

Interview with Mikhail Kanafotskyi. Interviewer: Kateryna Pryschepa. Place of record: Kyiv.

KP: Good afternoon. Thank you very much for agreeing to this interview. Allow me to formally introduce ourselves. My name is Kateryna Pryshchepa, I work for the College of Europe - Natolin Campus. We are implementing a project called "Three Revolutions. The investigation of protests between 1990 and 2014". The College of Europe is the main partner of this project, our institutional partners in Ukraine are the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy, and several other well-known international institutes, including: the Ukrainian Studies Institute of Harvard University, Alberta University, and the University College London (England). We are collecting evidence about the participants of the protests - beginning with the Revolution on Granite, the Orange Revolution, and then Euromaidan. The materials we record will be used for academic purposes, i.e. for analysis, information search and analysis, and for use by scholars. This is why we record them. This was a short information about the project. And I would ask you to introduce yourself, too.

MK: My name is Mykhailo Kanafotskyi. During the first revolution – the Revolution on Granite – I was a student of the Physics Department of Lviv University and I also belonged to the student organization called "The Student Fraternity". I am currently working as a counselor at the Patriarchal Curia of the Ukrainian Greek Catholic Church, in the department of relations with state party structures and organizations.

KP: Then we will start with the very first protest – the Revolution on Granite – which is considered the first for our project. Could you tell us shortly what was the reason, and what was the prehistory of your participation in the hunger strike? And what were the reasons for your joining that Student Fraternity?

MK: Well, you see, there is a very nice phrase “God forbid you live in a time of change”. I would paraphrase it into “God let us live in a time of change”. In fact, I was studying during those years. I came back from the army in 1988 and continued studying at the Physics department and that was when the first movements triggered in Western Ukraine. So, first I joined that movement – there were some people from the Ukrainian Helsinki Union – I still remember how I went to our oldest physician, his name was Ivan Makar, and I brought a Declaration of Human rights on a very fine rolling paper from him. It was 1988. Probably, all those events had already begun by that time. Then there was the Ukrainian Language Society. Then the movement itself began, and in 1989 the student organization appeared, this Student Fraternity, in Lviv, and later on it spread to many other oblasts [regions]. And so this Student Fraternity appeared simultaneously in several institutes of higher education, it appeared first in spring, so the first official public appearances took place in spring of 1989. The biggest centers of the Student Fraternities were concentrated at the Lviv Polytechnic [institute] and at the University. I belonged to the University’s Student Fraternity as well as to the administration of the Lviv Student Fraternity. This is how it all started: with the rebirth of culture and history... So we started our work by regenerating the remembrance, i.e. the national traditions – songs, holidays, especially the ritual ones. So, first and foremost, there were the songs of the Sich Rifleman and so on. We were also visiting different regions of the Western and later Eastern Ukraine - restoring monuments of the Sich Riflemen, some other historical memorable places, etc. And, basically this was how it started and it gave us an opportunity to, let’s say, test our capacity to work, and to become more united/organized. And so many people did not like it. We were taking an active part in destroying Komsomol. So we were working very actively in all the institutes of higher education to at least reform it. We worked very actively to integrate a self-government in the institutes of higher education, even to change curriculum somehow. Let’s take our Lviv University, for instance. It was the first institute which adopted the Statute... it was 1990 already, or 1989? I don’t remember. So it was a University Statute which was very progressive. We chose a rector. And not only the professors and scientists took part in it, but students too. Vakarchuk became this rector. That was when we made a decision: it became the first institute of higher education in Ukraine where at the general assembly

there was decided to put a Ukrainian national flag on the university. It was basically the first Ukrainian institute of higher education and it also was one of the first state institutions where the Ukrainian national flag was hoisted. So we were working in several directions: national rebirth and everything connected with the protection of students' rights. Different situations occurred, for example, when our friend from Georgia, Gia Gongadze, arrived. He was such a friend of the Student Fraternity, he was one of the organizers of the students' youth actions in Tbilisi, when there was a fight with digging tools. And so he was telling us about all those events and how it actually happened. We were also holding an action of solidarity, it was a one-day hunger strike near Lviv Opera. The Ukrainian Student Union also held the same action in Kyiv. It was a one-day hunger strike for the sake of solidarity with the Chinese students, who were practically destroyed then on Tiananmen Square. There were lots of such nuances, even when the students' movement was developing. Like when the students went out to protest in Kyiv, they were arrested and put in the Investigation Cell. Our students came to Kyiv to liberate students from Kyiv and our students were arrested too. After that bigger students' strikes were launched all around the Western Ukraine, Lviv Oblast, and Lviv City. And those strikes involved thousands of people. It was a lot for that time. It was already a very powerful force, which got even bigger later, as many others were joining it. Such actions were happening in different cities and were held simultaneously. And, as I have said already, everything came from our culture, right? And in this process it was clear that we could not stop, we had to do something more serious. After the students' arrests in spring of 1990, the heads of the Kyiv and Lviv organizations agreed to implement some bigger action in Kyiv for the following autumn. The format of the action had not yet been decided, but the preparation was held simultaneously in Kyiv and Lviv, coordinating it from time to time. But basically we were preparing it by ourselves. We also held our first festival "Vyvykh 90" (in Ukrainian: *Bubux 90*) in Lviv in May, 1990, it was a festival of the Ukrainian underground, and was coordinated by the Student Fraternity. We managed to gather a small amount of money for tickets, tents etc. That is how we prepared for the strike.

KP: But the main initiator was the Lviv Fraternity, wasn't it?

MK: You know it is hard to say who the main organizer was. There was a desire from both sides. It was clear that it could not go on like this. However, there was some difference between the Lviv Student Fraternity and the Ukrainian Student Union. The Student Fraternity was more politically engaged, if I can say so. And the Ukrainian Student Union consisted of representatives from eastern regions and they were more inclined to the trade union movements. Not that they were more passive, but we had to take into account there was another situation in Eastern Ukraine. Well, what I know is that the first talks about the implementation of such an action took place in the spring. Then some more specific agreements were done later in Zaporizhia - when some event connected with Cossacks took place there.

KP: Was it in spring of 1990?

MK: No, it was not spring, it was summer already. Yes, everything concerning the schedule was arranged more specifically by then, and it became clear that there was going to be a hunger strike. However, it was hard to predict how long it was going to last. And so we were getting ready - some technicalities were also unknown. They agreed to be held simultaneously this action in Lviv and Kyiv. Nonetheless, we were for sure relying on ourselves. We had some grounds not to trust several individuals, but it makes no difference now.

KP: Those were people from the Student Union?

MK: Yes. There were some moments - in other words, first and foremost, we had to rely upon ourselves. When our boys were in Zaporizhia making arrangements about that action, I was in Bulgaria, in Sofia. I got acquainted with student leaders of that time. It was immediately after the events in Sofia, where they practically won. And, as a result, one in five student leaders or student youth leaders came to their Parliament. It seems to me it was either spring or summer of 1990. And I saw the student tent cities, they, however, had another character, they had rather an informational character. Because it was summer already and everything already ended, and so there were only the students disseminating some pamphlets etc. But I

remembered the format very well. There were some talks about the occupational strikes, because that was how they took over their university. So I talked about those formats in the beginning of September here in Lviv, when we were already in the process of preparation. And the way how it was going to look like slowly began to emerge. So it was clear that the action had to take place on one of the central Maidans in Kyiv, and it was clear it had to be a hunger strike, i.e. it had to be an act of self-sacrifice. In any case, the basic part of the Student Fraternity did not have such extreme positions as to go and ruin something and things like that. In other words, all our actions had to be peaceful, drastic, as an act of self-sacrifice. We saw it as a hunger strike. It became clear we would need the tents - which we had to create a tent city in Kyiv. The only thing we did not take into account was that it could last for so long. We thought it would be just as it happened in the past. But we were really getting ready for the worst consequences. We even assumed that the first group we sent there could at minimum be arrested and at maximum could be like it was in Tbilisi. There were no thoughts about Tiananmen. We didn't want to think about such a result. But in fact we were ready. Those who were going there – this first group – were ready. And the groups to rotate with them were getting ready at once. In other words, it had to permanently go on like that. And in fact there was only a question of the date. We had been speaking publicly about implementing such an action for a month already. It was announced at the meeting - we did not announce what specifically it would be like, but we were saying that the students were preparing some serious actions. We had to start on the first of October, but we had organized a big meeting, a movement and so on. And that is why we decided to leave it until the second of October.

KP: May I ask a question about the Bulgarians? I didn't know about that - and that is why it is interesting. Were there any other elements of the formats of protest borrowed from them?

MK: Well, the thing is that we didn't borrow everything directly from them. That is to say, we knew from the books about the format of the tent cities, for instance. So the form of organizing was already examined by us. First, we already knew about the experience of those political prisoners, who were held under arrest for so long. Second, we had the experience of holding a one-day hunger strike, and finally the experience of the boys put into the remand center, they had also announced a hunger strike in Kyiv. So basically this format was clear. As for the tent city, we knew there was such a variant. And the fact that they discovered such format was used in Bulgaria was simply an additional confirmation.

KP: That means that Bulgarian students lived in the tent city for some time, didn't they?

MK: Yes, but they were there for another reason. Those tent cities were not actually "cities". There were several tents on one of the central squares, next to some institutes of higher education etc.

KP: That is clear.

MK: In other words, they had another role. It was an informative role. No one was on a hunger strike there, of course. It was all different. And the tent city there was serving another purpose. It was clear people had to be on the spot, that people had to hide from rain somewhere, and so on.

KP: Then I have a question. You say it was being prepared and announced beforehand – what was your interaction, if I can use this word here, with the representatives of the government? Were the police and universities' administration interested in how it was going to be?

MK: First, they didn't know exactly when our action was going to take place. As for the university administration - the thing is Lviv is not Kyiv. And if the university administrations did not provide any support officially, and there were, let's say, those trying to persuade us somehow that it was not worth it, and tried to intimidate the students with possible expulsion and so on. Yet in 1989 the students taking part in some actions were expelled - for example Markiyan Ivashchyn. But in other universities it was difficult to do something with those students. For instance, at the Student Fraternity in Economic and Trade University there was some student called Khoroshchyn – they could not expel him when he had only excellent grades. And so we had quite great support, as there was the national movement with a number of scholars and professors who joined it, the Association of the Ukrainian language, so there was support on the part of the universities. As for the police, they did not have any claims on me, I had problems only after 1992. I know only that there were such problems in Kyiv. Obviously, there might have

been some problems in Lviv, too, with some individuals, but I cannot be more specific. I know that there were some efforts to persuade us not to do anything and especially at the time when the hunger strike had already began, even the deputies of the then-Narodna Rada were trying to stop us.

KP: You mean when they were coming to the Maidan in Kyiv?

MK: Yes, it was perceived ambiguously.

KP: If, as you say, there wasn't such a violent attempt to break up, arrest etc. on the second of October...

MK: You see, the situation had been tense for several days. Prisoner transport vehicles together with police had been standing on Maidan for several days. They just weren't given an order. They were putting it off till the evening, until Kyiv Rada would allow to hold the action. There was more police near Verkhovna Rada for some reason. They were concentrated there and in Mariyinskyi Park. There were of course some at Moskva hotel, the present Ukrayina hotel, and basically they didn't let us put up tents for a while until we managed to put some tens of tents in some 10 minutes.

KP: Was it the second of October?

MK: Yes, in the evening. And on the third of October the weather became freezing. The snow began to fall. It was one more surprise. And then we had to give credit to the boys from Kyiv. Taras Korpalo was the commander of the Kyiv camp. I was responsible for the Lviv part, while Taras Korpalo was responsible for Kyiv. So he brought the first camping cots from Hydropark, as far as I know, first there were dozens of them and later even hundreds of them. And soon people started to bring different things, although such a cold weather was a surprise for everyone. And, actually, when we were going to the hunger strike – people now say that it was for health reasons. No one was thinking about it at the time. Imagine hundreds of people going by train to Maidan, they have eaten what they'd got (laughs), what they'd bought or what

somebody had given to them – because tomorrow they are going to start a hunger strike. The first two days of the strike they were still drinking tea – herbal tea, after that only boiled water was allowed. And owing to such a poor preparation, there were some problems connected with intoxication and the like things. So no one started the hunger strike using any specific method.

KP: Was there any interaction with other people? Did the Kyiv residents take interest in what was going on there, or they were simply passing by? What were the talks?

MK: This is the most interesting thing. The most interesting were the night duties, or not necessarily the night ones, and when you are on duty, when you see the same people passing by every single day. First, people did not understand. They were afraid. They were frightened, women, of course, felt sorry, there were even those who were simply intimidated – there were different cases. Mainly it was a support, and it was noticeable how many people were rotating. People saw that it was happening genuinely. This action was sincere, there had not been such a thing as a bribe, there hadn't been any political technologies, and it was all just as we could manage to do it. Youth were also participating as they considered it to be their obligation and wanted to change something. And people were changing and shifting, one could notice it via telegrams and letters. But there were different situations, of course. Old women were bringing things, they wanted to help, although we were refusing to take things. And there were plenty of funny situations. There were some girls of a "corresponding" demeanor and when one such girl came at night, tears falling down her cheek, she gives some grapes, and you understand that she is overcoming some turning point too. In other words, there were different cases. Although there were pure provocations, for instance, where someone brought some acid instead of tea in the thermos. Luckily someone accidentally touched it – it was a big thermos containing some 1.5 or 2 liters – at it fell on some newspapers and it yellowed at once, and so on. Luckily for us it happened so. There was also a situation when someone was throwing thunder-flashes out of the exit located close to the main Post office. I mean it was thrown onto Maidan but from the direction of the main Post office. And as it turned out later, it was done by a military student.

KP: Did he do it himself or was he inspired, if I can say so, by someone?

MK: Well, we don't know the whole story. We only know he was caught and the police took him in, but we don't know how it all ended. So we thought he was acting alone. But I am not sure about it. There was one interesting situation, when the veterans had to march – it was Kyiv Liberation Day – there had to be a parade and everybody was afraid of how it was going to be. We were afraid of how the “banderivtsi” – the Bandera adherents - would “throw around” those veterans. It was clear that it was a provocation to let them walk through Khreshchatyk Street. And it happened. A part of them consisted of elderly people – they were going through the street by buses, and a part of them were walking. And the reaction was approximately the following: despite some abusive words from one part of the veterans, from the students everything was positive. There were words of glory to the warriors who protected us and so on. Of course, we had clearly expressed our position against the communist party, but the fact that they had been at war and that they somehow ended this war led us to give these warriors the credit due. And so it passed peacefully.

KP: Had you seen many mass media representatives?

MK: A lot.

KP: A lot? Were they Ukrainian mass media or...?

MK: There was a woman - a French photo correspondent. There were also a lot of representatives of the international agencies, there were Russian, the ones from Moscow, there were, as far as I can remember, “Namedni” TV program, I don't remember its name...

KP: “Vzgliad”?

MK: “Vzgliad”, right. Our media representatives were there, too. They were as supportive as they could be. Moreover, there was also such a situation: we aimed at getting on air. And there was a strike group

organized on TV and “the first” and “the second” radio. They gathered enough signatures to show the support of the students, and then we got on air.

KP: Were there phone calls?

MK: Sorry?

KP: Did it allow phone calls from the audience?

MK: No, it didn't. We could only say what we wanted.

KP: Did you have any contacts with the Kyiv Rada or Verkhovna Rada? How was that happening?

MK: Well, we were in contact with Kyiv Rada, it contained some deputies from the movement, and some different structures. So it was quite progressive at that time and it took much effort to hold this action. As for Verkhovna Rada, first there were no contacts, but later of course we made some. And some of the deputies joined our strike. First, some deputies from the National Rada were coming. There were many of them. A part of those deputies wanted to interfere and to command a bit as, for instance Stepan Smar and some others. But we said to them, “Do you want to help us? Then put on the headband and start a hunger strike”. (Laughs). And they did, wearing those headbands. Then Kravchuk came, the head of the police was general Nedryhailo, and he was the one we could at least negotiate with. He was a bit different person than the one we have here now - or have been here lately. Then a group in Verkhovna Rada was created. This group was led by Vikhnovskiy. And a conciliation group was also created, I don't remember for sure when exactly, but it was perhaps more than a week after the beginning of the protest. The group consisted of five representatives of the students, five representatives of Narodna Rada, and five representatives of the majority. I was present among the students at the conciliation group and at that time already it was clear that we had to do something, as it all could go out of control. Well, first, the camp grew very big. Second,

large actions launched all around Kyiv, the strikes began, universities and even schools stopped working, and people started to go out in columns in different cities, both in the West and East. We were also in contact with the independent trade unions, and they were preparing and organizing something. In other words, Ukraine began to rise. Although the seventh, eighth – from the 4th till the 10th day – were the most difficult. Because those who were taking part in the hunger strike from the first day were exhausted, some of them were even taken to the hospitals. We had several prohibitions: those who were serving or guarding were not allowed to take part in a hunger strike. Although they sometimes switched. Ladies were not allowed to participate. And a dry hunger strike was also forbidden. Although several men were doing so. They were aware of what they were doing. One of those students was already dead. But they were doing it, and they had problems, they were falling into comas, so there were certain difficulties. And the problem was that we couldn't "wake" Kyiv up. It seemed to be asleep. The problem was that there were less active citizens than in Lviv. Basically, they were doing all they could, but there were very few of them. And those groups arriving from Western Ukraine here, together with the representatives from Kyiv they were going to the universities and trying to motivate Kyiv institutions of higher education. There were some Kyiv citizens but mainly there were people from Lviv, and we managed to wake Kyiv up on approximately the tenth day. Khreshchatyk Street had already been blocked off, first it wasn't closed off, it happened later. First they blocked the street during some meetings, but later it became permanently closed. And on the 15th of October, there was the biggest gathering of people, I believe. There were perhaps one hundred or even more – one hundred twenty thousand people. Then the breach of the Verkhovna Rada happened. And basically, if we so desired, we could come into the Rada. But we stopped. On the stairs.

KP: And how many...?

MK: And then the second camp city was organized in front of Verkhovna Rada.

KP: What was the minimum and maximum of people living in the camp cities at its peak?

MK: At its height, it was towards the end, there were almost a thousand people in the camp cities. The upper camp city was located near Verkhovna Rada and included around one hundred people, and in the lower camp city there were near a thousand - there were so many people that it was hard to manage them.

So in the morning we were taking people to the universities, making some visits to the Left-Bank etc. Unfortunately, I cannot say how many people, in what time period, were simultaneously participating in the hunger strike. But in fact there were more than a hundred people participating from its beginning till the end - Ihor Kotsyuruba will confirm it. But there were more than a hundred for sure. I mean, among those who were starving from the beginning till the end i.e. from the second till the 17th of October.

KP: I also have a question about the trade unions. Were there any contacts? There is certain information about the miners, which joined at some point. Were there any trade unions in general, taking into account that, as you say, the Ukrainian student union was connected with politics...?

MK: You see, there were both the Ukrainian Student Union and the Student Fraternity. They existed in certain regions. So when our actions were held in other regions, we were supported by, for instance, Komsomol, which turned into the Democratic Youth Association here and there. And they supported those requests together with the representatives from the trade union organizations. Miner trade unions were the most well-organized and powerful. In fact, there were very few other representatives of the trade unions. But in general miner trade unions were best organized back in those days. There were hardly any other unions.

KP: Were they holding any actions in their cities or did you have direct contacts with them?

MK: We didn't have direct contacts, but they were also dictating their demands and sending their support to us. So basically a full nationwide strike was being prepared. Leninska Kuznya was striking, too. So back in the day we were very close to making all of Kyiv rise.

KP: My parents worked in Leninska Kuznya...

MK: So even they... Even taking into account that it was a military facility.

KP: And another question, a more curious one: how was it decided who should go to Verkhovna Rada? Was there any voting or decisions made afterwards? How were those individuals selected?

MK: What do you mean by Verkhovna Rada?

KP: The public appearance of the co-chairmen.

MK: Oh. It is actually very simple. As for who were there - Markiyan Ivashchynshyn departed to Lviv, and Ihor Kotsyuruba took his place in Kyiv, while he was away. But he was mostly involved in work with some actions on the street – not politics. There were some other individuals and Oles Doniy was the one who could talk and look good. It wasn't decided or done on purpose, we just determined that he should do it, and he himself wanted it.

KP: Well someone else could have wanted it too, but you made up your mind...

MK: As far as I know, Markiyan was among those who from the start exerted the most effort to it, he wouldn't have done it if he didn't want to, but he did not need it.

KP: But in summing up, do you think that the hunger strike turned out to be successful? How do you estimate the results of this action?

MK: Well, you see, it wasn't fully accomplished. Our problem was that we relied on our seniors, let's say, friends, who eventually a little bit ... I can't say what they did. I believed that we should have put more effort in dismissing the Verkhovna Rada, so to some extent we reached a compromise - although there was said that the early elections should be held. Though by the time elections were supposed to be held

everybody, including the Narodna Rada, voted to raise the age limit. And because of this change in the age limit most of our leaders – a prevailing majority of our leaders - could not get into the parliament because of this age limit. So now we could do something different. It was clear that Masol, as they say, was not the worst one, but some of the officials from that government used to say so. Concerning the Communist Party, you see how long it had lasted and even up to those days the process of de-communization had not been accomplished. Because formally there were several ways to break it, but in fact this was a serious thing as it was. As for the other demands, yes, our boys were not supposed to serve in the army outside the country, and that was a big benefit. And as one government left, another government came. Nonetheless, I believe it produced a positive result because some turning point happened. It was a kind of the first spiritual revolution for Ukraine, when the youth showed that it was possible to live differently, and that it was possible to make a self-sacrifice, and to do something and change something. And then people rose up, Kyiv rose up and the whole of Ukraine rose up - one could see it, and it was a wave. Some people come to power, other people don't - this is all rubbish. The main thing is that change begins inside people. And all those stages the Ukrainian people went through – the whole Ukrainian society went through - with the Maidans, they were changing us. As long as a person doesn't change him or herself, unfortunately, we won't gain anything.

KP: I would also like to know some more details. There are some Church representatives on many pictures. How was it? And which religions were there?

MK: Actually there were not very many of them. Greek Catholics “came out of hiding”. There was an autocephalous church and an Orthodox one. There wasn't such a division back in the day. So basically it was everybody. We had seminarians from Greek Catholics, also had the Student Fraternity there. They were also taking part in a hunger strike. I do not remember exactly, but I do remember that the chapel on Maidan was at that time already an inter-confessional one.

KP: I didn't know about that.

MK: This was an interesting phenomenon.

KP: Turning back to the requirements, how did this list of requirements happen to appear? Was it discussed beforehand or did it spontaneously come into being?

MK: No, why? Of course it had been discussed.

KP: And why all those very requirements but not the planned withdrawal from Afghanistan?

MK: First of all, our goal was to make Ukraine independent. Concerning Afghanistan the process of withdrawing had already begun, and it was important for us to allow our boys to serve here in Ukraine. First, it would guarantee that the army would not turn against us, that it would be our boys. Concerning the others, a part of the requirements had already been formulated at once and coordinated between Kyiv and Lviv.

KP: Then... let's try to briefly discuss the Orange Revolution and Maidan. We can reconstruct the way you remember the order of events. Or we can try to first answer the question whether the revolution on Granite influenced the way Maidan started – I mean the form of protest. Were you there when the first tents were pitched in 2004?

MK: There was a period of time between it. There was also the action “Ukraine without Kuchma” - I don't call it a revolution because there wasn't a Maidan as such – however, I do believe that it was a serious stage. As for the second Maidan, despite people rising up and everyone knowing what they were standing for, this second Maidan had been prepared beforehand. I wasn't there from the very beginning. I was connected, but not directly. I had many acquaintances there, including “Samooborona”, it wasn't “Samooborona” back in the day, and including “Pora”, and actually among those in security services. But I wasn't directly involved. I helped when people were bringing some things, but I am not sure that really counts. Basically, I wasn't involved in any political party any more than others. I was just coming, talking and consulting with those who were there from the beginning. But I didn't have any role in its management, and I didn't take an active part in it.

KP: But you mentioned “Ukraine without Kuchma”, to what extent did that influence the events of Maidan 2004?

MK: The thing is that the dissatisfaction was gradually growing, but people got really sick and tired when the election campaign was held in December of 2004. And, people might have probably not supported Yushchenko, but rather just stand up for their rights. Although, you know that in fact there is no choice, there is only illusion of choice. Unfortunately, the system we have puts us into a difficult bind. In other words, we think we have to choose, but we have no choice. Yes, there are two individuals, but in the long run the choices should be different. So I had information about what was going to happen and that some falsifications were being prepared – I saw something and I knew something as I was engaged in some information work, so it was clear that it all was moving towards electing Yanukovych [for President]. Although, at the end of the day, what I didn’t like most in that election campaign was that Russian political technologists programmed the split of Ukraine beforehand. This is when it began, although it started even earlier – during Kuchma’s time, but now it started explicitly. The posters on which Ukraine was divided appeared - but I believe it was even deeper, because those political technologists were Russian and they... After 2004 I remember well how all those moments concerning Eastern regions were being implemented. When that Georgian ribbon was introduced together with many other things. I was working on UT1 Channel, I was an analyst, and I remember who was the most active – this channel came to be called “INTER” later. This is how it all began to be implemented.

KP: Turning back to the Orange Revolution and taking into account only formal characteristics: was it similar to the Revolution on Granite or not?

MK: In principle, it was, in the light of many moments. It started in a similar way. There were some people performing their call of duty or due to their party affiliation they had to be there and they became a bulk of what was organized there. But then people came, people came by themselves, in other words, even though some say they were bribed to attend - there could have been some people who got paid for it - but many people were sincerely there on their own. And, once again, this second revolution was a very powerful spiritual breakthrough. Such a tremendous potential was formed then and I remember how Marynovych

and some others were trying to get into the Trade Unions building, to get to the administration - it was the time when people were on the rise, first of all it was a spiritual rise. So we had to do something with that spiritual rise, as, if it isn't consolidated, it will never lead us to any consequences. Then comes the peak, and the fall follows it, this is what they call "a reverse reaction", or a dragon tail hit, or the other end of the stick - they call it in a variety of ways. This is when people lose their faith, after all, just as it happens now. Anyway, it was a very powerful spiritual turning point, and what is most interesting, Kyiv and the eastern Ukraine were becoming more and more active. It was very important. In other words, it was increasing constantly.

KP: Then let's turn back for one more question: was the period after the 1990s characterized by some kind of sinking, perhaps, into disappointment, sinking into despair?

MK: Well, it was a little, of course. Because, perhaps such a reverse phase began in the end of 1990 and the beginning of 1991. In other words again they started to attack the organizations, to arrest people, they did many different things. There were many incidents: even by means of using the media, they said that every student taking part in the hunger strike were paid \$200 a day. It was written so. I cannot even tell you how long one could live for \$200 at that time (laughs).

KP: But who could provide the money?

MK: Well, it might have been CIA... they wrote about it. They said it was all paid up, and, of course, that was ludicrous. But this is how it was. So everything was done in order to negate the spirit, to produce the depression. But then "Chervona Ruta" of the 1991 and the putsch took place - that is one more interesting story to tell, we couldn't get bored... They tried to stop our movement before it got started. The worst happened probably after 1994 when the participants of that youth community grew up, some of them became the deputies, some of them didn't, but the problem was that the situation in the country was changing, it improved in terms of economics, so basically there was a struggle with the communist regime and everything seemed to be clear. When the process of privatization began afterwards, the same authority but in a different form was passed on to those who had strong influence, and it became the new power structures, i.e. the public persecutors office, Komsomol members etc. in other words, everyone who had an

opportunity to somehow buy up the assets and so on - they all did it; and the majority of those people who were connected to the revolution were left to be mere dreamers - although there were several of those men who also became successful.

KP: Let's try then to either finish or to put suspension points in this analysis. If we are talking about Maidan, can we compare the Revolution on Granite and the Orange Revolution?

MK: This last Maidan resembled the Revolution on Granite.

KP: Yes, but why is it so?

MK: I would say, this is how I feel. Yes. Why? Because regardless that the last Maidan was prepared by someone, everything went the way they did not expect, the prevailing majority of people were coming to it according to their own will. And it started as a sincere action. Students went there, and once again if the Orange Revolution was like a basis – not only the student went to that protest - way far more than students, this last action was started by the students too. And it was planned as a peaceful action. It was transformed only later. It was extremely advantages for someone to see it end in such a non-peaceful way, as it actually happened. But as it turned out I wasn't afraid anymore that it would resemble a Filipino variant, I thought that some other way would be found to persuade the authorities. Nonetheless, there was a provocation, and it led to such consequences.

KP: What do you think, during the last Maidan, to what extent were the protesters the subjects? In other words, who had the greatest impact on the situation, and did this impact change or had been modified in the course of time?

MK: That was a very big problem to make Maidan as such to be the subject. We wanted to do it. And there were certain efforts done to make it happen. The coordinating councils started working at once but the

problem was that “the other part” blocked all possibilities to do it, and it wasn't advantageous for any specific party now in power - just as it wasn't beneficial for them to let the workers of those civil society organizations and the people who went to Maidan be able to organize themselves and to be able to coordinate their actions. In other words, it wasn't beneficial for those who, owing to Maidan, came to power.

KP: Was there any chance to make this self-organization more influential or was this just the way it happened?

MK: No, there were chances...It happened so that those coordinating bodies did not manage to become effective - primarily as a result of outer influence. Basically, that coordinating body consisted of more than 100 organizations and people, so of course some things were kept hidden from us.

KP: And do you consider it was done on purpose?

MK: I believe it was to some extent done deliberately.

KP: How do you assess your function or your role during Maidan?

MK: Well, there I had a somewhat specific function. There were two directions to my work. I was already in church - in the Patriarchal Curia - and we had some moments concerning our participation, as well as the participation of the priests, chaplains, so we had to hold some actions, provide help with aid rooms being organized there, and there was that patriarchal shelter under our patriarch's cathedral. So once again there was such a phenomenon when different religions and different churches got together and everybody were praying together, and that is such a strange phenomenon for today's Europe. I heard about this delegation from the church council came to the Netherlands with their own money, and people couldn't understand how this could be real - neither could the politicians understand it. For instance, when the Pope's

representative was present at the council's meeting, he said "I have never seen the representatives of such different religions sitting and talking so peacefully and being able to show something to their country". And that is why I believe in principle that spiritual support was extremely important back at that time. And besides the fact that I had worked there, there were also several structures trying to analyze the situation and predict the consequences, and were trying to monitor all the information and network, the provocations etc. So, I was also involved in such activities.

KP: We have talked so much about the Revolution on Granite and it, in fact, is very valuable, but the last question: taking into account that such revolutions or Maidans take place pretty regularly in Ukraine, from your perspective as a participant, do you define it to be a typical way of political activity in Ukraine, and are those events logically interrelated? In other words, how do you estimate the role of such protests? Is it worth taking part in such protests if, heaven forbid, it requires such events every several years. So is it worth taking part in it? How do you estimate [the value of] the Maidans?

MK: First, it can happen, right? At the same time, the three Maidans we had were the variants of self-organization and the rising of the population, as people rose up by themselves. And this Maidan as such was some kind of Ukrainian phenomenon. From the very beginning it had been different, it wasn't aggressive from the start, it was only aggressive towards the end, because someone needed it, because it was advantageous for someone. But I consider it to be a kind of "boiler" which has gradually framed new ways of self-organization among society as such. I do not rule out that at this point some new form of self-government, some new form of building the state (like something that we call "a networking" society) has to be born here. This is where it is going. In other words, this is a special experimental platform, and, for sure, it is possible only here in Ukraine, because it wasn't such a thing in Russia - It would lead to fist fights at once there. The same would happen in the West. In other words, this is actually a phenomena of Ukraine. That is on the one hand. On the other hand there is another phenomenon: generally speaking, people are kind and sincere. Though, as you see, there is one problem, the so-called violation of "thou shalt not make into thee any graven image". So, the problem was that we created an idol, and bring this person to power, and then we go home, sit on our sofa, drink beer and wait until something will change. But nothing will change. Basically this Maidan needs to complete what it started, because all those Maidans, including the last one, happens right here [points to his heart]. All those Maidans are happening inside every specific person, they are going on in every specific hallway, because it is a way of thinking, a

struggle inside us. As the first who started it were young people, who wanted to self-organize, whose aim was not to invade something but to realize themselves. These were people who wanted to find personal fulfillment. And they didn't need that old system, because they couldn't achieve their goals in it. Why didn't they need that old system? Why did they see Europe? Because it was the best option, where they would have such possibility to fulfill themselves. Well, probably they haven't found any other options. And here you have an old system, a consumer system, which was shaped by, let us say, "the new poor ones", people who are poor not because of lacking money, though they are mainly poor in such a way too, but also spiritually poor. They are people of post-Soviet mentality. For example, let us take Eastern Ukraine. It is their own fault that they are who they are. It is not about working hard, their region has always been "a black zone". The locals don't know anything except going out from the mines and getting drunk. They always worked hard and didn't get anything back. Because it is a black zone and it doesn't matter how much money you invest there, the black zone will swallow it. There won't be any further growth and development. People didn't see any other way out, they didn't know what else could be done. There are actually many people elsewhere in Ukraine who don't want to change themselves, the problem is that many people want to be given something. But it doesn't work like that - nothing will happen without effort.

KP: Clear. Thank you very much for your time.