: Ok. The Action "Ukraine without Kuchma" and "Orange Revolution". What is the connection between them?

IB: This "Ukraine" without Kuchma" was everywhere, everyone was saying that Kuchma had to go away, and his surrounding too. Medvedchuk – who was his close friend and colleague, Volchynsky and others. They all had to go. Sociological polling showed that Yushchenko became a hero. He became a hero at the time when he was at the head of the government. But why did he become a hero? Let's recall that after the introduction of the hryvnia in 1996 an awful inflation took place.

**Ukraine without
Kuchma**
Actors
Medvedchuk
Volkov
Yushchenko

Sorry, I am mistaken. The inflation took place before the year 1996, and one year it was 10000%, I mean the situation was like this: you got your salary and ran sharply to buy some food, because you needed food, and the next day the price could be different, much higher. The process was stopped with the implementing of the own currency-a Ukrainian currency. But as economics based on barter so the next phenomena took place – no salaries were paid at all. Sometimes during the year. Sometimes they could give you 20% of your salary. And it was not Yushchenko but Tymoshenko who had stopped that. She was in his government and she was working with Naftogaz and etc. And she said that she knew about such schemes perfectly well. And she was right. She closed them, and money appeared, and economics started to develop, and salaries started to be paid, but all these changes for the best were connected with the name of Yushchenko, in spite of the fact that it was due to Tymoshenko's work. But Yushchenko due to her work became a hero. And all the sociological polling showed that he was winning against Yanukovich. And the change took place in autumn when everyone demanded "We need higher salaries! We need higher salaries! Why are salaries not raised? The economy is developing but salaries are not growing!" This topic was very popular. A month before the elections all the pensioners got 400 hryvnias, and it was a really big sum of money for them.

History
Introduction of
hryvnia

IM: Was it the Yushchenko government?

IB: No, it was already Yanukovuch. And his rating had jumped sharply at that time.

IM: Of Yanukovych or Kuchma?

IB: Of Yanukovuch, of course. It was finished with Kuchma, But according to the different questionnaires Yushchenko still was in the leading position. And then started the performance which we call “elections”. But it should be admitted that a strong feature of the Yanukovuch group is their ability to administrate. They had “cleaned up the minds” of people almost on every location. I can tell you about it because I saw it with my own eyes. It was in Kyiv, and Kyiv voted for Yushchenko. And there were ink pens at the polling stations. And in some time the ink simply disappeared from the paper, vanished. Such a “magic ink”. It was the one thing. And there was some other thing. All the bulletins had to be signed. And one woman working at the polling station didn’t sign the bulletins. And without the signature the bulletins were not valid. The woman was caught, but a lot of bulletins were spoiled. And people saw it, understood and became very angry. I won’t speak here about the absolutely scandalous pre-election campaign. The channels simply advertised him, constantly so everyone could see perfectly well how unfair was this pre-election campaign.

Orange Revolution
Emotion
Angry

IM: You mean, it was the main reason of protests? People were not satisfied with the unfair campaign? Or there were some other reasons?

IB: No, no. It just was accumulating. And after that...But when there was an exit poll I was often told that I was like the Aurora shot. Because on the 5 channel it was I who announced the results of the first round. And we had 4 companies which were united in the complex one and it was the social monitoring. The complex included Sotsis, KMIS, Razumkov Centre, and us. At 8 o’clock we announced the results and we were the only oppositional channel which gave the information that Yushchenko won with the advantage by some percent. And then unfortunately two

sociological companies changed their results and at 11 we had to announce that Yanukovuch was the winner. Because Chyvilov said there was something wrong during the ballot counting, something of this kind. But I do not want to speak about it anymore. He said that there was an attempt to kill him, and someone threatened his daughter, something of that kind. There was a big scandal, and the next day we explained, that it was not so and our first results were right, and so on. But people did not go to the streets at that time. On the second round we worked without the companies of Razumkov and KMIS, and according to our data Yushchenko had 10 percent more votes, and they announced the absolutely opposite results. So, people went to the streets. People went to the streets because there was a feeling that if they are giving wrong results, so – nothing will turn for the best. No more democracy, no more elections, nothing more. But that Maidan was gathering beforehand. That Maidan was led by the politicians and it was gathered by the politicians. For example, I know the position of the City Major. He told “If there gather 10,000 people, I will do nothing. If there are so many people”. And there were much more people. And tents appear almost immediately.

IM: And why are you saying that the leaders were politicians and it was prepared by the politicians?

IB: Because they already knew there would be false results. There were falsifications and everyone could see that. For example, in Donbas the members of the commission were telling strictly in the faces that there were only 400 people who decided to vote for Yushchenko, and they were told there should be only 40 people, no more, otherwise they would have serious problems and very bad people would explain them in a clear form that they, the members of the commission, were wrong. So everyone could see numerous falsifications. The buses were going, and so on. And only politicians took the word from the tribune, only politicians. It was the Maidan of politicians supported by the people, of course.

Internal Policy
Pressure by the
authorities

IM: Ok. Politicians. Who were they?

Actors
P.Poroshenko
V.Yushchenko
Y.Tymoshenko

IB: First of all Poroshenko, Yushchenko and Tymoshenko,. Also the man, I do not remember his name, he died from cancer. You can find the information easily.

IM: Who else?

IB: Bezsmertny, Rybachuk, Martynenko. All those who were called “dear friends” afterwards.

Actors

Y.Beysmertny

O.Rybachuk

☐ Martynenko

IM: Ok. Who were the protest leaders from the other side?

IB: What do you mean by the “other side”? There was no “other side”!

IM: And what about Antimaidan?

IB: There was no Antimaidan, absolutely! There weren't any |titushki”, there was nothing of this kind.

IM: And what about the antagonists team? Yanukovuch, Kuchma?

Actors

L.Kuchma

V.Yanukovich

IB: Kuchma's position was “I am standing aside, I know nothing”.

IM: Ok. And Yanukovuch's position?

IB: And what could he do? He had no power at all. Yes, he was a prime minister. I know he told Kuchma to bring everything to an order and so on. And Kuchma answered him; “What do you want from me? I am the commander-in-chief and I can give the orders to the Army only. Do you think, I should bring the Army and the soldiers? You have got militia at your disposal; you are the prime minister so do what you want!” Our President, in fact, decided not to interfere. But we had a President, though. We had such a presidential republic, not even the presidential-parliament. And what could Yanukovych do? Actually, nothing. So, nothing happened. So, there was a third round, and Yushchenko won with a huge advantage. The end. So, it was such a funny Maidan. No

one was beaten and no one was even punched. Nothing. No provocations, no “titushki”. There was music, there were speeches and there was an atmosphere of holiday in the city. Cars were driven in chains and they signaled: “Yu-shchen-ko!Yu-shchen-ko!”

IM: And why are you saying that it was Maidan of politicians?

IB: Because it was organized by the politicians.

IM: And why did the people support it?

IB: There were some expectations, first of all, from Yushchenko. Yushchenko was like an idol for the population. In our country paternalism is very strong, even now. And for us he was like a father – we believed – he comes, and everything will change for the best, everything will be all right

Motivation
Support for
Yushchenko

IM: And what is your opinion concerning the role of oligarchy in the events?

IB: I suppose, their role was simply neutral. They decided not to interfere in the events. Some of them were against. But Kuchma was playing the first guitar.

IM: Do you mean he was an example for them?

IB: I mean that if to take Akhmetov, for example, he would like to see Yanukovich as a winner.

IM: Was this position so active?

IB: Not so active.

IM: And were there any active oligarchs in this process?

IB: They were very active during the election campaign, because all the agitation work and everything connected with it. They were actively counteracting the election campaign. They organized mass falsifications and paid for them. But during the Orange Revolution I did not see their active position. Oligarch TV channels also were against and were on the side of the others. So – no, no...

IM: And politicians from abroad? What was their role?

IB: Sure, they supported us.

IM: And who was the most active?

IB: I do not remember now.

IM: Ok. Can you say that Orange Revolution has led to a significant change in the political system?

IB: Surely. It returned us the opportunity to make honest elections and democratic elections. next elections in the year 2006 were competitive, and Yanukovych's political forces got revenge.

Outcomes Establishing of democratic principles

IM: But why?

IB: Because Ukraine was still divided. Yushchenko won but adherents of Yanukovych did not vanish. It was approximately 50 / 50, Yanukovych had a little less. How and where could they disappear? So they obtained 30% on the elections.

IM: Ok. What were the other consequences for the political system?

IB: Of course, it was really awful that they started to sort relations with each other. We know what was taking place. Especially, Yushchenko and Tymoshenko. And I think if not for this... I had heard that Tymoshenko was really sorry for all this afterwards. Because if that did not happen, there would be no Yanukovych – prime minister, no restoration of all the political powers took place.

IM: Was a conflict between Yushchenko and Tymoshenko the consequence of the Orange revolution?

IB: Yes, because she was standing near him and she also was the heroine. Before the events her rating was negative – minus 45. She was described as a person connected with some complicated schemes. And after she became prime minister her ratings became positive.

IM: And what was the use of it for her?

IB: She became popular. And in the next elections in the year 2006 she had beaten “Nasha Ukraina” because she had twice as many votes.

IM: I see. How did these events influence the oligarchy?

I.B.: They became more powerful, because in contrast to Kuchma, Yushchenko was really weak. President Kuchma showed them all who they were and where they should sit. He was a kind of “showing finger”, and Yushchenko was not. It was the first. And the second, during the Kuchma period we had a presidential republic and one of the conditions of the third round was an essential limitation of the president’s power and increasing of the parties’ power. And what kinds of parties do we have? Oligarchic parties! It was so and it will be so. So they became more powerful, for sure.

Part V 54:31

IM: Ok. Can you trace the development of the social moods till the events of the year 2013?

Outcomes Weak of presidential branch of power

IB: As a sociologist, I can say that the year 2005 was an absolutely unique, according to sociologic data, year, because all the indices were growing. For the first time people started to trust the president, the new government with Yulia Tymoshenko. And the most interesting was that the Supreme Council continued to be the same – and people had not trusted it before. Oops, suddenly something had changed and people started trusting the same people they had never trusted before! A kind of nonsense. But it could be explained by the fact that the general mood was very positive. People started to believe, that everything would change for the better. A new team has come. And if to look precisely at that, if not of this crisis and conflict, it would be difficult to say whether there had ever been so strong government before.

Outcomes
Started trust in branch of power

IM: Were the reasons personal or political ones?

IB: Personal, without any doubt. Absolutely personal. Yushchenko’s ambitions and Tymoshenko’s ambitions.

IM: Ok. What is the connection between that conflict and events of the years 2013-2014?

IB: You know, I have already started talking about the year 2005. Afterwards everything was going down. Yanukovich was assigned as the post of prime minister, people felt disappointment, and the apathy was really strong. I mean, everything was going down to the indicators of the 1990s. Though, economic development was going rather well, till the crisis in 2008. A strong middle class was forming because of the economic development, people felt more free. The media also were freer in their expression in comparison with the Kuchma period. That means democracy was developing at that time. Also, we should mention the fact that young people and some other interested people had gathered in different state organizations very actively. I mean, the future contingent, which took the reins in 2013, was being formed. But if to have a look at the opinion, there is such a question in the Institute of sociology monitoring (the question from the year 2005). “What do you feel while thinking about the future of Ukraine? The worst indices were in the year 2013. The year 2013 seemed to be rather good, it was stable. After the crisis in 2008

Outcomes
Developing democracy
Disappointment within society
Emotions
Apathy

people at last started living better, everything was so good, stabilized. Yet optimism and hopes for a better life was on the lowest level.

IM: How it can be explained?

IB: There was a feeling of “cemetery”. Feeling that after such people came to rule nothing can be changed for the better.

IM: And what do you mean by “change for the better”. You had admitted that people felt free, why did this feeling of “cemetery” took place?

IB: Because people could clearly see what was taking place in politics. Corruption had always existed but at that time it simply flourished. If at the beginning you could bring 20% to people, who could help in solving some specific problems, who could say a word in your favor to the ear of some important personality at some important posts, so now you had to give 50% and even 80%. So, the whole country had changed into such a money giving machine. The situations were almost anecdotic sometimes. They were absolutely brilliant organizers. For example, one woman had told me that her husband had been working at the Ministry of Foreign affairs, if I do remember correctly. So, the salary there was not very high, but there was an opportunity to some vacation tour there and to pay only 30% for it. But for everything, even for that they had to pay 20% above. Ok, let it be, we have in general 50%, but what for? And it could be seen absolutely everywhere. For example, when it was time for me to get my foreign passport, in the migration office, there was a special machine standing, and you could pay all the bills there. People were paying. And I was interested in what bank the money was going to. It was written there “Donetsk, Artema street, 46” – I mean it was Sasha’s Yanukovych’s bank. So if there was an opportunity to get some money, even to steal, it was done, and Ukraine changed into such a money-giving pump.

Situation
Flourishing of
corruption

IM: Right. On the one hand you told me that the corruption had been flourishing, and on the other hand you spoke about the stability. What kind of stability do you mean?

IB: Don't you see... the stability of "the cemetery". Everything is calm and peaceful.

IM: But I still would like to hear about the indices of such stability. Corruption, on the one hand, a money-giving pump. As I do understand the situation, people were starting to become poorer?

IB: No, I can't say so, because there was economic development. In 2008 it was almost dead, and Tymoshenko lost the game only because of this reason. If there was not a crisis in the year 2008, she would have been president, for sure. Before the crisis she had 30% of voters, and for Yanukovich also had 30%

IM: Well, was such kind of stability very bad?

IB: No.

IM: So, what do you mean under such stability?

IB: You know, everything should move. Movement is a sense of life. And if it is so...calm...Well we still had hope that we would sign the Association Agreement with the European Union and would become a part of Europe.

IM: How do you think people understood what "going into Europe" meant...

IB: We know that it's good to live in Europe, so people understood... Europe – it is good. For sure, it will be to live better, salaries will be higher, the level of living will be better. For people are interested in improving of their material level. Higher material level gives opportunity to go abroad, to travel. Europe has always been associated with something positive. And, by the way, during the year 2012 and partly 2014 Yanukovich himself supported for the European Union. Moreover, I do personally know when there were some unsatisfied people in the Party of Regions, he gathered them and told them: "We are going to Europe".

History
Idea of integration
with Europe Union

IM: Can you divide the cause of the protests and the reasons for the protests?

IB: Sure! The cause of the protests was our desire for a change for the better, people were simply sick and tired of the way of life they had.

**Revolution of
Dignity
Motivation**
Desire of changes
for the best

IM: In what spheres?

IB: In all the spheres. People wanted to have more freedom, more democracy. And more than that they wanted to change the authorities. The reason appeared after the beating of the students.

Events
Beating of
students

IM: So, you wanted to join Europe, you wanted some changes for the better. What kind of changes?

IB: Changes in everything. And most of all we wanted to dismiss this band of robbers ruling the government. Not only common people were sick and tired of Yanukovych, but the oligarchy as well. Because the oligarchy channels showed how the students were beaten, with all the details and blood, and of course people were shocked. I do remember perfectly well the Sunday morning, when people were going to protest. I live at the metro station Chernyhivska, one stop before the end of the line, and it was almost impossible to enter – so many people were going. We didn't have an opportunity to get out at Khreshchatyk because the doors were closed, and we didn't get the opportunity to get off at Teatralna station, and University station, so we could go away only on Vokzalna metro station. There were so many people that it was the feeling the whole city had gathered there.

IM: And in the line “cause and reason” what place is given for the signing of the association agreement? Were you waiting for some acts from Yanukovych?

IB: It was such a push in the back! So, it became clear that the final point was behind, and this government will change nothing for the better, no sense to wait.

IM: If not for the student's beating, how do you think the events would take place? What was more important – the signing of the agreement or beating of the students?

IB: Surely, the student's beating was of more importance. Because they have crossed the [redacted] because Ukrainians have never been beaten before. Yes, sometimes, somewhere near Shevchenko monument there could be some kind of incident with some consequences, but not serious...And here was a kind of explosion, all the channels showed the students, how they were beaten. And when it turned out that the students ran to Mykchailovcka church... you do understand that Ukrainians are very special. When we see a fight, we are not running from it, we are running towards it. We are running to help and to protect.

Place
Mykchailovska church

IM: Ok. And what were the consequences?

IB: The consequences were great! I would also admit that the internet played an important role. Facebook, social networks. When, for example, there were some acute situations, people simply called the taxi and rushed to Maidan, instead of sitting at home safely and quietly.

IM: Was it unexpected for you as a sociologist?

IB: I should mention that we are speaking about the minority. In all the events of the Orange Revolution only 15% of the population participated. In total. And here was almost the same situation. Including those who helped with money, and not only in Kyiv, but in the other cities too. It is a minority. But a very active minority. To tell you the truth, the minority is always changing history. And the rest were supporting or not. And in this case, half of the country was active.

Actors
Active minority

IM: Why?

IB: Because the governing of Yanukovich was not acceptable for them anymore. Half did not

support him. No, not this way. I would say that 50% still supported him, but more than 40% did not.

IM: How would you describe the self-organization in this process?

IB: I would say the horizontal self-organization was perfect, and the vertical organization was simply awful. I mean, there was no vertical organization at all.

IM: Was it good or bad?

IB: It was bad. I mean, on the one hand, it was good. On the horizontal level, for instance, people organized very fast. For example, medical assistance was organized by the people themselves. The same was with the food. People organized the protection by sotnyas and agreed with each other. Every sotnya had its own leader and they agreed who will stay at what pace. But any vertical structure which would represent Maidan did not exist. And I was a witness when they tried to organize it, to create it. We were called as experts, and I was present, Bystrytsky was present, some other representatives were present. It was in the hall of Trade Unions building it looked like this: “Who you are? And what do you do?” And it was so awful that they choose anyone. There were no representatives for introduction of the Maidan as it was. why the Maidan was introduced by the politicians. Who was the first, the second and the who was going to be the main representative... Ambition is one of the main problems in our civil society.

Activity

Some kind of representative of participants of rallies

IM: Ambitions of the public leaders, or political leaders?

IB: Public.

IM: Ok. How did people know how to gather in the sotnyas, how to organize money gathering, how to organize medical assistance?

IB: This all was taking place spontaneously. For example, some people were gathering in the kitchen and one more activity organized them. The same was with the sotnyas. And it should be said that discipline in the sotnyas was almost absolute! I do remember, for example, when people gathered in groups there appeared the sotnyas representatives at once. They were standing strict, as the soldiers. “Turn right, turn left, march!” So there was discipline and how they did it – I don’t know.

IM: Ok. Did I understand right that there was a kind of public leaders circle?

IB: Sure.

IM: Can we contrast it with the political leaders and how would you describe the correlation between the “public leaders, political leaders and experts”?

IB: I don’t know, because I was among the group of experts, I can say. Maybe, for the first in the history, because I had never seen anyone who made representative polling on the square during the meetings. It was for the first time. We had a certain sum of money, two thousand or two and a half, because we had to pay money for the people taking the interviews. Paniotto chose some important information and wrote who was standing where, how many steps should be done and so on. So, for the first time it was a sociological meeting and it was on the 6-7 of December. Everything was clear, strictly written, but the crowd! Where to go back?! That’s why we had decided urgently to ask people by telephone who were on the left. To ask people on the right. To ask someone who is behind. There were some problems because people wanted to speak and we did not let them speak just because they were giving not the type of context we needed. The second stage was taking place in December. And the third one. I called them so – the first one was called the Maidan-meeting, the second the Maidan-camp, and the third one the Maiddan-Sich. The Maidan Sich – it was after the people were beaten and there were certain problems. For example in the two first Maidans there was a problem that people wanted to answer and we didn’t want their answers. Interviewers also wanted to take interviews, because it would be faster. And I took the interviews like a crazy dog. I was running, barking out the interviewers because I wanted to

keep close to the procedure. Because there were, for example, 12 students from the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, and she wanted them all to give interviews. I didn't let her do it.

IM: Ok. I'll return to my previous question. Experts-politicians-public activists. How do you see the cooperation process between them?

IB: I do not overestimate our role as experts. Our role at the beginning was to show that the results of the elections were falsified.

Orange Revolution Activity
Members of experts group

IM: You are telling about the events taking place in 2004?

IB: Yes. It had never been in the history of sociology before that the sociological questionnaires were spread in the amount of 300,000 copies. At night they had published 300,000 copies, and all these copies were spread on Maidan. And when some people asked what was being spread, and got the answer that it was an exit-polling, there were no more questions. Our role as the experts was to contradict the theses which have been introduced by the authorities. And the theses were like that "There were marginal people, unemployed and Galytchyna". Unemployed came to Maidan in Galytchyna because they had nothing to do, and that was all. And we showed that there were intelligent people, with the level of education much higher than in Ukraine in general, and that there were many people with high education. Yes, there were some unemployed people, but only 10%. And they were not only representatives from Galytchyna, but also Russian speaking people. 20% of representatives from the East and South. So, we showed the general structure of the mass, we showed their wishes and their demands. And it was our role.

Actors
10% Unemployed people
20% from the East and South Ukraine
People from Ukraine
Citizens from Galytchyna

IM: Ok, but why did the need to do this appeared in the expert's environment at all? What was your motivation?

IB: First of all, it was a scientific interest. And Paniotto supported it very much. We simply had to do something like that. I asked Volodya if we should do this and he supported my idea.

Actors
V. Paniotto

IM: Did you have such a feeling that the results were really important?

IB: No, I had not.

IM: And in the year 2004?

IB: Yes.

IM: And what was the difference?

IB: I am not telling about the exit-polling, I am telling about the general polling.

IM: I do understand. But in both cases you were, frankly speaking, contradicting with the authorities. Were there some similarities in these situations? What was pushing you? Did you feel that it was of great importance for the society in that moment?

IB: For sure, we felt that! Sorry, but we also went to the Maidan, and we made first aid kits. whole office went there, of course!

**Revolution of
Dignity
Activity
Supply**

IM: Did you feel yourself more in the center of the events in the year 2014 - or in 2004?

IB: In 2014, of course. Because in 2004 it was a kind of festival. We did not feel any danger. And in 2013 it was dangerous. But, by the way, it was not scary when we were there, and it was the most interesting thing! I have been there from time to time. And when I took somebody with me, I was telling them: "If there would happen something, I'll tell I am making a training here. We are studying the protest moods now by the method of inside observation."

IM: Ok. I would like you to explain more details about the environment and the vertical organization...

IB: Yes, I was there, but aside...

IM: Did you have a picture in your mind, how should it all look like?

IB: Yes, there should be such a general structure of the Maidan, and there was no such structure. There was some kind of vertical line, which gave opportunity. I even think that there could be a new Party organized, based on the Maidan. But it didn't happen...

IM: Ok. If to speak about the potential of the phenomena, about the real results, what would you call as the achievements and what were the failures?

IB: As to the achievements... The society has changed. Not so greatly, considering our society, but still. For example, there are such a press releases: "How has the society, how have we changed". People became more self-confident, started to feel and understand their rights much better. When we asked: "How had the society changed?" Half of the people, who were being questioned, answered that they would fight for their rights. And when they were being asked: "Are you personally ready to fight for your rights", one-third answered positively. That's a lot. The volunteer movement appeared. Volunteers take the first place according to trustworthiness. People believe in them more than in the church. State community and the attitude towards the public organizations gained a positive evaluation for the first time in the history, because before that attitude was absolutely negative. So, public initiatives and public movements appeared, and it was a positive change.

Outcomes
Creation of civil society

IM: And if to evaluate the Soviet inheritance in the Ukrainian society, it's influence and existence.

IB: Forget about it! There is no Soviet inheritance in Ukraine. Yes, there are some elderly people...

IM: ...And what about the social experience, and about the events in the year 2014, could it be considered an elimination of the Soviet inheritance?

IB: Bullshit! It did not have any meaning for the Soviet inheritance at all. Those who were 30-35 years old at the time of Soviet Union for now are old as the sea. What the hell are you speaking about? Yes, there are some people who still remember the Soviet times, they wear little stripes with specific colors. I used to write about that in *Nove Vremya*, and got so much feedback! Let them live in peace, don't trouble them.

IM: And what would you say about the youth, who are trying to be nostalgic even not knowing what they are feeling nostalgic for, because they were not even born when the Soviet Union existed?

IB: They are not nostalgic, trust me! They are just repeating some foolish things after someone, that's all. They know nothing about the Soviet Union. Nostalgia is an emotion. And they are just trying to look better than they are. A grandma says that living at the times of the Soviet Union was cool, because all the people had jobs. And for a person who is unemployed this might be easy to think: "It was really good to live in the Soviet Union because every person was employed"

Part VI 1:20:06

IM: Ok. But tell me please if we can consider the events taking place from the year 1990 till 2014 as some kind of long-lasting events?

IB: To tell you the truth, everything in the society is long lasting...

IM: And do you see the aim of this all? The final point? What will be the end of this process?

IB: I think the formation of a European country will happen. In spite of the fact that we were at the same place for a long period of time, and there were two steps back, and one ahead, jumping in place or steps aside. But in fact we are moving forwards. Slowly, but we are going in the right

direction. We are separating from Russia more and more. We are not going in the same direction with Russia. We are going in opposite directions...

IM: Explain, please, what way is Ukraine going and what way is Russia going?

IB: We are going towards a civilized European society, and Russia is going the way of dictatorship. Before that they had a kind of “vegetarian”, “civilized” authoritarianism. The main index for me is the attitude to sociology. When the leading company “Levada Center” was closed and people working there were called traitors and foreign agents, it reminds me of the Soviet Union, when we did not have any sociological agencies or polling at all. In Poland they existed. Secretly, but existed. In Yugoslavia it existed too. Such agencies simply did not exist in our country. And nowadays in Russia they do not have any independent sociology.

IM: I do understand. Can you see find any connections between this process – 25 years of the social development and the history of the 20th century? Can you tell me about some similarities that can be traced?

IB: Thank God that the events of 1917 were not repeated in our country. But I am really afraid that the third Maidan could resemble the revolution which happened in 1917.

History
Events in 1917

IM: Did the events of Ukrainian history of the 20th century have any meaning for the development of events since 1990?

IB: I think there was a kind of decline. The decline in Ukraine started in 1917 and the positive processes began in the middle of 1960s. For sure, it was a kind of “renaissance”.

IM: Did the movement of 60s have some influence on the events of 1990?

IB: Yes, it had.

IM: In what form?

IB: Do you remember the phrase that the “Decembrists had woken Herten from his long dream” and so on. Here is the same situation. Someone had to be first. They were the first.

IM: I have a question concerning the members of the process from the year 1990 till 2014. What is your opinion concerning the participation in the previous protests, did it influence the desire or unwillingness to participate in the next ones?

IB: Yes, of course! Let’s take such famous figures as Naboka, Doniy. For example. But there were some other, too. For instance, Pikchovshyk also participated.

IM: But his trajectory was slightly different, wasn’t it? And if to speak about the society in general and about other citizens? After being disappointed in the events of 2005, were they willing to participate in the events of 2014?

IB: For sure, they were willing. Do you think, some Martians came from the other planet to help us? There were the same people from Ukraine!

IM: So, this desire still existed, and dissatisfaction as well?

IB: Dissatisfaction always finds a way out, in one or another way, if the society is not punished. Our authorities do not understand that democracy gives the opportunity to live without revolutions. I have always said that revolutions appear at a time when the democracy mechanisms stop working. Democracy in Europe started to develop intensively after our October Revolution had taken place. It is like opening of the hot pot – when appears the chance to let some steam out, an opportunity to dismiss the authorities but quietly, without serious troubles and revolutions, a possibility to say calmly that the authorities are the “bullshit” and not to be imprisoned.

History
Revolution as the results of stopping democracy progress

words are out – and you feel much more comfortable. I mean, there are two ways – to press the society strongly, so it will be a dictator regime, or, as in Ukraine, people went to the streets.

IM: You said that the third Maidan can be like the revolution which took place in 1917. Why?

IB: Because there were two failures already and people have guns at their disposal. The second Maidan was without guns. I am sure that people had some kind of weapon but it was prohibited even to show that you had a gun. Because it was clear – if everyone takes a gun there will be a lot of blood. And what we can see now? Someone had thrown a bomb and the mess started. Chaos... And chaos is scary. The Maidan was regulated. There was a discipline in groups of the hundreds of “sotnyas”.

IM: But why did it happen so? They were absolute strangers, who didn't know each other, and suddenly they became the disciplined “sotnya” members?

IB: Those without discipline were simply thrown out. That's all. The drunk were not accepted, there were no drunk people in the sotnyas at all. You know, I was with them on New Year's Day with these people. And they simply felt that it was not possible. To be drunk. Yes, they celebrated New Years, but there was only one bottle of champagne for a company which consisted of 4-6 people. That's all. They had a reason and opportunity to drink a lot, but they didn't do it

IM: You mean that mentality was different?

IB: I mean that they were literate, responsible, intelligent people, a lot of from middle class...

IM: But why did such people appear on the Maidan?

IB: To tell the truth, we call that a revolution – the Revolution of Dignity, and it was really... There were no economic demands. There were the demands to change the authorities, to change the corruption, etc.

**Revolution of
Dignity
Motivation**
Fight against
corruption
Change the
.. ..

IM: Fine. And what about the results and disappointments of the year 2014?

IB: You see, the disappointment mainly was because people from the society started living their own life in their own little worlds. Because of the aggressiveness. Because of the war. The war became one of the main disappointments in the authorities. Our people have understood that there is no other alternative. We may criticize the authorities, and we have to do this, but there are much more important things to do. The war takes our attention now.

Outcomes

War in Eastern
Ukraine

IM: Is there any connection between the Maidan and the war?

IB: Yes. Because Russia understood that Ukraine was going away. And it was a kind of gesture of despair, I think. To tell the truth, Ukraine was going away, and they thought (may be, due to sociological data) that they could obtain half of Ukraine. The Concept of “Novorossia” is forgotten by now, but in the spring of 2014 this idea was very popular in Russia. But the events took absolutely a different character.

Russia's Policy

War
Concept of
“Novorossia”

IM: What was the role of the oligarchy and politicians from abroad in the year 2014?

IB: They played a very important role. The issue is that there can't be oligarchs in Ukraine which are on the side of Russia, because they do not want us to...and these are not my words, but the words of Mostova... she used to say “Texas should be robbed by the people from Texas”.

IM: You mean that the oligarchs supported the Maidan in 2014?

IB: No, no! They didn't support the Maidan, I am not speaking about the Maidan! They decided to wait. I would say, they didn't want to support Yanukovich.

IM: But why?

IB: Because they were also “fed up” with his politics. Because Yanukovich wanted to be the only oligarch in our country, the main oligarch, and they didn’t want it. After the events their behavior was different. But again, there was a difference between the oligarchs from Donetsk region, as we can say, from the Yanukovich “family” and the other ones, from the other regions. The other oligarchs didn’t support Yanukovich. And they had been trying to change something. They tried to stay in Donbas and to live as they had lived before. And now we can see what the results are.

Situation
Fight between
oligarchy clans

IM: What was the role of the Church on the Maidan?

IB: The Church supported the Maidan. The one exception was – the Moscow Patriarchy Orthodox Church.

IM: Was it important for the people on the Maidan?

IB: Yes, sure! The Church supported us! It was really of great importance! There were many religious people on the Maidan and it was really important for them to realize that the Church was on their side.

External support
Clergy

IM: And what about the politicians from abroad?

IB: It was also very important. We had to know that the “civilized world” supported us.

IM: Ok. We have already finished with our questions. Can you summarize this all?

IB: You know, Ukraine has a very interesting history. And I think that one day the history of Ukrainian revolutions will be included in textbooks in world history courses. The history of the French revolution is included there, so of our revolutions will be included too. We used to learn world history. There are so many countries in the world, but we didn’t learn about the history of the Netherlands, or some other interesting countries, unfortunately. But we had to read about the

history of France because French revolutions took place there. We have already had two revolutions, so Ukraine will be included in the history books as a very successful country or as a failed state. But certainly, it will be included.