UNIVERSITY OF BELGRADE
FACULTY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Regional Master's Program in Peace Studies

MASTER'S THESIS

Revisiting the Orange Revolution and Euromaidan: Pro-Democracy Civil Disobedience in Ukraine

Academic supervisor:
Associate Professor Marko Simendić

Student:
Olga Vasilevich
9/18

Belgrade, 2020

Content

Introduction ……3

1. Theoretical section……..9
   1.1 Civil disobedience……9
   1.2 Civil society……... 19
   1.3 Nonviolence……... 24
Conclusion…… 31

2. Analytical section……..33
   2.1 The framework for disobedience…….…….. 33
   2.2 Orange Revolution……. 40
   2.3 Euromaidan…… 47
Conclusion…… 59

Conclusion…… 62

References…….67

INTRODUCTION

The Orange Revolution and the Revolution of Dignity have precipitated the ongoing Ukraine crisis. According to the United Nations Rights Office, the latter has claimed the lives of 13,000 people, including those of unarmed civilian population, and entailed 30,000 wounded (Miller 2019). The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees adds to that 1.5 million internally displaced persons (IDPs), 100,000 refugees and asylum-seekers (UNHCR 2014). The armed conflict is of continued relevance to Russia, Europe, as well as the United States. During the first 10 months, Russia invested USD 1 billion in it and continues to do so (Aleksashenko et al. 2015, 61). It also bears negative economic consequences: the free trade zone agreement was ceased, the sanctions against Russian companies and high-profile politicians were introduced, and the bilateral food embargo was imposed. In addition, the warfare is taking place in one of the biggest countries of the Eastern Europe, leading to the involvement of Germany and France as the peace brokers and such international organizations, as the OSCE, which is undertaking a Special Monitoring Mission (SMM) to Ukraine tasked with conflict resolution. Besides, the EU committed more than EUR 15 billion to a package of constitutional, electoral, judicial, energy, and other reforms (EU 2019). Lastly, the US ended in a renewed confrontation with Russia over its financial support of Ukraine's democratic insurgency, that is, the Orange Revolution and Euromaidan, and an increased military assistance in the conflict (Berger 2019). The Ukraine crisis caused by geopolitical tensions between the West and Russia is by far one of the thorniest in Europe; the armed violence persists since 2014, and so does the humanitarian disaster. To better understand the current on-the-ground situation, we seek to reexamine the motives behind both Orange Revolution and Euromaidan also known as the Revolution of Dignity.

From the theoretical standpoint, the value of the topic chosen lies in the assumption that the Orange Revolution and Euromaidan contained acts of civil disobedience as opposed to mere mass mobilization. It is our belief that the Ukrainians proved chief agents of social change, even though their efforts were intensified by means of external democratization. By the example of Ukraine, we would like to ascertain that the citizenry in the former republics of the Soviet Union are not necessarily unquestioningly obedient or voiceless; they are aware of the injustices of the system and oftentimes outspoken in their criticism of a government and its policies. A vibrant

civil society is one of the keystones of a robust democracy, and the people of Ukraine appear unyielding in their quest for it despite the overwhelming Russian political clout. Practically, the case studies under examination indicate the root causes of the current Ukraine crisis and help envision a workable settlement to it. As yet, a major breakthrough in negotiations has not been achieved, considering that the peace talks remain dominated by contradictory statements and reluctance to make political concessions by either party.

The war between Ukraine and Russia has been draining both countries of its people and resources for 6 years so far. For post-Euromaidan Ukraine, the annexation of Crimea followed by the Russian-backed separatist insurgency in Donbas meant the violation of sovereignty and territorial integrity, heavy military and civilian casualties, brain drain, badly damaged infrastructure, in addition to such persistent issues, as corruption, cronyism, poverty, unemployment, etc. Equally important, it signified a breach of trust between the Russians and Ukrainians, many of whom share common historical and cultural origins, have ties of kinship, or, for instance, hold Ukrainian citizenship and speak Russian as a mother tongue. As per Russia, going to war against Ukraine resulted in the imposition of severe economic sanctions, diplomatic isolation, and an ever-rising death toll of Russian troops. Moreover, Moscow has launched a full-scale information warfare, with state-owned TV-channels broadcasting government propaganda against Ukrainian “neo-fascism” and “terrorism” in order to justify the intervention therein. It is so ubiquitous that the Russian population is being manipulated into believing complete untruths. At the same time, the Ukrainian media has not been so skillful at debunking extremely enduring myths established by their Russian counterparts. It is against this backdrop that we made a decision to choose the two Ukrainian revolutions as prerequisites to understanding the basics of the continued struggle for democracy, which escalated into the war dimension.

The prime aim of this thesis is to establish that a number of pro-democratic political acts in Ukraine’s recent history qualify as political defiance. Driven by this objective, we get on with a two-fold task: first, we review the theory to point out the hallmarks of civil disobedience and second, we determine whether the Ukrainian protest events, notably the Orange Revolution and Euromaidan, include acts of civil disobedience.

This is a qualitative study based on the analysis of normative theoretical texts discussing civil disobedience and their application to a specific historical and political situation. To this end, we will consult a variety of relevant primary and secondary sources ranging from historical studies

and political science papers to media reports and official statistics that could shed light on the events of the Orange Revolution and the Revolution of Dignity, particularly on the activities of the protesters.

The introductory chapter demonstrates the pertinence of the topic and necessity for a solution, its theoretical and practical value, our motivation for choosing it, aims and tasks, research methods employed, thesis structure, key literature used, limitations, and aspects for further research.

The body chapter opens up with the core theoretical concepts, such as "civil disobedience", "civil society", and "nonviolence". The definitions of "civil disobedience" are taken from Henry David Thoreau, John Rawls, Jürgen Habermas, and Gene Sharp. Those of "civil society", provided by Marc Morjé Howard, Timm Beichelt, and Wolfgang Merkel, shed light on the role of Ukrainian civil society in the Orange Revolution and Euromaidan. The theory of "nonviolence", advanced by Leo Tolstoy, Mahatma Gandhi, and Martin Luther King, Jr., occupies a fundamental role in the arrangement of the Orange Revolution, to a lesser degree Euromaidan, and deserves special attention as well.

We then proceed with the analytical section, which brings the 2004-2005 Orange Revolution and the 2013-2014 Revolution of Dignity into focus, along with some noteworthy homegrown (the Revolution on Granite, the Donbas miners' strikes, and "Ukraine without Kuchma") and foreign protest events (the October 5 Revolution in Serbia and the Rose Revolution in Georgia). The Orange Revolution was made possible owing to the experience of student and labor union activism, namely the Revolution on Granite (1990), the Donbas miners' strikes (1989 and 1991), as well as the protest campaign "Ukraine without Kuchma" (2000-2001). These protest events are viewed in terms of general methods and techniques they introduced to the Ukrainian repertoire of contention. Equally, the overthrow of Slobodan Milošević in Federal Republic of Yugoslavia served as an important precedent for anti-Communism in Georgia and Ukraine. In connection therewith, we embark on a comprehensive study of the Orange Revolution itself, its main actors, political demands, major events, civil society organizations (CSOs), youth movements, external influences, and outcomes. We take the same aspects into consideration with regard to Euromaidan. Having started as a peaceful demonstration in support of European integration, the Euromaidan grew increasingly radicalized and transformed into a powerful opposition to the system *per se*.

The concluding part summarizes the central points of the thesis as well as communicates our contribution to the selected topic. Via the Orange Revolution and Euromaidan, the Ukrainians acquired strategic tools and practical know-how to express their discontent with the ex- and would-be power holders. The legacy of both acts of civil disobedience on Ukraine's democratization has been generous as the country articulated its clear intent to lean westward away from the Russian sphere of influence. The ethically-minded Orange demonstrators effectively challenged the electoral system to make it more just and broadly endorsed the democratic candidate Viktor Yushchenko over Putin's protégé Viktor Yanukovych. The Kremlin was defeated in that presidential race; in the recent past, the nation overwhelmingly voted for Volodymyr Zelensky, a comedian-turned-president who believes in the benefits of democracy. For its part, the Revolution of Dignity corroborated the firmness of popular intentions in the spread of democracy and gave fresh momentum to CSOs, which was lost with the outbreak of hostilities in the Southeast. Being Euromaidan's immediate aftermath, the Russia-Ukraine conflict must be addressed as a matter of urgency, which necessitates a peaceful solution for all the key stakeholders involved (Ukraine, Russia, Ukrainian nationalists, and pro-Russian separatists). Should this be the case, the Ukrainian civil society members would be able to fully participate in voluntary organizations and (re)shape their national politics. Then again, such deeply ingrained practices, as corruption, nepotism, oligarchy, impunity, let alone the hostile takeover of the Crimean Peninsula and the armed conflict in the Donbas region, proved a hindrance to the institutionalization and consolidation of democracy in Ukraine.

In what follows, we provide the principal textual sources, which directed the compilation of the present thesis. With regard to definitions of "civil disobedience", we reference this set of ideas very broadly and include accounts of Thoreau, Rawls, Habermas, and Sharp. Thoreau, the progenitor of the term, rebels against slavery in the US and the Mexican-American War of 1846 - 1848, whereas Rawls and Habermas are supportive of civil unrest in the light of the Vietnam War and the installation of nuclear weapons in Germany during the course of the 1980s respectively. As for Sharp, his book *From Dictatorship to Democracy: A Conceptual Framework for Liberation* played a major part in shaping the transition from Communism to democracy, serving as a step-by-step guide to a regime change in the then republics of the USSR and Yugoslavia.

Further on, we shift the focus of our theoretical research onto "civil society" based on the definitions from Howard, Beichelt, and Merkel. Although Howard is skeptical of popular agency in post-Communist states, he writes shortly before the Orange Revolution and the Revolution of Dignity take place in Ukraine. Nonetheless, his grasp of the situation in transitional contexts in question rings particularly true of people's membership in voluntary organizations, that is, the lack thereof. Beichelt and Merkel concentrate mainly on external democracy promotion and its rather limited effects on post-socialist civil societies provided that a degree of societal autonomy is denied. Apart from their contribution to comprehension of the term, the authors enumerate the essential democratizing functions of civil society according to the following classical political philosophers: John Locke, Montesquieu, Alexis de Tocqueville, Robert D. Putnam, and Jürgen Habermas.

Finally, we take "nonviolence" into consideration. Tolstoy and Gandhi's correspondence reveals their vision of truth, love, fellowship, and absence of violence as a basis for a sustainable society. Tolstoy distinguishes the "law of love" as a crucial component in nonviolent resistance. At the same time, he provides the three justifications for violence that power holders have used to cling to power since time immemorial, downplaying the significance of the principle of love. In a like manner, Gandhi's understanding of civil disobedience as active resistance by peaceful means is inextricably intertwined with his philosophy of nonviolence. His Satyagraha ("truth-force" or "soul-force") principle explains why nonviolence is an integral part of civil disobedience, which helps attain one's ends more effectively. In turn, King Jr. is one of the leading proponents of nonviolent resistance against racial injustice in the 1960s and 1970s America. He singles out three preparation stages prior to engaging in civil disobedience in a peaceful manner (what he calls "direct action"), which we cover alongside his other unique insights into the topic.

All in all, this thesis covers diverse theoretical concepts pertaining to civil disobedience, carefully examines the specifics of the Orange Revolution and the Revolution of Dignity, and alludes to the annexation of Crimea as well as the Russo-Ukrainian war as the physical manifestation of the ideological conflict between the two states. Yet, there are certain areas of research that are beyond the scope of this project, notably an extreme social stratification between the East and the West of Ukraine; the ascent of uncivil civil society, with the ultranationalists and the so-called porokhoboty, fervent supporters of the former President Petro

Poroshenko and the war policy, coming to the fore; and the input of the Ukrainian diaspora, living in great numbers in the US and Canada, in cross-border pro-democracy advocacy. When it comes to challenges, we lacked both time and funding to conduct a quantitative analysis of the Ukrainian civil society, which could be used to determine people's political identifications and attitude to social activism. Instead, we will make use of the empirical findings by the authors quoted and the secondary data, such as official statistics.

THEORETICAL SECTION

To establish a theoretical framework for the analysis of both the Orange Revolution and Euromaidan, we intend to explore the central concepts of "civil disobedience", "civil society", and "nonviolence". First and foremost, we examine "civil disobedience" also referred to as "civil resistance" and "political defiance", the subject matter of the present thesis. To this end, we take into consideration the related works by Henry David Thoreau, the author of the term, as well as John Rawls, Jürgen Habermas, and Gene Sharp, who contributed greatly to its deeper understanding. We then explore "civil society", particularly the role it plays in civil disobedience and democracy, referencing Marc Morjé Howard, Timm Beichelt, and Wolfgang Merkel. Finally, we look into "nonviolence", the principle that assumes cardinal importance in terms of showing respect for the constitution and averting bloodshed, enunciated by Leo Tolstoy, Mahatma Gandhi, and Martin Luther King, Jr., leading thinkers and social change activists in the field of nonviolent resistance.

Civil Disobedience

It was Thoreau who coined the term "civil disobedience" in the 1849 eponymous essay. At this period, the writer came under the influence of Ralph Waldo Emerson's philosophy of transcendentalism, which promotes the importance of the spiritual over the material. Understanding the true significance of nature for the inner life, he isolated himself from society in Walden Woods, embarking on a journey of self-discovery. In his paper *Civil Disobedience*, Thoreau wrote in contradiction to James K. Polk, the 11th President of the United States, who acted in favor of slavery (about one-sixth of the population was enslaved) and initiated the Mexican-American War (1846 – 1848) preceded by the US annexation of Texas. To express his deep disagreement with the government's social and military policy, Thoreau withheld the payment of taxes, which led to detention in jail in his native Massachusetts. Although his aunt eventually paid the bill, Thoreau supposed that deeds of this sort abet the cause of injustice, letting "private feelings interfere with the public good" (Thoreau 1866, 44). Leading by example,

the literary figure demonstrated that one has a moral obligation to oppose an oppressive regime, while nonpayment is just one of the nonviolent tools available to political dissidents.

According to Thoreau, prison becomes the sole place where a person can retain their freedom and honor. He declared that all honest people belong therein if such is the price of telling the truth to power holders. He reassures that one should not be concerned about the apparent surrender to the powerful nemesis since a personal encounter with inequity facilitates the struggle against systemic injustices. On the whole, his piece advocates principles of reason and individual thought over blind obedience to the law and authorities even as popular with masses as Polk was. Thoreau criticizes political passivity and argues that there is a glaring discrepancy between an "opinion" and "agency", considering that disagreeing in theory amounts to nothing short of inertia or a pretense of activity while taking action displays moral courage and genuine loyalty to the state. Thoreau venerates those who use their "consciences" rather than "bodies" to be of real assistance to the state. That being said, he does not charge the people with the duty of correcting injustices but, at least, withdrawing their (financial) support of downright wrongs.

Interestingly enough, Thoreau uses the metaphor of government as a machine and constructs three likely scenarios: first, injustice as a mechanism is doomed to failure because unjust societies are unsustainable; second, there might be a cure to a corrupt system so long as injustice has an origin; and, third, if a state based on injustice orders its citizens to commit immoral acts toward one another, then civil disobedience is justifiable. He writes, "… if it is of such a nature that it requires you to be the agent of injustice to another, then, I say, break the law. Let your life be a counter friction to stop the machine" (Thoreau 1866, 36). It is the choice that individuals make on moral grounds, inasmuch as ethical norms trump unjust laws.

Above all, the essayist emphasizes the primacy of the individual over the state, where the former empowers the latter and not vice versa. Should politicians show proper respect for the people and execute the popular will could a steady state-civil society relationship be built. Prior to being subjects, the citizenry deserve consideration as human beings, with their conceptions of right and wrong, fair and unfair. These are the very people whose critical and analytical thinking skills could bring about an improvement to an inequitable political system. Nonetheless, "heroes, patriots, martyrs, and reformers" are more often than not ostracized as a result of criticizing the government (Thoreau 1866, 30). Thoreau maintains, "There will never be a really free and enlightened State, until the State comes to recognize the individual as a higher and independent

power, from which all its own power and authority are derived, and treats him accordingly" (Thoreau 1866, 48).

As for John Rawls, he yields his insight into "civil disobedience" in the *magnum opus A Theory of Justice* (1971). In this book, Rawls primarily reasons what a just society is; he refutes utilitarianism, which makes the well-being and benefit of the majority the cornerstone, in favor of both libertarianism and egalitarianism, giving all citizens "equal basic liberties", namely "liberty of conscience and freedom of association, freedom of speech and liberty of the person, the rights to vote, to hold public office, to be treated in accordance with the rule of law, and so on" (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy 2017). At Princeton, Rawls wrote a theology thesis and, furthermore, contemplated entering the priesthood. The political philosopher is also known to espouse anti-militarism, inasmuch as his ideas were drawn from his unsettling experience as an American soldier, who saw the horrors of World War II, specifically the Holocaust and the Hiroshima bombing. While in academia, he buoyed anti-Vietnam War activism and the US military intervention therein. The armed conflict in question made him reflect on how citizenry could withstand the state's aggressive foreign policy that threatens global peace and security.

Rawls' theory of civil disobedience pertains solely to constitutional democracies with "nearly just" societies that have a "public [commonly shared] conception of justice" (Rawls 1999, 321). While citizens accept the legitimacy of the constitution, the "duty to comply" often comes into conflict with the "duty to oppose injustice" (Rawls 1999, 319). The violation of the "equal basic liberties" by the state invites either submission or resistance. With regard to the latter, Rawls defines "civil disobedience" in terms of four essential characteristics: publicity, nonviolence, conscientiousness, and illegality. He stresses the political nature of civilly disobedient acts since they stem from political rather than religious or other beliefs. Rawls considers the majoritarian principle generally effective legislation-wise. However, he also recognizes the limits of majority rule provided that a minority is denied justice on reasonable grounds:

"… civil disobedience as a public, nonviolent, conscientious, yet political act contrary to law usually done with the aim of bringing about a change in the law or policies of the government. By acting in this way, one addresses the sense of justice of the majority of the community and declares that in one's considered opinion the principles of social cooperation among free and equal men are not being respected" (Rawls 1999, 320-321).

Rawls highlights the public nature of such acts and the absence of violence thereof. Notified in advance, civil disobedience is engaged with overtly. It does not necessarily flout the law protested against. It shuns violence because it does not seek to terrorize, even less so disrespect the law *per se*. Both of these aspects are necessary to ensure the integrity of protesters' motives, who act disobediently yet loyally to the cardinal principles of justice underpinning the constitution. In this sense, civil disobedience exists in a gray area between a legal protest and a conscientious refusal (noncompliance) while being diametrically opposed to a militant action (Rawls 1999, 322). Since political dissidents hold citizenship of the state, granting them rights and imposing civic duties, they have to make their claims openly and recognize the state's monopoly on violence, as well as face the consequences of their unlawful behavior. Apropos of punishment, it should be both proportional and fitting and, in certain cases, Rawls expects, reduced or suspended overall:

"… civil disobedience is a public act. … it takes place in the public forum. For this reason, among others, civil disobedience is nonviolent. … Civil disobedience is nonviolent for another reason. It expresses disobedience to law within the limits of fidelity to law, although it is at the outer edge thereof. The law is broken, but fidelity to law is expressed by the public and nonviolent nature of the act, by the willingness to accept the legal consequences of one's conduct. This fidelity to law helps to establish to the majority that the act is indeed politically conscientious and sincere, and that it is intended to address the public's sense of justice" (Rawls 1999, 322).

Rawls remarks that the people are duty-bound to observe unjust laws so long as they do not transgress the reasonable bounds of injustice. He cautions against taking advantage of systemic flaws or exploiting legal loopholes for personal gain due to a "natural duty of civility" (Rawls 1999, 312). At the same time, he asserts that patently unjust laws, policies, and institutions should be abolished. In case laws and policies struggle to meet proper standards agreed upon by members of the public, the latter have the right to express their political discontent in the form of a protest. Were the two fundamental principles of justice (equal citizenship and opportunity) to be at stake, civil disobedience would be morally justified. The political philosopher is not

unconditionally supportive of that form of protest, though. According to him, it should be the ultimate means available, which proves of absolute necessity only under a combination of circumstances: a worthy cause, official refusal of formal requests, the ineffectiveness of legal methods, including the indifference of power holders to popular demands issued, the inability to revoke an unfair law, and cynical disregard of the expression of public discontent by the authorities.

Limited to redressing terrible legal wrongs, civil disobedience is designed "to preserve and to strengthen the institutions of justice" (Rawls 1999, 325). What is more, civilly disobedient acts mobilize civil society, help build confidence in oneself and others, as well as inspire mutual respect among citizens, ensuring greater fairness, not to mention establishing strong networks of interpersonal relationships within a given society. Concurrently, that form of political dissent involves attendant risks, taking into account that personal convictions might lead to chaos and anarchy. Then again, people have to give it a serious thought and hold moral and legal responsibility for their actions (or inactions). One's informed choice should steer their behavior and attitudes in public. Even if he or she errs, they do so in good faith, listening to the voice of conscience. Accordingly, Rawls stands up for civil disobedience perceived as a "reasonable and prudent form of political dissent" (Rawls 1999, 340).

In his turn, Jürgen Habermas was the German philosopher and an outstanding representative of the Frankfurt School of critical theory. He matured in post-war Germany, with his identity being shaped profoundly by both his strict Protestant upbringing and the Nuremberg Trials. Accordingly, he developed into a vocal critic of National Socialism, the doctrine that shook Germany's moral and political foundations. He spent his life in academia, particularly concerned with political philosophy and Anglo-American thought. The corpus of Habermas' works encompasses the "topics stretching from social-political theory to aesthetics, epistemology and language to philosophy of religion …" (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy 2014). In addition, he contributed to several German newspapers (for instance, *Die Zeit*) on the subject of critical issues of policy. Habermas judged civil disobedience reasonable due to the 1983 deployment of Pershing IIs, American ballistic missiles, in West Germany. During the Cold War, the arms race between the Soviet Union and the US could feasibly result in a nuclear blunder; however, peace movements in the Federal Republic of Germany and elsewhere in Europe led to the NATO rockets' decommissioning.

In his paper *Civil Disobedience: Litmus Test for the Democratic Constitutional State*, the social philosopher points out five salient features of civil disobedience. First, it should be a political act, originating from widely held beliefs, not personal opinions or vested interests. Second, it has to be done in an overt and officially pre-arranged manner. Third, it needs to be directed toward an unjust law or government policy while not infringing upon the system as a whole. Fourth, the demonstrators are bound to face up to the consequences that will follow from a court decision. Finally, it should have a symbolic nature, which is why civil disobedience excludes violence. It seeks to appeal to reason and sense of justice of the majority and make it reconsider its opinion on the validity of certain verdicts reached. While Habermas is not categorically opposed to majoritarianism, he does reject majority rule in relation to making decisions of existential importance, such as the installation of the missiles in question. It should be further noted that civil disobedience can only occur under a relatively just and legitimate democratic constitutional regime:

"Civil disobedience is a morally justified protest which may not be founded only on private convictions or individual self-interests; it is a public act which, as a rule, is announced in advance and which the police can control as it occurs; it includes the premeditated transgression of individual legal norms without calling into question obedience to the rule of law as a whole; it demands the readiness to accept legal consequences of the transgressions of those norms; the infraction by which civil disobedience is expressed has an exclusively symbolic character – hence is derived the restriction to non-violent means of protest" (Habermas 1985, 101).

Habermas argues that citizens have a right to exercise sovereignty over laws underlying a constitutional order. Instead of demanding passive obedience to the constitution on pain of punishment, power brokers should expect compliance with it of one's own free will, which forms the core of "fidelity to the law" (Habermas 1985, 101). Concerning the voluntary basis of legitimacy, Habermas maintains, "… only those norms are justified, which give expression to a generalizable interest and, thus, could count on the considered agreement of all concerned" (Habermas 1985, 102). One understandably expects a rational thought to be at the heart of the justice system, with what is "legal" being either acknowledged as "legitimate" or discarded as "illegitimate" by means of voting through. This implies that the leadership should merely await

limited rather than absolute legal obedience ("qualified" as opposed to "unconditional" in Habermas' terminology) since "legality" does not guarantee "legitimacy" (Habermas 1985, 102).

Like Rawls, Habermas places certain limitations on civil disobedience. The demonstrators have to ensure that it is absolutely necessary to recourse to that form of protest, so long as they feel morally obligated to do so, whereas the state officials have to treat their citizens respectfully, even if the latter are in the wrong. Most importantly, civil disobedience should not undermine the fundament of the constitutional framework, albeit the protesters violate the tranquility of the existing order. The intellectual also declares against the institutionalization of civil disobedience or what he calls "normalizing the extraordinary" (Habermas 1985, 106). He does not endorse the legalization of the right to protest owing to two principal reasons: should "all personal risk [be] eliminated", the ethical principle is deemed compromised, as well as the potency of the political message decreased (Habermas 1985, 106). Civil disobedience should, thereby, balance delicately between "legality" and "legitimacy".

Ultimately, the real value of civil disobedience lies in challenging the legitimacy of the state. That being said, by no means should a dissident be perceived as a common criminal or penalized as such. Otherwise, the authorities fall into the trap of "authoritarian legalism", prosecuting and punishing the challengers as usual, as well as overlooking the capacity of civil disobedience to foster "a mature political culture" (Habermas 1985, 99). The German philosopher argues in its favor, inasmuch as "the constitutional state as a whole appears … not as a finished product, but rather as a susceptible, precarious undertaking, which is constructed for the purpose of establishing or maintaining, renewing or broadening a legitimate legal order under constantly changing circumstances" (Habermas 1985, 104). Given that laws and policies are always open to revision, acts of civil disobedience are deemed justified from an ethical standpoint.

It is, finally, Gene Sharp, an American political scientist, who championed the philosophy of "nonviolent resistance". In the early 1950s, he was arrested for conscientious objection to military service during the Korean War and even imprisoned for nine months. At the time, he was writing his first book on Gandhi, who had a major influence on his thinking about the nonviolent struggle against both political and colonial oppression. Sharp completed his studies in Norway and later worked as a special adviser to the Swedish Ministry of Defense, supporting its efforts to apply the technique of nonviolent resistance to their military policy (Right Livelihood Foundation, n.d.). It was he who formulated 198 methods of nonviolent action, categorizing them

into three groups: “nonviolent protest and persuasion”, “noncooperation (social, economic, and political)”, and “nonviolent intervention” (Albert Einstein Institution, n.d.). He also founded the Albert Einstein Institution advancing the cause of nonviolent action for change. Above all, Sharp’s book *From Dictatorship to Democracy: A Conceptual Framework for Liberation* (1993) inspired by the Burmese pro-democracy protests in 1988 has been handed down from generation to generation of democratic challengers in Myanmar, ex-Yugoslavia, post-Soviet states, and the Arab world.

In this book, Sharp highlights the nonviolent and political dimensions of “political defiance”, the concept he uses instead of the corresponding “civil disobedience”. He differentiates “political defiance” from “pacifism” as well as “nonviolence” in its religious or ethical sense. The term relates to peaceful public resistance to a tyrannical regime with the aim of not only toppling the dictatorship, but also “rebuilding a society with greater political democracy, personal liberties, and social justice” (Sharp 2010, 2). Accordingly, the people act disobediently in order to liberate themselves from tyranny as well as dismantle dictatorial structures based on injustice, intimidation, and oppression:

“Political defiance” is nonviolent struggle (protest, noncooperation, and intervention) applied defiantly and actively for political purposes [introduced by Robert Helvey]. … “Defiance” denotes a deliberate challenge to authority by disobedience, allowing no room for submission. “Political defiance” describes the environment in which the action is employed (political) as well as the objective (political power). The term is used principally to describe action by populations to regain from dictatorships control over governmental institutions by relentlessly attacking their sources of power and deliberately using strategic planning and operations to do so” (Sharp 2010, 1).

Sharp underscores the distinctive features of “political defiance”, notably the rejection of violent methods, the quality of being strong and resilient, the ability to expose dictators’ weaknesses and withdraw their sources of power, the capacity to have a wide spread yet work toward the big-picture goal, the power to make power brokers err in thought or deed, the possibility of an all-out mass mobilization against a tyrannical political system, and the empowerment of the civilian population and civil institutions, instrumental in bringing about a

more democratic society (Sharp 2010, 29-30). It is of the utmost importance that the demonstrators do not let their frustration at the regime and hostility toward it fuel violence, which would afford the authorities ground for responding with superior strength. It does not follow that casualties can be completely avoided, though. The demonstrators maintaining nonviolent discipline need to be prepared to resist and incur losses. Contrary to popular opinion, nonviolent means are not necessarily time-consuming as compared with violent ones. The sources of power mentioned above comprise "legitimacy" (political and moral authority), "human resources" (popular cooperation and obedience), "skills and knowledge", "intangible factors" (psychology and ideology), "material sources", and "sanctions" (punishment) (Sharp 2010, 18-19). Provided that they are not being replenished via cooperation and obedience, there is a high probability that the dictators will fall from power.

Sharp raises the issue of dictatorial regimes, which curtail people's freedom, abuse human rights, and use brute force to maintain political power. Not only do dictators undermine government institutions so as to assume full control over them, but they also deteriorate social capital. When networks of interpersonal relationships are broken, people lose the capacity to resist through lack of unity, trust, and solidarity. Gradually, members of the public get used to complying with tyrannical rules and regulations, forming a "habit of obedience" (Sharp 2010, 3). In order to succeed in overthrowing a dictatorship, the nonviolence theorist suggests the following four measures: first, confidence-building activities for people, who, otherwise, feel isolated, frightened, and disempowered; second, the consolidation of civil society organizations (CSOs) and civil institutions, which serve as a basis for political defiance and become an integral part of a free society; third, the creation of a strong resistance movement; and, fourth, the meticulous planning of the regime change as well as its implementation (Sharp 2010, 7-8).

Although dictatorships often seem omnipotent, they do possess vulnerabilities that can be exploited, including but not limited to dependence on public cooperation, ossified and unresponsive political system, erosion of official ideology and symbolism, bureaucratic inefficiency, rivalry for the leadership, split in the power hierarchy, political blunders, decentralization, student and intellectual activism, various types of diversity (ethnic, national, linguistic, regional, etc.), and disobedience among the police and the military (Sharp 2010, 26-27). Besides, Sharp points out the three principal sources of support at dictators' disposal, specifically the police, public servants, and the army. Without their obedience and endorsement,

there is every likelihood that dictatorial rulers will be overthrown. In order to prevent another (often more brutal) dictatorship from coming to power, the democratic leaders have to tackle the inequitable distribution of power through social mobilization and institution-building.

In the final analysis, the oppressed population is directly responsible for its emancipation from oppressors or, alternatively, failure to reclaim social and political freedom. To second Sharp, "The degree of liberty or tyranny in any government is … in large degree a reflection of the relative determination of the subjects to be free and their willingness and ability to resist efforts to enslave them" (Sharp 2010, 20). Moreover, public awareness of nonviolent forms of action, as well as first-hand experience thereof, have democratizing effects on a society. The citizens will be much more skilled in asserting their rights and freedoms by means of noncooperation and defiance. Most significantly, the people master the art of demonstrating peacefully whenever they nurse a legitimate grievance against the government in office. Nonviolent resistance is undoubtedly a more preferable option than guerilla warfare, for instance. To recapitulate, Sharp argues that "political defiance, or nonviolent struggle, is the most powerful means available to those struggling for freedom", the long-term objectives of which are to build a free society and establish a durable democracy (Sharp 2010, 14).

On the whole, civil disobedience has the following features: publicity, nonviolence, conscientiousness, and unlawfulness. Being politically motivated, it opposes the legitimacy of an oppressive government, while not challenging the state's monopoly on the use of force. There is no necessity for the institutionalization of civil disobedience, the power of which is to provide a counterweight to the state, with the protesters taking personal risks. Those engaging in civil disobedience have to espouse such values, as unity, solidarity, empathy, and understanding. In preference to an impromptu performance, an act of civil disobedience needs to be carefully planned to bear fruit. Provided that all possibilities of revision are exhausted, political dissidents have every right to resort to disobedience to the authorities. At the same time, the demonstrators must readily accept the punishment so as to show respect for the law. That being said, the protesters should not be treated and, consequently, penalized as common criminals. Most importantly, civil disobedience enables popular mobilization, creating a conducive atmosphere for social capital, as well as strengthens democratic institutions. Both citizen empowerment and institutional consolidation are prerequisites to a healthy democratic system.

Civil Society

Having covered both the definitions and central features of "civil disobedience", we approach "civil society" from the standpoint of Marc Morjé Howard, Timm Beichelt, and Wolfgang Merkel. Howard is a Professor of Government and Law at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. His areas of research include challenges to democracy and criminal justice as well as the reorganization of the American prison system. Howard's book *The Weakness of Civil Society in Post-Communist Europe* (2003) identifies a paradigm of collective action in the former countries of the Eastern Bloc. We are particularly interested in the chapter *Civil Society and Democratization*, which defines the term "civil society", contrasts it with overlapping concepts, as well as illustrates its influence on democracy and democratization. As opposed to political society and economic society, "… civil society is the realm of ordinary citizens, who join and participate in groups and associations because of their everyday interests, needs, and desires" (Howard 2003, 35). Members of civil society have the capacity to shape the state's policy through the agency of their organizations, the membership of and active participation in which are of the utmost importance. While they do not aim at obtaining power or economic benefit, civil society organizations (CSOs) more often than not lack funds as well as intend to gain more political leverage. These groups, associations, and organizations have to be "formally established, legally protected, autonomously run, and voluntarily joined by ordinary citizens" (Howard 2003, 34-35). They include but are not limited to educational, cultural, religious, human rights, women's rights, peace, sports, youth, seniors, veterans', disability, environmental, and animal rights advocacy groups.

Howard references Larry Diamond, an American political sociologist, who enumerates the benefits of civil society to the process of democratic consolidation: not only does a civil society monitor the government in office and delimit its power, but it also engenders grassroots activism, inculcates the significance of negotiation and tolerance, enables the expression of the will of the people, encourages public debate about critical issues, nurtures the next generation of politicians, democratizes information, as well as permits economic development, which are widely reckoned to be the requisites of a robust democracy and democratic institutions (Howard 2003, 43). Furthermore, civil society should by no means assume the responsibilities of the state, which, otherwise, has a negative influence on good governance. Solid legal and political establishments

bring into existence a civil society that strives to maximize the legitimacy and effectiveness of a democratic regime.

When it comes to state-civil society nexus, Howard favors a symbiotic rather than an antagonistic relationship between the two. Many states in Central, Southern, and Eastern Europe have undergone the transition from Communism to democracy (with varied success), where the civil society was antithetical to the state. At that point, the people had to confront the Communist regime so as to enable a change of government. By contrast, highly-evolved democracies and states striving for democratization and democratic consolidation opt for establishing an "interactive" and "reciprocal" rapport with the citizens on the basis of two-way communication and cooperation (Howard 2003, 38). Additionally, Howard holds to an opinion that civil society does not comprise spontaneous collective action. He lays emphasis on "a degree of routinization and institutionalization", which demands the use of respective tactics (Howard 2003, 39). In other words, civil society is not identical to mass mobilization (even though they do overlap greatly), considering that members of civil society belong to an organization and engage directly in its activities. Concurrently, a social movement might give rise to a CSO, provided its leaders or participants officially found an organization.

The scholar then illustrates the differences between "civil society" and "social capital", which tend to be frequently conflated. Referencing Robert D. Putnam, an American scholar of political science, Howard seconds the idea that "social capital" represents a wider concept inclusive of all types of social interactions based on "reciprocity" and "trustworthiness" (Putnam in Howard 2003, 41). With an emphasis on mutual trust, criminal organizations constitute no exception and neither do family and friendship networks. "Civil society", conversely, does not embrace the associations of the aforementioned kind, being a "behavioral and institutional phenomenon" (Howard 2003, 42). It pertains to making a public appearance for *bona fide* political, legal, as well as socioeconomic reasons. Putnam, *inter alia*, was quoted as saying that CSOs are "schools of democracy", given that people learn to cooperate and communicate more effectively with others who are neither close friends nor family members. It leads to stronger social relationships built on interpersonal trust and acceptance of each other's differences, let alone facilitates a political dialog, with the express purpose of fortifying a democratic system. Besides, through interaction, the public discovers their objects and abilities as citizens, which facilitates the spread of participatory democracy.

Interestingly enough, Howard cites a British anthropologist Chris Hann, who questions the possibility of westernizing the allegedly supreme idea behind "civil society". He supports this claim with two astute observations, notably the term reflects the liberal-individual principles foreign to many non-Western societies as well as overlooks local social practices. Hence, Hann deems it indispensable to include ethnographic studies in order to broaden the comprehension of the term, which is by far reliant on moral standards established by the West. Yet, Howard asserts that civil society is a product of Western civilization and its historical experience rooted in the ideology of liberal democracy (Howard 2003, 41). While he agrees with Hann that understanding non-Western cultures demands ethnographic research, Howard objects to the inclusion of all types of social organization into "civil society". To recapitulate, Howard insists on the primacy of direct participation of ordinary citizens in membership organizations, with the people being knit together by common interests and needs.

As pertains Timm Beichelt and Wolfgang Merkel, both are German university professors, whereas the latter is a political scientist as well. Their research fields comprise dictatorship, democracy and democratization, specifically democratic consolidation in post-socialist Eastern Europe, and civil society. Beichelt and Merkel have co-authored a paper *Democracy Promotion and Civil Society: Regime Types, Transition Modes, and Effects*, which reveals that external democratization has a rather limited impact upon those on the receiving end without a degree of autonomy given to civil society and its organizations. When designing civil society-oriented democracy promotion, one needs to take the context into consideration, namely a political regime, a transition phase (democratic consolidation, re-autocratization, or a hybrid regime), and the nature of civil society and types of CSOs coupled with an appropriate mode of external democratization (Beichelt and Merkel 2014, 44).

According to Merkel and Hans-Joachim Lauth, another political scientist from Germany, civil society carries out diverse functions during the three phases of democratization: liberalization, institutionalization, and consolidation (Beichelt and Merkel 2014, 45). The liberalization phase opens up unparalleled opportunities for mass mobilization due to the ineptitude of existing political institutions and the establishment. Civil society serves primarily to topple a dictatorial government, with the population launching a resistance movement. As soon as the institutional framework is set, civil society has ample scope for a pro-democracy agency. The newly established democratic structures are rather fragile in the course of formation; therefore, the

levels of political activism are the highest. Following free and fair elections, a transitional state enters a period of consolidation, during which democratic institutions achieve greater efficiency. Civil movements should ideally metamorphose into political parties, allowing new political leaders to incorporate popular ideas and suggestions into political programs. At this juncture, it is fundamental for civil society to give way to the elected officials and let them actively represent various social strata.

Furthermore, the authors review five democratizing functions that civil society performs, building on such classical political philosophers, as John Locke, Montesquieu, Alexis de Tocqueville, Putnam, and Habermas. While Beichelt and Merkel clearly delineate the functions, they should rather be perceived as complementary.

Locke deems civil society to be outside the bounds of the state, where free and independent individuals associate with one another. By what he calls "protection from state arbitrariness", he emphasizes civil society's mission to curb state interference in the lives of its citizens, extend their citizenship rights, and defend their private ownership (Beichelt and Merkel 2014, 46). Locke lays additional stress on the demarcation between and the impossibility of the state-civil society unification.

Unlike Locke, Montesquieu argues that the two share a reciprocal rather than antagonistic relationship. The state and civil society are diverse yet mutually dependent; consequently, the equilibrium needs to be sought between them. The power of the government (Montesquieu implies a constitutional monarchy) has to be restrained by the rule of law as well as the system of checks and balances. At the same time, the so-called *corps intermédiaires* ("intermediary bodies") that link civil society and the state should support and observe the law, giving endorsement to both state institutions and civic organizations.

Tocqueville eminently identifies with the Montesquieuan line of thought, while making "free associations" the focal point of his political philosophy. He believes that civic associations, for which Tocqueville coins the term "schools of democracy", are the guardians of individual liberty, giving an impetus to both thinking democratically and acting civilly on a regular basis. The importance of civic socialization and engagement comes into prominence due to "creating and entrenching civic virtues, such as tolerance, mutual acceptance, honesty, integrity, trust, and the courage to stand up for one's beliefs" (Beichelt and Merkel 2014, 47). Not only do these associations caution against authoritarian rule, but they also prevent the tyranny of a majority.

Putnam, in turn, pushes the "production of social capital" to the forefront (Beichelt and Merkel 2014, 47). Following Tocqueville, the political scientist suggests that civic associations simplify social interaction among otherwise strangers and pave the way for a mutual exchange of views, debates, and some sort of agreement. The ability to connect with a variety of people appears essential for developing a relationship of trust and understanding. Crucially, the rise of social capital is inversely proportional to the use of direct or structural violence. It should be further noted that social capital has the potential for "bonding" and "bridging" interpersonal differences; "bonding" social capital relates to building trust between "socially, culturally, religiously, and ethnically homogeneous circles, subcultures, and associations", whereas its "bridging" type unites people belonging to diverse ethnicities, religions, cultures, and classes (Beichelt and Merkel 2014, 60). While the former might provoke social segmentation, the latter seeks to overcome intercommunal divisions.

Ultimately, the authors mention Habermas' critique of civil society, who endorses that such actors, as governmental institutions, political parties, and even organizations pertinent to big business (for instance, trade associations), lie outside the public sphere. Habermas insists that popular movements and CSOs act as a force multiplier since they have the capacity to elevate local societal issues to be addressed at a higher (regional or national) level. In other words, their central task is to supervise political decision-making and influence it by means of communication. Indeed, civic associations in question can catalyze the process of change, although their efforts de facto prove of little to no avail.

By and large, "civil society" refers to an empowered citizenry who become members of CSOs to deliberate and act in their shared interests and daily needs. Active citizens do not aspire to gain political power or make a profit through these organizations but rather to contribute to government decisions and, thereby, behave responsibly toward both society and the environment. It is essential that CSOs are official and independent organizations that are protected by law and joined on a voluntary basis. Civil society builds on strong and accountable institutions, producing five democratizing effects on both citizens and the state, namely it protects individual freedom from state interference (Locke), ensures horizontal control (Montesquieu), stimulates citizen power and proactivity (Tocqueville), cultivates interpersonal trust and tolerance (Putnam), and promotes deliberation and communication with the decision-makers (Habermas). CSOs help accumulate both bonding and bridging social capital, with bonding ties connecting

homogeneous segments of society and the bridging ones established between highly heterogeneous communities beyond private networks. It is the weak ties that have tremendous value for civil society, with the citizens striving for egalitarianism and internalizing the values of participatory democracy.

Nonviolence

Following the accounts of both "civil disobedience" and "civil society", we present the concept of "nonviolence" with reference to Leo Tolstoy, Mahatma Gandhi, and Martin Luther King, Jr. It appears reasonable to begin with Tolstoy, who had a profound influence upon Gandhi, who, in turn, provided considerable impetus to King, Jr.'s civil rights movement in the US.

Having been an artillery officer in the Crimean War (1853 – 1856), Count Tolstoy came to strongly disapprove of military conscription and left the army. A nonconformist ever since, he had been dedicated to seeking the truth his whole life. Murthy succinctly encapsulates Tolstoy's credo: "[He] passionately sought a practical way of life based on reason and conscience in his quest for truth" (Murthy 1987, 17). While attaching great importance to religion in its highest sense, the Russian literary intellectual became an outspoken critic of the church as an institution. He considered that an individual aspiring to comprehend God (the truth) has to do so through critical and moral judgment. Moreover, he championed the idea of "bread labor", according to which everyone should earn their bread through hard physical work. In accordance therewith, Tolstoy cultivated his land in Yasnaya Polyana as well as mastered shoemaking. He is, furthermore, known for his anarchist philosophy originating from the belief that the state is, by definition, an inequitable institution. Once it is abolished, it will be feasible "to reconstruct society so as to wipe out economic and social inequality" (Murthy 1987, 17). However, it can hardly be done without a change of public opinion: "… improvements in the human condition would be brought about only through personal moral transformation and commitment to truth and justice" (Murthy 1987, 21).

In 1908, Tolstoy wrote *A Letter to a Hindu* in defense of his theory of nonresistance that passed into Gandhi's hands and deeply impressed him. Gandhi's letter to Tolstoy marked the beginning of their correspondence, which elucidates their philosophy of life grounded in both

truth-seeking and the avoidance of violence. In *Mahatma Gandhi and Leo Tolstoy Letters*, compiled by B. Srinivasa Murthy, Tolstoy argues that love unaffected by doctrinal delusions and misinterpretations propels the people toward nonviolent resistance. Love, he reveals, is the highest expression of natural law founded on immutable principles as well as harmonized with people's consciences. Once an individual chooses to resort to violence, "the law of love" loses its validity, giving way to that of violence and the logic of might makes right. What is interesting, Tolstoy considers that the principle of love is most strongly pronounced in the Christian doctrine. However, the theory and practice of nonviolence conflict with each other: by his own account, there is an apparent "… contradiction between love recognized as the law of life and violence recognized as inevitable in different departments of life …" (Tolstoy in Murthy 2001, 36). To resolve the conflict, the people have to either abandon Christianity or abolish the military along with rejecting violence employed by the power holders to maintain their political ascendancy:

"… what one calls nonresistance, is in reality nothing else but the discipline of love undeformed by false interpretation. Love is the aspiration for communion and solidarity with other souls, and that aspiration always liberates the source of noble activities. That love is the supreme and unique law of human life which everyone feels in the depth of one's soul. We find it manifested most clearly in the soul of the infants" (Tolstoy in Murthy 2001, 35).

The Russian intellectual points out the prime justifications for violence, the first of which dates back to absolutism when power was essentially concentrated in the hands of a single monarch (Tolstoy in Murthy 2001, 50). He or she was believed to have a divine right to do as they wished, including the use of coercion. Gradually, the populace lost faith in the God-given legitimacy of the mighty. They grasped both the absurdity and amorality of the royal doctrine, henceforth, unwilling to remain submissive or obey morally repugnant orders. For this reason, the select few chose to defend violence on pseudo-scientific grounds, making a reference to the "historic law" (the continued existence of coercion throughout human history) and the "law of struggle and survival" (Tolstoy in Murthy 2001, 52). Not infrequently do the power brokers cite yet another reason why violence is supposedly acceptable: they reflect the will of the people, which grants them the legitimacy to decide who deserves punishment and who does not. Another way to justify violence is to claim that the minority has to be penalized for the welfare of the

majority (Tolstoy in Murthy 2001, 52). The mighty cultivate a sense of inevitability of brute force amid people while challenging the dominance and potential of "the law of love".

According to Tolstoy, the reason why the oppressed turn to violence is "… the lack of a reasonable religious teaching, which, by explaining the meaning of life, would supply a supreme law for the guidance of conduct …" (Tolstoy in Murthy 2001, 45). The people often grow accustomed to political and religious dogmas, which dissuade them from changing the existing social order by peaceful means. Yet, Tolstoy advocates overcoming prejudice toward the practice of nonviolence as well as acknowledging the truth that one can remedy injustice only through love. This universal law forbids any act of violence, including resistance against tyranny by force. Consequently, the only available alternative is the method of nonresistance to evil manifested in self-suffering (an inherent element of the "law of love" given the distortion of the truth). Should human beings nurture their spiritual strength, of which love is a crucial component, they would be able to secure freedom from oppression or tackle other sociopolitical issues conflicting with the truth. In other words, love forms the core of "non-violence", which eliminates the possibility of violent resistance to oppressors, let alone personal involvement in brutalities.

Equally, Mahatma Gandhi's doctrine of Satyagraha casts light on what nonviolence is. Gandhi experienced social injustice first-hand when he was infamously thrown off a train bound for Pretoria at the Pietermaritzburg station (1893). He was evicted from it on the grounds of race since only white people were eligible for a first-class compartment in accordance with South Africa's racial segregation rules. The train incident remembered as Gandhi's first act of civil disobedience galvanized him into action against racial injustice. Having evolved from an attorney into a civil rights activist, he became an advocate of Indian nationalism and nonviolent resistance to British rule. In 1930, he led the Salt March to defy the British tax law (1882 Salt Act) that prohibited Indians from harvesting or selling salt. Although many were beaten by police and arrested, with Gandhi himself taken into custody, the Salt March turned out to be a crucial turning point that brought about decolonization. Furthermore, the campaign had a major influence on shaping Martin Luther King, Jr.'s conception of civil disobedience and the role of nonviolence in it. Gandhian philosophy at large spurred Nelson Mandela's liberation movement in South Africa.

Gandhi coined the term "Satyagraha" ("truth-force" or "soul-force") to differentiate the struggle of the Indians in South Africa from passive resistance therein and in the United Kingdom. By his own account, Satyagraha is meant as "a weapon of the strongest, [which] excludes the use of violence in any shape or form" (Gandhi 2001, 6). He perceives disobedience as civil to the extent that it employs nonviolent means. People are normally expected to be law-abiding citizens of their own accord, while civil disobedience should preferably be reserved for a small group of people to have recourse to as a last resort. His politico-religious doctrine reveals that civil disobedience can be triggered in case of manifestly unjust laws. It is then, by definition, an illegal undertaking. Prior to transgressing a law, he urges to exhaust all legal possibilities of revision, for instance, launching a formal appeal to legislators. Alternatively, one can either coerce lawmakers into annulling discriminatory laws (albeit Gandhi rejects the idea of confronting the government through physical force) or assume full liability for flouting them. Gandhi asserts that people act in actual obedience to laws of the state only if they are prepared to resist grave injustice. He is highly critical of those who readily observe both fair and unfair laws since it is rather abnormal for people to comply fully (Gandhi compares it to "slavery"). Excessive conformity is deemed destructive of individual consciences and human nature overall.

The intellectual draws a parallel between the "means" and the "ends", pointing out that "fair means alone can produce fair results" (Gandhi 2001, 13). The rationale behind excluding violence is that the "force of the soul" feeding on love and truth is infinitely more powerful than muscular strength (Gandhi 2001, 15). He cherishes such ethical values, as unity, solidarity, honesty, empathy, compassion, and generosity, to name but a few. He makes use of the Buddhist concept of "Ahimsa" ("nonviolence"), which has a negative and positive meaning. The former implies doing no physical or mental harm, whereas the latter presupposes "the largest love" that incorporates truth and fearlessness (Murthy 1987, 15). Under the unmistakable influence of Tolstoy, Gandhi suggests that modernity is inconsistent with nonviolence since power-hungry politicians are known to be harmful to individuals, who then cause harm to other members of society. In order to break the vicious circle and defy injustice, one has an obligation to challenge the government with determination and self-restraint.

Gandhi argues against anyone knowing the absolute truth about right and wrong; consequently, no one can have a moral sanction for imposing punishment. As an individual who fasted on several occasions, with the longest one being 21 days, Gandhi endorses the principle of

"self-suffering", according to which one should primarily inflict damage on oneself rather than others. It should come as no surprise that a person can make an error of judgment and, thereby, cause serious harm to a multitude of people. By contrast, if he or she is mistaken, they should endure suffering themselves without hurting others. What is more, people might disagree on what laws qualify as just or unjust. He remarks, "… no man should be a law unto himself …", the logic that provided a basis for the establishment of the advisory committee to ascertain justice or injustice of particular laws (Gandhi 2001, 21). Nevertheless, Gandhi acknowledges that an individual has to engage in the pursuit of truth and aspire to determine it. Should a person be unable to elicit truth independently for whatever reason, he or she might follow someone who managed to have done so.

The Indian freedom fighter reaffirms the noncriminal nature of acts of civil disobedience. Gandhi emphasizes the substantial discrepancy between a perpetrator and a Satyagrahi. Those who commit crimes are predominantly concerned with doing so clandestinely and escaping punishment, whereas a Satyagrahi willingly abides by the law under normal conditions provided that it strives to achieve justice and the common good. Should a law prove unfair or indifferent to community welfare, protesters would be forced to act decisively and overtly to secure their rights. As regards their attitude toward cooperation with both the government and the police, Gandhi maintains, "… a Satyagrahi's business is not to assist the police in the method, which is open to the police, but he helps the authorities and the police to make the people more law-abiding and more respectable to authority" (Gandhi 2001, 28). Crucially, the Satyagraha principle postulates that one has "to follow truth at all costs and refrain from violence" when producing social and political change (Gandhi 2001, 32).

At last, the concept of "nonviolence" is absolutely fundamental to Martin Luther King, Jr.'s ideology. Having grown up in a family of clergymen (his father, grandfather, and great-grandfather were all Baptist ministers), he immersed himself into theological studies and later became a pastor at the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Atlanta, Georgia. In 1955, Rosa Parks famously refused to give up her seat to a white person on the Montgomery city bus, which marked the beginning of a movement against racial discrimination in the American South. Parks' arrest as well as the injustice of the segregation law on public transportation triggered the Montgomery Bus Boycott (1955 – 1956). As a result, this campaign of civil disobedience induced the Supreme Court to rule the law in question unconstitutional, indicating the power and

practical implementation of nonviolent methods. Due to his position in the community and eloquence, King, Jr. came to spearhead the civil rights movement in the 1960s and 1970s US. Ultimately, King, Jr.'s activism produced a major social change, helping repeal or amend a number of patently unjust laws. To illustrate, the 24th Amendment (1964), the Civil Rights Act (1964), and the Voting Rights Act (1965) illegalized discrimination on the grounds of race and removed barriers to voting for African Americans.

Over the course of his human rights advocacy, King, Jr. had been taken into custody over 20 times, including Birmingham, Alabama, where he wrote *Letter From Birmingham City Jail* (1963) used for the purposes of this subchapter. In it, he expresses a sentiment that "Birmingham is probably the most thoroughly segregated city in the United States" due to egregious police brutality, unfair treatment of African Americans in court, and the Birmingham church bombing, to name but a few (King, Jr. 1963, 69). He categorizes four stages in organizing an act of nonviolent civil disobedience: gathering data, corroborating the existence of a form of social injustice; bargaining with the political leaders in an attempt to address the issue; internalizing nonviolent behavior (what King, Jr. terms "self-purification") via preparation and practice; and, finally, "direct action" proper (King, Jr. 1963, 69). The social change leader offers an explanation for the latter term: it is designed to bring a critical situation to a powerful climax when it can no longer be dismissed by the majority, generating a much-anticipated public discussion:

"Nonviolent direct action seeks to create such a crisis and establish such creative tension that a community that has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue. It seeks so to dramatize the issue that it can no longer be ignored. … I have earnestly worked and preached against violent tension, but there is a type of constructive nonviolent tension that is necessary for growth" (King, Jr. 1963, 71).

As can be seen, King, Jr. differentiates between "violent tension" (he is outspoken in his opposition to it) and "constructive nonviolent tension" that encourages the transcendence of biases, such as racism, and espousal of unity and tolerance (King, Jr. 1963, 71). It is worth noting that he compares "the creation of tension" with that of Socrates, who would engage in discourse

to provide intellectual stimulation and make a person question their old dogmas, triggering more independent thought processes and greater objectivity.

The American human rights activist echoes Saint Augustine and Thoreau, asserting that unjust laws coexist with just ones, inasmuch as both are man-made. A just law is congruous with natural law, which has its morality grounded in God, whereas an unjust one is based on constructs of mind (for instance, prejudice), rendering it immoral and nonbinding (King, Jr. 1963, 73). It was Saint Thomas Aquinas who yielded an original insight as to why some laws are unfair: they are not harmonized with divine law. In contrast with unjust laws, those founded on moral order glorify human beings and their spiritual needs. Furthermore, if a majority imposes its will on a minority without the consent of the latter, it is tyranny ("difference made legal"); alternatively, if the minority voluntarily obeys the law enacted by the majority, it is justice ("sameness made legal") (King, Jr. 1963, 74). Alongside Gandhi, King, Jr. discovers a strong connection between the means and the ends. Not only does he reject the strive for justice through violence, but he also regards it unjustifiable to pursue unethical or illegal goals in a fair manner. Hence, the integrity of methods and objectives is deemed equally pivotal in conducting a campaign of nonviolent civil disobedience.

In the absence of this politico-religious philosophy, the American South would have witnessed extreme forms of intercommunal violence. Apropos, King, Jr. expresses deep dissatisfaction at the role played by the "white moderate", who, having embraced conformity, oppose the fight for social progress so as to preserve the so-called public order (King, Jr. 1963, 75). He warns that if white people remain dismissive of their cause, African Americans might feel compelled to adopt Black nationalism, which will inevitably result in racial tensions. On top of that, the civil rights activist articulates that the church should take up a tougher, more uncompromising stance toward basic human rights that it had been the case at the time of the freedom movement. Although the contemporary church does not wield power and influence it used to at the beginning of Christianity, it should "recapture the sacrificial spirit of the early church" (King, Jr. 1964, 81). For the abovementioned reasons, King, Jr. suggests that violating unfair laws is legitimate and necessary as long as it is done "*openly*, *lovingly*, … and with a willingness to accept the penalty" (King, Jr. 1963, 74).

In sum, nonviolence plays a pivotal role in civil disobedience. Being harmonized with eternal and immutable natural law, the principle of nonviolence, the cornerstone of which is love, leans

heavily on consciousness, acceptance of truth, sovereignty, freedom, and order. Grounded in ethics, it is consistent with one's conscience as well as contains true power as contrasted with moral weakness manifested as physical force. Given that no one can know the ultimate truth, one needs to reject violent methods so as to do no harm to others should an error of judgment occur. A nonviolent campaign of civil disobedience should be preceded by information gathering, resolution through negotiations, as well as education and training in nonviolent resistance. The aforementioned representatives of the nonviolent discipline encourage the idea that seeking justice through injustice as well as upholding injustice through legal means is fundamentally erroneous. Alternatively, a political dissident has to demonstrate a commitment to greater social justice as well as tackling political, economic, racial, sexual, or other forms of oppression in a peaceful manner.

Conclusion

All things considered, we have presented the definitions and essential features of "civil disobedience" (from the perspectives of Thoreau, Rawls, Habermas, and Sharp), "civil society" (Howard, Beichelt, and Merkel), and "nonviolence" (Tolstoy, Gandhi, and King, Jr.). To recapitulate, civil disobedience is required to be public, nonviolent, conscientious, political, and illegal. It is uniquely capable of challenging the authority of the state without infringing upon the latter's exclusive right to use physical force. It should rather not be institutionalized to retain its powerful effect. Civil disobedience must be guided by unity, solidarity, nonviolence, empathy, and understanding. Careful planning, as opposed to spontaneity, is preferable if an act is to be a success. It is supposed to be turned to only as a last resort should legal methods prove inadequate. Its participants must fully accept a penalty imposed by the state as a token of respect for the law. Concurrently, political dissidents are not mere criminals, and the two should not be punished in the same manner. Not only does civil disobedience help consolidate democratic institutions, but it also mobilizes civil society and its organizations, builds confidence, trust, as well as mutual respect. Strong institutions give rise to empowered citizens, whose agency is essential for reinforcing democracy.

With regard to civil society, it is an institutionalized structure designed to exercise popular control over government decisions as well as raise awareness about both public and

environmental interests and needs. Unlike political society and economic society, ordinary citizens have no power- or profit-seeking intentions, albeit their membership organizations more often than not lack political clout and resources needed. To qualify as such, CSOs should be officially established, autonomous, legally protected, and, last but not least, voluntary. In addition, civil society is supportive of robust political and legal institutions, which are a *sine qua non* of a vibrant democratic system. It exerts a beneficial effect on the process of democratic consolidation in terms of securing limited government, fostering active citizenship, promoting a culture of tolerance and pluralism, articulating public opinion, increasing youth political participation, protecting the democratic functioning of institutions, providing free access to public information, and improving economic governance. Social capital, which provides a sound basis for a democratic society, draws substantially on CSOs; its bridging type takes on paramount importance in comparison to the bonding one due to its potential for forging intercommunal links.

As far as nonviolence is concerned, it is an integral component of civil disobedience from an ethical standpoint. It is the epitome of natural law undergirded by universal and immutable principles and truth, with love at its core together with knowledge, sovereignty, freedom, and order. What is important, nonviolence is harmonized with one's conscience, and it is one's conscientious refusal to engage in violence as opposed to perceived weakness. Since it is human to err, one should not inflict suffering on others but on oneself if need be. Prior to launching a nonviolent campaign, one has to collect data indicating the existence of social injustice, attempt to tackle the issue through diplomacy and negotiation with the authorities, and internalize nonviolence theoretically and empirically. There is a consensus of opinion among the leading proponents of nonviolence that the ends do not justify the means; the legitimacy of the latter, as well as the worthiness of the former, are fundamental.

ANALYTICAL SECTION

Having examined a basic theoretical framework, we proceed with the analysis stated. In order to explore civil disobedience in post-Soviet Ukraine, we take the Orange Revolution (2004 - 2005) and Euromaidan (2013 - 2014) as representative examples, providing the causes, key events, political stakeholders, youth movements, civil society groups and organizations, methods of nonviolent action adopted, as well as external influences. The achievements of both the Orange Revolution and the Revolution of Dignity are largely due to the Revolution on Granite (1990), the Donbas miners' strikes (1989 and 1991), and "Ukraine without Kuchma" (2000 - 2001). For this reason, we outline the background to these protest events as well as their influence on a new generation of democratic challengers in Ukraine. In addition to domestic protest experience, the October 5 Revolution in Yugoslavia (2000) and the Rose Revolution in Georgia (2003) played a prominent role in developing a strategic framework used by the Orange demonstrators, who then empowered the Ukrainians to protest on Maidan a decade later.

The Framework for Disobedience: Revolution on Granite, Donbas Miners' Strikes, "Ukraine without Kuchma", and Revolutions in Yugoslavia and Georgia

First of all, the Revolution on Granite serves as a reference point for all the subsequent protest events in Ukraine. It gained momentum owing to the students' going on a hunger strike and demonstrating peacefully in the space of 16 days (October 2-17, 1990). The size of the student-led protest is estimated at 2,000 participants as a maximum (Onuch 2017, 3). It was they who started a popular tradition of protesting on Maidan Nezalezhnosti (the then-Lenin Square). As Onuch notes, "Many repertoires observed in Ukraine, such as the "tent city", the concert stage, and the use of humor and performance … [were] later mimicked and adopted by future generations of activists" (Onuch 2017, 9). The members of the Ukrainian students' union, Kyiv students' brotherhood, as well as young leaders from Lviv, Kharkiv, and Odessa made five central demands: the secession from the Soviet Union, the resignation of Vitaliy Masol, the head of the national government, the transition to a multi-party system, with holding of parliamentary elections within a year, the suspension of compulsory military service, and the nationalization of the property of the Communist Party along with that of Komsomol, the Communist Youth

League (Onuch 2017, 8). The movement also included hitherto imprisoned political dissidents (Vyacheslav Chornovil and Ivan Drach) alongside youth activists (Oleksandr Doniy, Markian Ivashchyshyn, Vyacheslav Kyrylenko, and Mykhailo Svystovych), who would be involved in the ensuing acts of civil disobedience and counsel the next generation of protesters. Following the local factory workers, who showed solidarity with the student-led campaign, Verkhovna Rada arrived at a decision in favor of the protesters and issued a statement meeting the majority of their demands. Upon national liberation (August 24, 1991), human and civil rights advocacy replaced sovereignty high on the public agenda. Hence, the protest methods and techniques pioneered during the Revolution on Granite, notably erecting a tent city, building a concert stage, and using the power of humor and public performance proved effective on Ukrainian soil and entered the people's repertoire of contention.

Second, the Donbas coal miners put forward a variety of analogous political demands in 1991, laying the groundwork for further manifestations of popular contention. As a result of their 1989 mobilization, the miners received their overdue wages, were entitled to increased holidays as well as medical and financial assistance in a greater number of work-related injuries and illnesses (Vyshnytska and Vlasova 2020). In March – April 1991, the strikers called for Gorbachev's impeachment, the removal of the Congress of People's Deputies (the then supreme governmental institution) from office, the creation of a Council of the Confederation of Sovereign States in its place, the adoption of the Declaration of Independence of Ukraine, not to mention a regular growth in wages (due to inflation) and guaranteed pensions (Onuch 2017, 8). The latter strike was a joint endeavor of the representatives of the Independent Trade Union of Miners of Ukraine, the Kuzbass Workers' Committee, and the Federation of Trade Unions of Ukraine, with their numbers reaching a peak of 500,000 participants (Vyshnytska and Vlasova 2020). Indeed, the protesters accomplished quite a lot in terms of their grievances; yet, the leading politicians exercised the prerogative to leave the Soviet Union and delegate authority on their own terms. The mine workers continued to demand their rights and benefits on a regular basis throughout the 1990s. In the words of Nikolayenko, "The disintegration of the Communist system has altered the power balance in state-society relations by opening up access to broad-based political participation" (Nikolayenko 2007, 175). Thus, the Donbas mine workers, the epitome of labor union activism, made a major contribution to the fall of the USSR as well as gaining Ukrainian independence.

Third, the protest campaign referred to as "Ukraine without Kuchma" turned out to be crucial in precipitating the Orange Revolution. The murder of an investigative journalist Georgy Gongadze, who started a well-known online newspaper Ukrayinska Pravda ("Ukrainian Truth") and uncovered evidence of President Leonid Kuchma's corruption schemes, provoked a major three-month-long mass movement (December 15, 2000 – March 9, 2001). It emerged out of the goal to have a transparent criminal investigation conducted and dismiss Kuchma alongside his top officials guilty of obstruction of justice in relation to that case (Nikolayenko 2017, 175). The audiotapes revealing Kuchma's complicity in Gongadze's death, to say nothing of his other transgressions in office, were leaked by his ex-bodyguard Mykola Melnychenko. This scandal surrounding the government dubbed "the Kuchmagate crisis" exposed the absence of the rule of law as well as the persistence of Soviet elites and institutions in post-Soviet Ukraine. Interestingly enough, Lviv-based youth activists played a prominent role during the "Ukraine without Kuchma" campaign. They set up the Za Pravdu ("For Truth") National Civic Resistance Committee and rallied for the sake of a regime transformation. Despite the rightfulness of their vociferous objections, the political leaders vilified the opposition in the media, infiltrating agents provocateurs in their midst to provide a justification for the brutal police suppression (Wilson 2015, 312). As reported by Kuzio, the size of "Ukraine without Kuchma" range from 20,000 to 50,000 participants, which proved insufficient to remove Kuchma from power (Kuzio 2006, 55). Therefore, although the Ukrainian people failed to oust Kuchma and bring the perpetrators to justice, they carried on their anti-authoritarian struggle by means of the Orange Revolution, placing emphasis on both the massive size of the protest and nonviolence.

Concurrently, not only did the Orange Revolution build on domestic protest experience, but also that of the Serbian October 5 Revolution (2000) and the Rose Revolution in Georgia (2003). The Bulldozer Revolution (September 29 – October 5, 2000) laid the blueprint for the Orange demonstrators, being triggered by the fraudulent presidential election. In 1996-1997, the Serbs suffered a setback in their attempt to overthrow Slobodan Milošević, whose presidency incurred all-out wars (Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and later Kosovo), ethnic cleansing, NATO air campaign, repression, and fear, let alone grinding poverty and unemployment. In his documentary, Steve York labels the Yugoslav President as "the bloodiest tyrant in Europe" as well as "the butcher of the Balkans" (York 2002). The divided opposition could not help confront the regime; however, the ideas put into action by Otpor! ("Resistance!"), founded by

Srdja Popović and co-founded by Slobodan Djinović, gained ground nationwide and led to the downfall of the dictatorship.

Having started as a bunch of students in October 1998, the Otpor! youth movement grew to encompass 70,000 people by the 2000 election (Nikolayenko 2007, 171). The University of Belgrade has a history of student activism, bearing in mind the 1968 student strikes in Yugoslavia, and it continued to occupy a special place in the course of the October 5 Revolution. Learning from the past, the youth activists set two principal objectives so as to topple the dictator: to engage at least 1,000,000 protest participants as well as keep the campaign of civil disobedience strictly nonviolent (Popović 2015). To this end, practical workshops were held to prepare the demonstrators not to succumb to provocations from the part of the police and the army, including a training by a retired US colonel Robert L. Helvey. Their central demands were the removal of Milošević, free and fair election, and democratic transfer of power (Popović 2015). Being perceived as a revolutionary organization was a cardinal concern for the Otpor! members. Indeed, the government made futile attempts to portray them as "terrorists" and "drug addicts" in the mass media, let alone discredit them as "violent mercenaries preparing ground for NATO invasion" (Binnendijk and Marović 2006, 417).

The students protested under the catchy slogan "Gotov Je!" ("He's Finished!"), explicitly denying Milošević's legitimacy. In order to reinforce their political message, they pasted more than 1,000,000 stickers reading the abovementioned slogan (Nikolayenko 2007, 173). Equally, they used paint as a protest tool, spraying "Otpor Do Pobede!" ("Resistance Until Victory!") and "Narod Je Otpor!" ("The People Are Resistance!") on both government and residential buildings. Furthermore, the use of humor and performance uniquely enabled them to overcome fear and apathy that bolster dictatorial rulers, empowering citizens to actively involve. To illustrate, the students put on a public performance for Milošević's birthday, with slices of a cake representing parts of Serbia that ex-President intended to consume (Popović 2015). On another occasion, they exhibited an oil barrel, which had Milošević's face on it and a hole on the top; all those, who wanted to hit the barrel, had to insert a coin first. In the end, the police arrested the barrel, while the Otpor! members observed the performance from a nearby café (Popović 2015).

The youth activists did not forge alliances with other political parties due to the fact that they shared the public distrust of the powerholders (Nikolayenko 2007, 178). In turn, the opposition leaders were rather concerned about the growing popularity of the student-led movement. While

the political elites remained split, Milošević seized the opportunity to call the elections 10 months ahead of schedule. As a result, the opposition leaders acquiesced to form a coalition, Democratic Opposition of Serbia (DOS), to back Vojislav Koštunica, whose nationalist and anti-American rhetoric enjoyed broad public approval. Milošević attempted to initiate a police crackdown on student activists, which led to their beatings and arrests. However, he failed to do so in the long term, considering that the protesters fraternized with the police and military officers, who did not choose to remain loyal to the existing order. On October 5, 800,000 protesters from all over Serbia gathered in front of the National Assembly to clinch Koštunica's electoral victory (Binnendijk and Marović 2006, 413). The parliament was taken over in a nonviolent manner, whereas the orders to remove the crowds were disobeyed since the security forces stepped over to the side of the people. In the final analysis, Milošević conceded the election to Koštunica, who was sworn as President of Yugoslavia alongside Zoran Djindjić as Prime Minister. Milošević was extradited to the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) in the Hague to be tried for war crimes and crimes against humanity.

In retrospect, the fundamental principles behind the movement's success were unity, planning, and nonviolent discipline (Popović 2015). Sharp's *From Dictatorship to Democracy: A Conceptual Framework for Liberation*, 5,500 copies of which were made by the Serbian NGO Civic Initiatives in collaboration with the Albert Einstein Institute, proved instrumental in intensifying their nonviolent struggle (Nikolayenko 2007, 183). Their monochrome clenched fist became highly symbolic of nonviolent resistance elsewhere and was exported to such post-Soviet states, as Georgia, Ukraine, Kyrgyzstan, and Belarus, among others. In 2003, Popović and Djinović started the Center for Applied Nonviolent Action and Strategies (CANVAS) that provided Ukrainian and Georgian pro-democracy activists with trainings in protest strategies and tactics adopted by Otpor (Center for Applied Nonviolent Action and Strategies, n.d.). Thus, the Serbs demonstrated that removing a long-standing dictator from power in a post-Communist context is feasible provided that the people are united in their aims, create a blueprint for action, and use nonviolent means.

The Georgian case illustrated that the people are capable of removing a post-Soviet leader from power by peaceful means, which fueled the Color Revolutions across the region and, *inter alia*, invigorated their Ukrainian counterparts. The Rose Revolution (November 3-23, 2003) occurred due to three vital prerequisites: fraud-tainted parliamentary elections, rampant systemic

corruption, and steep economic decline (Kandelaki 2006, 2). Besides, Tbilisi was losing its grip on Adjara, South Ossetia, and Abkhazia, the breakaway republics with ethnic Russian minorities. Faced with his legitimacy turning vulnerable and unwilling to step down on the verge of the 2005 presidential elections, President Eduard Shevarnadze connived at vote rigging. To challenge the official results, a PVT was performed (a methodology employed in Ukraine the following year), and alternative exit polls transmitted on an independent TV-channel Rustavi-2. The unofficial vote count broke through the widespread political apathy and sparked a wave of popular protests. Interestingly, well in advance of the Rose Revolution, Rustavi-2 started to regularly broadcast Ackerman's documentary *Bringing Down a Dictator* about the Serbian regime change, which had a ripple effect on a number of countries in the post-Soviet space.

The youth movement Kmara! ("Enough!") was explicitly modelled upon the Serbian Otpor!. Under the leadership of Giorgi Kandelaki, the movement's founder, the students of the Tbilisi State University and Student Movement for Georgia were actively involved in raising political awareness and promoting political participation by the Georgian public. However, the youth did not play a pivotal role in the context of the Rose Revolution; it was part of the extensive network of NGOs, opposition politicians, and journalists that ousted President Shevarnadze (Angley 2013, 42). Among the most influential domestic NGOs, there were the Liberty Institute, the Georgian Young Lawyers Association, the Open Society Georgia Foundation, the International Society for Fair Elections and Democracy, the Caucasian Institute for Peace, Democracy, and Development, and the Association for Legal and Public Education (Angley 2013, 45). Kmara! developed a close relationship with the Liberty Institute that devised an action plan, while the Open Society Georgia Foundation granted funding to its activities. The former was co-founded by Levan Ramishvili and Giga Bokeria, former Rustavi-2 staff members and participants of the 1989 pro-independence student protests in Tbilisi, whereas the latter's director was Alexander Lomaia, a Georgian politician and subsequently the Ambassador of Georgia to the United Nations. Regarding strategies and tactics implemented, Kmara! made a series of commercials for Rustavi-2, attacking corruption among Shevarnadze's For a New Georgia bloc, as well as issued thousands of leaflets explaining the PVT results (Angley 2013, 49).

The revolution's principal actor Mikheil Saakashvili, the leader of the party United National Movement, lobbied hard for the restoration of Georgia's unity, Euro-Atlantic integration, as well as adopted an all-pervasive anti-Russian rhetoric. It was he who appealed to the public for civil

disobedience so as to "paralyze Shevarnadze's government" (Kandelaki 2006, 4). On November 22, Saakashvili accompanied by his supporters forced an entrance into the parliament in the middle of Shevarnadze's speech and climbed the presidium, holding roses in their hands. It is estimated that around 120,000 protesters occupied the Freedom Square in Tbilisi, resulting in Shevarnadze's resignation and a takeover of the government (Kandelaki 2006, 11). Most importantly, the Rose Revolution abided by the principles of nonviolence: Kmara! activists distributed flowers and food among the troops, whereas the latter, including the elite military units, defected to the side of the people. On November 23, Shevarnadze met with the opposition leaders, namely Saakashvili, Nino Burjanadze, and Zurab Zhvania, and agreed to resign for the sake of preventing bloodshed. For the first time, the change of government occurred peacefully in the Caucasus region, albeit President Saakashvili's style of leadership was getting ever more autocratic, socioeconomic conditions stagnating, and control over Abkhazia and South Ossetia completely relinquished. Altogether, the Georgian civil society actors successfully implemented the Serbian model based on student activism, voter mobilization, election monitoring, independent mass media, and nonviolent discipline, empowering the Ukrainians to carry through with their anti-Kuchma campaign next year.

According to Dubovyk, Ukraine and Georgia share certain similarities in terms of their domestic and foreign policy objectives, notably the implementation of governmental and electoral reforms coupled with a range of anti-corruption measures, the Euro-Atlantic integration, and the rejection of Russia's hegemonic power politics against the sovereignty of the countries in question (Dubovyk 2016). It is clear that Putin's Russia seeks to continue to wield its soft power in relation to both countries; consequently, the Georgian and Ukrainian authorities need to decide on a strategy for withstanding the influence exerted by the Russian Orthodox Church (ROC), mass media, and culture. Dubovyk also suggests that Tbilisi and Kyiv develop a strategic partnership so as to strengthen security in the Black Sea region, given the deployment of the Russian Black Sea Fleet headquartered in Sevastopol and Russia's naval bases in Crimea (Dubovyk 2016). Wezeman and Kuimova concur that the region represents a "high-risk environment" since the takeover of Crimea and the ongoing clashes in southeastern Ukraine (Wezeman and Kuimova 2018, 1). In connection therewith, they report that "the six littoral states (Bulgaria, Georgia, Romania, Russia, Turkey, and Ukraine) intensified their efforts to build up their military potential …" (Wezeman and Kuimova 2018, 1). Taking into account Ukraine's and

Georgia's shared past as republics of the Soviet Union and the outbreak of the Color Revolutions there, the two should also seek closer cooperation on security policy in the Black Sea region.

Orange Revolution

Bearing in mind both homegrown and international precedents, we presently seek to thoroughly explore the Orange Revolution (November 22, 2004 – January 23, 2005). Like in Serbia and Georgia, the large-scale election manipulation unleashed a torrent of protests in the Ukrainian capital. The Yushchenko-Yanukovych presidential race shed light on a multitude of problems, from a lack of government accountability and the rule of law to bribery and corruption. Taras Kuzio, one of the leading political experts on Ukraine, singles out the following root causes of the crisis: low trust in state institutions, high popular support for Kuchma's impeachment, the deepening gap between the political elite and ordinary citizens, a growing opposition movement, and international isolation (Kuzio 2006, 45). He also provides statistics on the level of distrust toward the government: in 2004, only 20% of Ukrainians believed that the election will be free and fair, whereas 58% thought otherwise (Kuzio 2006, 46). Although the public sentiment was in favor of Yushchenko, the authorities were determined to declare Yanukovych's victory. To this end, the Central Election Committee contemplated ballot-rigging. On November 21, Donetsk witnessed the most outrageous ballot stuffing – a millionfold increase in the number of votes overnight (York 2007). Both the National Exit Poll and a PVT performed by the Kyiv International Institute for Sociology (KIIS) and the Razumkov Center, a Ukrainian non-governmental think tank, stated that Yushchenko led with 53% of the vote versus Yanukovych's 44%, corroborating the Election Committee's involvement in the falsification (Kuzio 2005, 41).

As his term was nearing its end and popularity dwindling, Leonid Kuchma designated Prime Minister Viktor Yanukovych as his successor. An ex-convict with two criminal records, Yanukovych represented the Donetsk clan, where organized crime flourished alongside political tribalism. The politician was most unlikely to cherish European values held by the majority of the population in western and central regions, with central Ukraine being decisive in producing election results. Yanukovych's pro-Russian rhetoric secured him Moscow's assistance in the

elections. Kuchma's candidate was personally endorsed by Putin, whose ultimate goal was to continue to wield influence over Ukraine.

At the other end of the spectrum was Viktor Yushchenko. Previously, he was part of the political system, chairing the National Bank and serving as prime minister under Kuchma. Moreover, Yushchenko backed the latter in relation to the Kuchmagate crisis that triggered the "Ukraine without Kuchma" movement and culminated with the Orange Revolution. He was duly credited for strengthening Ukraine's economy and encouraging the highest rate of economic growth across Europe at the beginning of the new millennium (Kuzio 2006, 49). Upon the dismissal of his government, Yushchenko metamorphosed into the main oppositionist. Not quite a revolutionary leader, he came to epitomize the spirit of the campaign. Yushchenko's identity forged by adopting a mix of nationalist, populist, and liberal rhetoric found a broad response among numerous pro-European Ukrainians (Katchanovski 2008, 367). To physically (rather than merely politically) destroy the opponent, his adversaries endeavored dioxin poisoning, which was meant to "disfigure the Messiah and brand him with the mark of the beast" (Wilson 2015, 323). Nevertheless, an attempt made on his life only generated a fresh surge of public endorsement. It should be noted that Yushchenko championed popular pressure through peaceful means for the sake of averting a violent police crackdown.

His coalition partner, another prominent opposition figure Deputy Prime Minister Yulia Tymoshenko, preferred to act radically and rapidly, though. For one, her urge to march to the parliament building could potentially spark its storming and entail a massive bloodshed in the early days of the revolution. Katchanovski depicts her as "a power-seeking oligarch who has frequently changed her political allies and political orientation to achieve this goal [to become prime minister]", which appears credible given her systematic change of tactics to stay at the top (Katchanovski 2008, 368). She can also be characterized as a charismatic leader, whose populist ideas widely appealed to the electorate. There was a real personality clash between Tymoshenko and Yushchenko, and the two had conflicting political ambitions; yet, they reached an agreement, granting her premiership in case of his victory, and formed two Orange governments later on.

By analogy with the Serbian revolution, the young people propelled the Ukrainians into action, making up two-thirds of the protesters (Kuzio 2006, 56). On November 22, the number of demonstrators reached approximately 100,000, whereas a total of 400 tents were put up on

Khreshchatyk the next day (National Memorial to the Heavenly Hundred Heroes and Revolution of Dignity Museum, n.d.). The students of the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy (NaUKMA) proved particularly active in anti-government protests, launching an independent Maidan-Mohylianka newspaper in particular (Nikolayenko 2007, 172). Less than a year before the election, two youth resistance movements emerged under the same name Pora! ("It's Time!"). The youth activists were among the first to set up a tent camp in downtown Kyiv following the exposure of the electoral fraud. Their main target was to liberate the Ukrainian people from Kuchma, as well as to eliminate oligarchy, hold free and fair election, and ensure the victory of the opposition. The two had to be subsequently renamed into Black Pora! and Yellow Pora! due to the incompatible personal ambitions of the leaders as well as their unwillingness to make information regarding means of funding available to one another (Nikolayenko 2017, 186). Black Pora! was co-founded by Mykhailo Svystovych, an enthusiastic member of the Revolution on Granite and "Ukraine without Kuchma" protest campaigns and the creator of the Maidan website. His youth organization established contact with an Otpor! activist Marko Marković, who was once refused entry to Ukraine on the grounds of assisting a "terrorist" organization (Kuzio 2005). Under the leadership of Vladyslav Kaskiv, Yellow Pora! forged links with transnational NGOs, including Freedom House (Kuzio 2005).

The popular mood became extremely anti-oligarchic since a high growth rate did not translate into a higher standard of living. It was notorious that Kuchma's regime patronized business tycoons, namely Viktor Medvedchuk, Viktor Pinchuk, and Rinat Akhmetov. At one point, Akhmetov and Pinchuk sought to privatize the largest state-owned enterprises, including the steel-producing Kryvorizhstal as well as Dniproenergo, the major power-generating company, which was perceived as thoroughly unjust. Therefore, Chysta Ukraina ("Clean Ukraine") was established to fight endemic corruption.

The lessons of the "Ukraine without Kuchma" civic movement were learned, with emphasis placed on projecting exclusively nonviolent power. In accordance with Sharp's classification, the methods of nonviolent action adopted by the Orange demonstrators and the opposition leaders included slogans ("Glory to Ukraine!", "Together, We Are Many, We Cannot Be Defeated!", "Police Are with the People!", "Shame!", "Criminals Out!", "Kuchma Out!", "Yushchenko!"); banners bearing various slogans and regions of Ukraine; displays of flags and symbolic colors (the orange flags, the yellow Pora! flags); wearing of symbols (orange clothes and ribbons);

displays of Yushchenko's portraits; symbolic sounds (car horns honking); Internet (the Maidan website, the Pora! website); online newspapers (*Ukrayinska Pravda*); radio and television (Channel 5); "haunting" officials (Kuchma's residence in Koncha-Zaspa); taunting officials (Yanukovych); fraternization with police officers; vigils; humorous skits and pranks (the *Jolly Eggs* performance, anecdotes about Yanukovych published in a *Yanukdote* book, caricatures of him printed in the *Silski Vesti* newspaper, and an *Operation ProFFessor* series); music (Vopli Vidopliassova and Okean Elzy); singing, including the national anthem; protest meetings (Maidan); public speeches advocating resistance (Yushchenko, Tymoshenko, and Yushchenko's campaign staff); a blockade of government buildings (Verkhovna Rada, the Office of the President of Ukraine, and the Supreme Court of Ukraine); and nonviolent occupation of buildings (the Trade Union House and the International Convention Center also known as the Ukrainian House). During the blockade of the parliament, some of the activists gave flowers and balloons to police guards, chanting "Police Are with the People!", while others played musical instruments and prevented possible conflicts with the security forces. The latter either defected to the side of the Orange demonstrators or preserved neutrality given that they did not wish to serve under a former prisoner (Kuzio 2006, 57). Although Kuchma gave the order to quell the opposition rallies, law enforcement officers refused to execute it without a written confirmation. Kuchma did not take the risk so as to leave a paper trail.

Maidan Nezalezhnosti, which became the center stage for the cause, had a carnival-like ambience, where live music was performed by renowned Ukrainian vocalists Oleh Skrypka and Svyatoslav Vakarchuk, the frontmen of the rock bands Vopli Vidopliassova and Okean Elzy respectively. Interestingly, Vakarchuk was later appointed Yushchenko's adviser as well as proved an outspoken advocate of Euromaidan. The masses sang folk songs and the national anthem, chanting a popular slogan "Glory to Ukraine!" coupled with "Together, We Are Many, We Cannot Be Defeated!", showing a strong sense of unity and patriotism. Apropos, *Razom Nas Bogato* ("Together, We Are Many") by Greenjolly, a hip-hop band from Ivano-Frankivsk, became the anthem of the Orange Revolution and was even performed at the Eurovision Song Contest in 2005. Not only did the music, but also the strategically chosen campaign color (orange was hitherto ideologically neutral) keep the atmosphere electrified in freezing conditions.

Equally important, humor was weaponized for the purposes of the revolution. Yanukovych became an easy target given his poor language skills, the use of criminal slang, and the public perception of him as "intellectually challenged" (Kuzio 2006, 58-59). One of the spelling mistakes he made in the documents with the word "professor" inspired a thirteen-episode *Operation ProFFessor* series mocking Yanukovych alongside other high-profile politicians. Numerous anecdotes about him, including those created by Yulia Tymoshenko and Mykhailo Brodsky, the leader of the Yabluko party, were compiled in the book entitled *Yanukdote* and published on the threshold of the repeat second round. A *Silski Visti* newspaper printed a caricature, depicting two prison guards and reporting their conversation as follows: "Where are the brothers [as in criminal brotherhood]?" "Don't worry. They will soon return. They have just gone out to campaign for their own …" (Kuzio 2006, 58). In addition, the so-called "attempted assassination" of Yanukovych, when an egg was thrown at him by a student in Ivano-Frankivsk, engendered the *Jolly Eggs* performance, where one asked why "a heavy blunt object" was not found at the site of the accident, and the other responded that his bodyguards carried him (Yanukovych) away (York 2007). Another fine example of the use of mocking is the joint public performance of Pora! enthusiasts and those of a youth NGO Znayu! ["I Know"], who dressed up as prison inmates and chanted "Yanukovych!" on Khreshchatyk, one of the principal streets in Kyiv (Kuzio 2006, 58). Likewise, Yanukovych's ex-wife, Lyudmyla, became an object of ridicule after she suggested that drugged oranges were distributed among the protesters to maintain their enthusiasm, let alone communicated the idea that *valenki* (felt boots) were sent directly from the United States to express support for the anti-government protesters (Kuzio 2006, 59). It was a classic example of Soviet propaganda, portraying the opposition as "drug addicts" and "American puppets". The Ukrainian people saw the humor of the situation and added "Made in the USA" on top of the felt boots.

That being said, the United States did participate actively in promoting democratic change abroad, substantially boosting funds for democracy assistance programs in the newly-minted post-Communist states in the 1990s (Fukuyama and McFaul 2007, 38). Victoria Nuland, former Assistant Secretary of State for European and Eurasian Affairs, disclosed that "the US had invested over USD 5 billion in democracy promotion in Ukraine since 1991" (Sakwa 2015). Such organizations, as USAID, Freedom House, Peace Corps, National Endowment for Democracy, International Republican Institute (IRI), National Democratic Institute (NDI),

George Soros' Open Society Foundations, notably International Renaissance Foundation (IRF), International Foundation for Human Rights, International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights, and International Crisis Group, among others, realized an abundance of democracy promotion projects on Ukrainian soil. They trained the Ukrainians in election observation, encouraged independent media outlets, and communicated different types of social mobilization in order to further the cause of liberal democracy. The American democracy promoters received sharp criticism for meddling in the internal affairs of these states, and, therefore, spurring political transformations; however, Fukuyama and McFaul maintain that it is a priori impossible to import a template for action without a broad base of popular support (Fukuyama and McFaul 2007, 28). Needless to say, the Ukrainians, as did many other nations in the former Communist world, welcomed liberal democracy, which met their actual aspirations for good governance, the rule of law, economic growth, and an equitable distribution of wealth and resources.

In turn, the Kremlin both conceived and heavily funded the Common Economic Space (CES) integration project and desperately needed Ukraine's participation in it. To this end, Putin committed to promoting Yanukovych not only in Donbas, a region of special historical and cultural significance, but also Russia (election campaign posters reading "The Ukrainians of Russia are choosing President Viktor Yanukovych!" could be seen in Moscow). The political continuity was displayed at an ad hoc military parade in Kyiv a week before the election day, with Kuchma, Yanukovych, and Putin standing shoulder to shoulder. On the threshold of the second round, the three met again in Crimea to promptly react to an unexpected electoral defeat, resulting in the maximization of the voter turnout in Donetsk mentioned above. In hindsight, the Kremlin campaign managers demonstrated an extraordinary lapse of judgement, mistakenly believing that "Russian election strategies [would work] in a country with a different political environment" (Petrov and Ryabov 2006, 149). In return for partnership with Russia, the voters were promised a boost in pension, a recognition of Russian as a regional language, VAT exemption for Ukrainian exports, as well as simplified procedures for labor migration to Russia (Wilson 2015, 317). Using trade or other economic tools as a lever of diplomacy could only prove impactful in relation to southeastern Ukrainians, which exacerbated East-West divisions. Having fallen short of their objective, they employed a time-proven propaganda machine, depicting the Orange Revolution as a "Polish-American conspiracy", a media frame that surprisingly persisted throughout almost two decades (Petrov and Ryabov 2006, 161). The entire

political campaign proved a fiasco, which rendered it impossible for Moscow to encourage an increased political and economic cooperation, let alone arouse an anti-Western sentiment among the Ukrainians.

After a week of unrest, the Orange demonstrators induced the Supreme Court to acknowledge the gross election-related violations and the systemic nature thereof, invalidate the second round, and schedule a repeat vote for December 26. Anticipating that the incumbent government might rig votes yet again, Yushchenko's coalition agreed to diminish presidential powers, thus, boosting those of the parliament, in exchange for the electoral reform. It was perceived as a major political blunder, which gave away the attainments of the revolution. Predictably, the Orange coalition (consisting mainly of Yushchenko's Our Ukraine and Tymoshenko's bloc, BYuT) soon fractured due to internal differences, with Yanukovych's the Party of Regions making a strong comeback in Verkhovna Rada. His parliamentary majority goaded Tymoshenko and Yushchenko into trying to dissolve the government, a rather undemocratic tendency on the part of the pro-democracy camp. As a matter of fact, their alliance was doomed from the outset as the two were united against the ancien régime rather than shared "a common revolutionary ideology" (Katchanovski 2008, 371). Instead of initiating a long-delayed prosecution against the Soviet-era top officials and oligarchy, Yushchenko de facto granted them amnesty for crimes committed under Kuchma. The perpetrators of the election fraud and Yushchenko's poisoners, to say nothing of Gongadze's killers, managed to escape justice. To echo Wilson, "the old guard survived, returned, and prospered" (Wilson 2015, 322).

As subsequent events revealed, President Yushchenko undertook a range of initiatives in the realm of memory politics, particularly the institutionalization of Holodomor, the Great Famine of 1932-1933, and its recognition as genocide, the rehabilitation of the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (UPA) branded as Nazi collaborators, and the heroization of Stepan Bandera, the ideologist of the far-right Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists (OUN) (Zhurzhenko 2014, 254). Additionally, 2007 saw the foundation of the Museum of Soviet Occupation in Kyiv, which exposes the crimes of the Soviet regime against the people of Ukraine from 1917 to 1991. Identically, eponymous museums were established in Georgia, Latvia, and Estonia. Yushchenko advocated de-Sovietization as well as rethinking the Soviet past from a critical perspective. Yet, his "affirmative nationalism", as Zhurzhenko calls it, repelled a large segment of the Ukrainian population unwilling to hail the UPA as heroes, to say nothing of Russia at loggerheads over the

"g-word" (Zhurzhenko 2014, 255). As a matter of fact, Stalin's agricultural policy of collectivization caused mass starvation not only in Ukraine, but also the northern Caucasus, the Volga region, and Kazakhstan, to name but a few. Most importantly, the use of identity politics and the manipulation of historical memory by both Yushchenko and Yanukovych contributed to the deepening collective identity crisis.

Overall, the protest events of the Orange Revolution meet the five fundamental criteria for "civil disobedience": they were public, nonviolent, conscientious, unlawful, and political acts. They were planned and spontaneous, chaotic yet targeted. The overwhelmingly young protesters abided by the principles of nonviolence, encouraging one another, displaying a deep sense of patriotism, strength, and fearlessness in the face of the "bandit" regime. Their efforts did bear fruit, reducing the political influence of the oligarchs and making Ukraine more democratic in comparison with Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Moldova, and Russia, where the Color Revolutions ended in failure, to say nothing of the Tulip Revolution in Kyrgyzstan, the enthusiasm of which spilled over into large-scale violence. Still, a hybrid regime was established, with Yushchenko leaning toward repressive policy measures, Kuchma-backed political figures enduring and resuming the power struggle, and the growing public support for the Party of Regions that espouses Euroscepticism and a pro-Russian orientation. Although the transition to democracy remained incomplete, Ukraine achieved a fair degree of political liberalization, a vibrant civil society, a massive rise in the number of civil society groups and organizations, and heightened social capital. It was the empowered citizens who translated popular frustrations into the Revolution of Dignity.

Euromaidan

At last, Euromaidan (November 21, 2013 – February 23, 2014) became a logical extension of the Orange Revolution given the existence of the identical democracy-related issues and the presence of the same political elites. Compared to its predecessor, the Revolution of Dignity was "more fluid, more informal, more horizontal, and more diverse" (Shapovalova and Burlyuk 2018). The government's failure to deliver what it promised, namely the signing of the Association Agreement with the EU, outraged the nation and formed the background to mass unrest.

Following the 2004 and 2007 enlargement, with the three Baltic states as well as former Soviet-allied countries acceding to the European Union (EU), Yushchenko entered into negotiations with Brussels. These talks translated into an Eastern Partnership (EaP) policy initiative that remains targeted at achieving synergistic relations with six post-Soviet states, namely Belarus, Ukraine, Moldova, Armenia, Georgia, and Azerbaijan. Originally, Ukraine was the most likely prospective member state; however, the negotiations soon reached an impasse due to the flawed election law as well as Tymoshenko's imprisonment (the kind of selective justice that EU representatives expected to cease). The conclusive EaP summit was slated for November 2013 to be held in Vilnius, Lithuania. President Yanukovych showed hesitancy about sealing the deal since the Kremlin started a damaging trade war, allegedly threatened to annex Crimea, as well as gave a loan of USD 15 billion (Wilson 2015, 347). All in all, Yanukovych broke off the negotiations in question, paving the way for the first demonstrations in defiance of the decision made.

The majority of people were supportive of enhancing cooperation with the West. According to Statista, 53% of respondents would vote for Ukraine to join the EU were a referendum to be held (Statista 2014). Equally, 53% of Ukrainians take a favorable view of NATO (Roper 2020). In addition to political and economic reorientation from Russia to the EU, many feared that Yanukovych would augment his power and strengthen the abhorrent regime with the assistance of the Kremlin (Wilson 2015, 348). From November 21 onward, the youth started to protest on Independence Square under the slogan "Ukraine is Europe!". The opposition leaders, namely Vitaliy Klitschko (Ukrainian Democratic Alliance for Reform, UDAR), Arseniy Yatsenuyk (Tymoshenko's Batkivshchyna, "Fatherland"), and Oleh Tyahnybok (Svoboda, "Freedom") formed a coalition headed by Yatsenuyk. Yet, they lacked credibility with the public, inasmuch as they failed to comprehend their grievances and needs, let alone help them achieve their goals.

Instead of opening a dialog with the people, President Yanukovych mobilized Berkut special forces to clear Maidan on November 30. 86 individuals, many of whom were students, were subjected to a violent attack (Kariakina et al. 2017). The riot police officers were reported to beat with iron sticks rather than plastic ones (Afineevsky 2015). It is clear that the government endeavored to nip the protests in the bud, but it was the first time it had been done so overtly and brutally in independent Ukraine. On December 1, the protesters organized a nationwide strike, marching to the Presidential Administration. It was meant as a peaceful procession; yet, several

masked agents provocateurs infiltrated their midst and released aggression toward Berkut by means of throwing rocks and bricks at their riot shields. The latter were then given official permission to toss stun grenades and use tear gas against the demonstrators, resulting in 80 victims of the dispersal (Kariakina et al. 2017).

On December 11, Berkut attempted to wipe out Maidan yet again, which entailed violent clashes between the riot police and the demonstrators. Mustafa Nayyem, a journalist with *Ukrayinska Pravda*, who initiated Euromaidan through Facebook, started to sing the national anthem to bring the nation together. More often than not, it was Ruslana, the winner of Eurovision Song Contest 2004, an active supporter of democratic change throughout the Orange Revolution, and an ex-Member of Parliament for the Our Ukraine party, who sang the national anthem as well as called the crowds to adhere to nonviolence. Concurrently, Mikhaylovsky Monastery commenced to ring all the bells for the first time since the 1240 Mongol invasion (Afineevsky 2015). From the outset, the Monastery occupied a crucial role in assisting the demonstrators: it offered a sanctuary to those dumbstruck by the first police crackdown, and it continued to be a safe space for the demonstrators, specifically the wounded, throughout the revolution.

Having experienced such barbaric cruelty, the Ukrainian people recognized the importance of reversing the existing political regime even greater, which provided a fertile ground for citizen activism and facilitated civil society development. They had to master self-organization to be able to offer effective resistance. Compared with 2004, the Ukrainian civil society was much more powerful and diverse (Wilson 2015, 348; Shapovalova and Burlyuk 2018). It included clergy of different denominations, conflict mediators, journalists, think tank researchers, as well as LGBTIQ+ community members, among others. As Diuk observes, the Maidan participants erected both tents and field kitchens as they "did not protest merely episodically but lived there full-time" (Diuk 2014, 14). Each tent was named after one's hometown or region. The protesters also occupied the Kyiv City State Administration, where they could rest, nourish, dance, sing, and treat the wounded. They set up a Maidan Council for the purpose of giving advice to protest leaders as well as coordinating their activities (Sakwa 2015).

Based on the aforementioned classification by Gene Sharp, the protest methods employed by the participants of Euromaidan encompass slogans ("Ukraine is Europe!", "Glory to Ukraine! Glory to the Heroes!", "Shame!", "Convict Out!"); banners and posters, including those

demanding Yanukovych's resignation and Tymoshenko's release from prison; online newspapers (*Euromaidan Press, Ukrayinska Pravda*); radio and television (Hromadske TV); social networks (Facebook, VKontakte); displays of flags and symbolic colors (Ukrainian and EU flags, Svoboda and Pravy Sektor flags); wearing of symbols (EU-Ukraine ribbons); prayer and worship (Mikhaylovsky Monastery); displays of portraits (Tymoshenko, Stepan Bandera); paint as protest; vigils; music performances; singing the national anthem (Ruslana); student strikes; marches (the March of a Million, a march to the Presidential Administration, marches to the Parliament); motorcades (AutoMaidan); "haunting" officials (Yanukovych's residence in Mezhyhirya, as well as the residences of the Prosecutor General Viktor Pshonka, the Deputy Prime Minister Andriy Klyuyev, the Minister of the Interior Vitaly Zakharchenko, and the Ukrainian oligarch Viktor Medvedchuk); demonstrative funerals (Mikhail Zhiznevsky, Serhiy Nagoyan, Roman Senyk, Yury Verbytsky along with other Heavenly Hundred heroes); protest meetings (Maidan); public speeches (Klitschko); the refusal of public support (the trade agreement with the Russia-led Eurasian Economic Union); literature and speeches advocating resistance (activists); refusal to accept appointed officials; civil disobedience of illegitimate laws (the "dictatorship laws"); nonviolent harassment; and nonviolent occupation of government buildings (the Kyiv City State Administration and the Trade Union House).

Euromaidan produced an abundance of civic initiatives, the most successful of which are the Get-to-Maidan Initiative, AutoMaidan, the Maidan Self-Defense, EuromaidanSOS, the Initiative E+, the Injured and the Wounded in Maidan Initiative Group, the Hospital Guard, the People's Hospital, the People's Guard, the Maidan Search Initiative, the Open University of Maidan, the Maidan Library, the Maidan Post, an economic boycott of the Party of Regions, the Reanimation Package of Reforms Coalition, the Maidan Press Center, the Ukraine Crisis Media Center, Babylon'13, the Diana Makarova Foundation, the Maidan History Preservation Foundation, the Heavenly Hundred Heroes Family, and the Maidan Museum (National Memorial to the Heavenly Hundred Heroes and Revolution of Dignity Museum, n.d.).

The Get-to-Maidan initiative did not go beyond a Facebook page; however, it enabled the people to access the main protest venue (Independence Square), deliver food, clothes, medicine, as well as hospitalize to the injured and the wounded. In a like manner, AutoMaidan activists led by Dmytro Bulatov transported the demonstrators to and from Maidan to protect them from titushki, the Ukrainian state-sponsored thugs (Sakwa 2015). Car owners organized into

AutoMaidan drove in convoys to rally outside the mansions belonging to the leading politicians. On December 29, 2013, a motorcade of 1,000 cars gathered in front of Yanukovych's estate in Mezhyhirya, whereas they also picketed in the vicinity of the Prosecutor General Viktor Pshonka's mansion (the village of Gorenichy), the Deputy Prime Minister Andriy Klyuyev's residence (the village of Rudyky, Koncha-Zaspa), that of the Minister of the Interior Vitaliy Zakharchenko (the village of Pidhirtsi), as well as the Zakarpattya property of the pro-Russian oligarch Viktor Medvedchuk (Dzhygyr 2014). However, beginning January 23, Berkut in cooperation with the traffic police started to ambush those participating in AutoMaidan, arresting and abducting them, seizing their driver's licenses, as well as destroying their vehicles. The day before, Bulatov went missing; as it turned out, he was also kidnapped and severely tortured. Overall, it is estimated that 156 activists were victimized by both the police and the judges that announced illegal court decisions (Kariakina et al. 2017).

Following the brutal attack on a journalist Tetyana Chornovol, who wrote for *Ukrayinska Pravda* and conducted an investigation into corruption among high-ranking government officials, the demonstrators set up the Maidan Self-Defense. Organized into units, they learned to resist attacks under the guidance of retired militaries and those in reserve (Sakwa 2015; Afineevsky 2015). Similarly, the beating of the students on November 30 brought about the creation of EuromaidanSOS, a CSO that rendered free legal assistance to participants victimized by the special police force as well as helped find missing persons (Sakwa 2015). It was the Center for Civil Liberties, a human rights organization established soon after the Orange Revolution, that supported EuromaidanSOS in terms of "providing a list of lawyers, monitoring the fate of those who went missing, and creating mobile groups in Sevastopol and South-East Ukraine after the Crimean events" (Sakwa 2015).

Equally important, the main purpose of the Initiative E+ was to render medical, social, etc. assistance to victims of the Maidan confrontations and beyond. It also supported civic initiatives, encouraged development and implementation of regional and national community-based projects, gave training in first aid and emergency treatment, as well as afforded legal protection of fundamental human rights, including the right to freedom of opinion and expression. The Injured and the Wounded in Maidan Initiative Group was formed to offer social protection and any practical assistance to people who suffered varying degrees of injuries in the course of violent clashes with riot police. Similarly, the Hospital Guard was meant to protect victims and

give them medical aid, while Berkut was deliberately targeting hospitals, doctors, and the wounded. Considering the inefficiency of the current Ukrainian healthcare system unreformed since the Soviet times, the initiative metamorphosed into a long-term project. Another community-based initiative, the People's Hospital, supported doctors in terms of medical equipment and medicine as well as helped raise funds for those in need of costly surgical procedures. The Maidan Search Initiative is primarily engaged in searching for missing persons, burial sites, and collecting eyewitness accounts of crimes committed during the events in Maidan.

The Open University of Maidan founded by Ostap Stasiv educates the public about personal effectiveness, interaction with other people, social entrepreneurship, community formation and development, nonviolent resistance, and promotes legal literacy (Open University of Maidan, n.d.). Having started with public lectures on Maidan stage, the university began to provide non-formal civic education nationwide, online courses included. As regards the Maidan Library, this civic initiative set up in the Ukrainian House offered a platform for reading, thinking, deliberating, and regaining one's spiritual strength, not to mention collecting and sending literature to rural libraries throughout Ukraine. The Maidan Post, in turn, sought to enable the demonstrators to communicate with other residents of the tent camp via written messages on a daily basis. Interestingly enough, the Post issued its own stamps, envelopes, postcards, and the Heavenly Hundred commemorative series of drawings to honor the fallen protesters.

The Reanimation Package of Reforms (RPR) Coalition is a particularly extraordinary undertaking due to the fact that civil society members actively participate in drafting reform proposals and supervising the implementation process. More than 80 laws proposed have been passed by Verkhovna Rada thus far (Reanimation Package of Reforms, n.d.). Yet, the following reforms remain top priorities for the RPR activists pursuing Ukraine's democratic development: judicial, anti-corruption, decentralization and local governance, public administration, and electoral reforms, together with that of law enforcement. Other major changes are bound to take place in economic development, healthcare system, energy sector, environmental protection and sustainable development, mass media, education and science, cultural policy, youth policy, national memory policy, e-democracy, national security, and municipal development.

Furthermore, the Ukraine Crisis Media Center (UCMC) was established in order to counter the Kremlin's disinformation campaign in relation to the annexation of Crimea and defend

Ukraine's statehood and national interests in media space. UCMC does a lot of outreach both locally and internationally, while it also monitors the progress of ongoing reforms, supports regional journalism, educates youth in media and information literacy, covers cultural events, as well as analyses Russian information-warfare tools and techniques (Ukraine Crisis Media Center, n.d.). Concurrently, the Babylon'13 NGO aims to spread the word about the Revolution of Dignity and what followed, that is, Russia's military occupation of the Crimean Peninsula and the Russo-Ukrainian War, through documentaries with English subtitles.

The Diana Makarova Foundation started off with supplying food, clothes, medicine, and means of protection (helmets, bulletproof vests, etc.) to the protesters to later render aid to their medical treatment and rehabilitation, let alone financially support their families. Since the beginning of the armed conflict in the Donbas region, the Foundation has furnished the Armed Forces of Ukraine and the National Guard of Ukraine with combat outfit, food, medical supplies, protective equipment, and tactical gear.

As for the Maidan History Preservation Foundation, it intends to gather, store, and disseminate audio, video, and photo materials produced by both Euromaidan participants and eyewitnesses. For its part, the Heavenly Hundred Heroes Family NGO strives to unite all the family members of the fallen protesters so as to continue the struggle for justice, basic human rights, as well as the ideals of the Revolution of Dignity. It seeks to implement public control of and assistance to bodies investigating the Maidan cases, support civic initiatives aimed at establishing the preconditions and causes of mass human rights violations, not to mention identify ways to prevent it from happening ever again. In order to preserve the memory of the deceased and pay tribute to their patriotism and bravery, the organization also erected the National Memorial to the Heavenly Hundred Heroes on the alley named after them (that part of Instytutska Street, where most of them were shot and killed). Finally, the Maidan Museum was started to perpetuate the memory of Euromaidan protests as well as shed light on their primary motivation for seeking political and social change. The organization's working group collects Maidan artifacts and records testimonies of the participants, while developing the concept of the Maidan Museum and ensuring the protection of monuments, owing to which the protest sites on Hrushevskoho Street and Instytutska Street acquired the status of cultural heritage.

On January 16, 2014, Verkhovna Rada passed a number of tyrannical anti-protest statutes dubbed the "dictatorship laws". The CHESNO civil movement advocating transparency in

government and political accountability reported that these laws criminalized participating in peaceful assembly while wearing helmets or uniform (up to 10 days of arrest); setting up tents, stages, as well as making sounds without police permission (up to 15 days of arrest); convoy driving of more than five cars (confiscation of a driving license and a vehicle for 2 years); blocking access to an official's residence (6 years of imprisonment); disobeying the request to limit access to Internet, with the government reserving the right to prohibit Internet access altogether (fine of USD 850); disobeying the Security Service of Ukraine orders (fine of USD 250); distributing "extremist" materials (3 years of imprisonment); violating "public order" in groups (2 years of imprisonment); participating in mass protests (10-15 years of imprisonment); collecting information about a police officer or a judge (up to 3 years of imprisonment); threatening a police officer (7 years of imprisonment); disrespecting the court (15 days of arrest); and receiving foreign aid to an NGO's political activity without the state's permission, for instance. Moreover, both the riot police officers and state officials were exempt from punishment for the crimes committed against the people of Ukraine, whereas a protester could be found guilty and sentenced to 10-15 years of imprisonment without even being present in court. It is clear that the statutes proposed by Vadym Kolesnychenko and Volodymyr Oliynyk, Members of Parliament from the Party of Regions, violated civil and political rights of the Ukrainian people.

In disobedience to the illegitimate anti-protest laws, the people took to the streets, demonstratively wearing pots, bowls, and colanders on their heads, thereby, taunting the authorities. The riot police started to shoot at the protesters, whereas the people threw Molotov cocktails and stones in self-defense. Reportedly, Berkut used not only rubber bullets but also live ammunition (Afineevsky 2015). Furthermore, the powerholders hired the so-called titushky, members of the Oplot bandit group and former prison inmates, to run errands that even Berkut was not authorized to, such as killing the wounded. Attacks on AutoMaidan continued, with Berkut kidnapping the activists and severely beating them. Although the people were physically and emotionally exhausted after two months of hard resistance, the first murders of Serhiy Nagoyan, Mikhail Zhiznevsky, Roman Senyk, and Yury Verbytsky spurred the people into decisive action. In early February, the protesters put forward a set of political demands, notably the release of political prisoners (Tymoshenko will be discharged from prison toward the end of the Revolution of Dignity), the return to the 2004 constitutional amendments, establishing equality of power between the parliament and the president, as well as early presidential re-

elections (Afineevsky 2015). It could have been yet another chance for Yanukovych to shun more violence and formally resign. Instead, on February 18, Berkut flagrantly opened fire on unarmed protesters, who organized a march to the Parliament. The situation was rapidly deteriorating into a mass murder, with 10 killed, 103 injured, and 400 people "recognized as victims" (Kariakina et al. 2017).

As a result of the infamous sniper shootings on February 20, when Berkut shot and killed 48 people and wounded 157 individuals on Instytutska Street within walking distance of Verkhovna Rada, the government offered re-elections in December, with Yanukovych at the helm for another year (Kariakina et al. 2017). This deal brokered between President and the opposition leaders was utterly repudiated by the Euromaidan participants, prodding the nation into giving Yanukovych an ultimatum and demanding his immediate resignation. He was forced to flee the country, seeking asylum in Russia, submitting to the general will in an unconstitutional manner. Considering that Viktor Yanukovych became the personification of the unjust system, the Ukrainians aspired to get rid of him at all costs, four assassination attempts included. In the final analysis, President Yanukovych was overthrown, and the new presidential elections were due May 25, 2014.

Reports indicate that the number of casualties amounts to 91 killed (78 demonstrators and 13 police officers) as well as 1973 injured (Kariakina et al. 2017). In the words of Sakwa, "the police action was the key blunder, and later the Ukrainian authorities admitted that they had overreacted" (Sakwa 2015). Soon afterward, Berkut was permanently disbanded, while the New Ukraine government re-enacted the Orange constitution as well as made sure to sign the Association Agreement. Although the regime inflicted heavy casualties, the Ukrainians managed to maintain civic dignity and attain their ends. Upon assuming the presidency, Petro Poroshenko issued a decree making November 21, the day when both the Orange Revolution and Euromaidan began, a national holiday, otherwise known as the Day of Dignity and Freedom. President Poroshenko also established the Ukrainian Lustration Committee so as to initiate lustration of the officials who served under Yanukovych.

The movement for European values of "dignity, trust, tolerance, honesty, and hard work" soon metamorphosed into a full-scale rebellion against the system that ruined the country through corruption and misgovernment (Diuk 2014, 16; Sakwa 2015). As it happened, the aspirations of the middle-class revolutionaries for Ukraine's good governance, economic

modernization, and integration into Euro-Atlantic structures were eclipsed by the uncompromising militancy of the marginal segments of the population. In addition, the loss of territory enabled a further slide into hostilities away from the pursuit of liberal democracy. Having started as a genuine common cause, Euromaidan went through radicalization, the formation of a revolutionary elite, the seizure of power, as well as a counterrevolution, sparking off a major European crisis (Sakwa 2015). Neither the established power structures nor "bandit capitalism" were effectively challenged; the greedy elites, including the Yanukovych family and the oligarchy, proved remarkably resilient (Wilson 2015, 354). Given that Verkhovna Rada brought discredit on itself, the demonstrators assumed control of the country as a "people's parliament". The removal of the government forces upon Yanukovych's impeachment triggered the demolition of a multitude of Lenin statues dubbed "Leninopad", especially in the southeastern part of Ukraine. The practice of toppling Soviet monuments was introduced by Yushchenko, who strongly encouraged decommunization.

Interestingly enough, the popular slogan "Glory to Ukraine! Glory to the Heroes!" that gained salience during and post-Euromaidan ascends to the World War II era. It was a greeting of the Ukrainian radical nationalists that originated by analogy with the Nazi salute. In 2010, Yushchenko posthumously awarded Stepan Bandera the Hero of Ukraine. It proved to be a highly controversial deed that drew international condemnation, resulting in the award revocation. On the one hand, it would be erroneous to believe Russian state-run media that portrayed all the protesters as "Nazis" (Wilson 2015, 349). Since the Orange Revolution, the Kremlin strived to vilify Ukraine's pro-Western politicians as well as reduce Ukrainian civic nationalism to fascism. To this end, the Russian political consultants manipulated the historical memory of the OUN's and UPA's collaboration with Nazi Germany. Additionally, these nationalist symbols have de facto become mainstream both in Kyiv and throughout the country. Their use per se does not indicate the adoption of the extreme right ideology, but "it is rather an expression of a defensive identity in the face of aggressive Russian propaganda" (Zhurzhenko 2014, 261). On the other hand, the growth of the radical right in Ukraine was exemplified by the two leading ultranationalist parties, Pravy Sektor and Svoboda. The former's supporters are reputed to have provoked a series of bloody confrontations with the riot police that radicalized the demonstrators. Besides, Pravy Sektor endorsed Banderaite anti-Russian sentiment (both Russophobia and anti-Semitism are the basic features of radical Ukrainian nationalism) that

deepened the already marked cleavages between the Ukrainians and the Russians as well as impacted the Yatsenuyk-led government's policy making (Sakwa 2015).

What is more problematic, the Ukrainians lack a shared national identity. Historically, Eastern Ukraine was part of the Russian Empire, whereas Western Ukraine was under Austria-Hungary and forged close links with Poland, which led to the formation of conflicting collective identities. In Ukraine, one's national identity is strongly connected with civic activism given that individuals espousing a "pro-European" identity are galvanized into action more eagerly than those with an "Eastern Slavic" identity (Kuzio 2006, 62). Being a natural consequence of gaining independence, the process of nation-building gave rise to diverse identity narratives and the creation of in- and out-groups. Based on her research, Korostelina singles out five dominant narratives: a "dual identity", "pro-Soviet attitudes", "the fight for Ukrainian identity", "the recognition of Ukrainian identity", and a "multicultural civic identity" (Korostelina 2014, 270). Undoubtedly, the Maidan participants defended an "ethnic Ukrainian" identity narrative founded on the belief that the Ukrainian history, culture, language, and traditions should prevail at the national level as the Ukrainians make up 77.8% of the population (State Statistics Service of Ukraine 2001). They additionally regard themselves as "more democratic, tolerant, and freedom-loving" than Russians, whose leadership has long alienated Ukraine from Europe (Korostelina 2014, 273).

By contrast, the pro-government supporters who staged anti-Maidan protests explicitly repudiated these claims since they represented a neo-Soviet, "Eastern Slavic" identity. They are convinced that both Russian and Ukrainian cultures and languages deserve an equal representation on the territory of Ukraine, considering common cultural and historical heritage. It should be noted that the post-Euromaidan interim government promoted only the "ethnic Ukrainian" identity. It is largely due to the fact that "Ukrainian nation-building has been systematically denounced as an anti-Russian project and a product of Western conspiracy", as Zhurzhenko rightly observes (Zhurzhenko 2014, 251). Although nationalism seemed a necessary tool of nation-building, the exclusion of other narratives not only frustrated the inhabitants of the Southeast, but also gave the local extremists a strong reason for pro-Russian insurgency. In connection therewith, Korostelina suggests that the choice in favor of any trajectory of Ukrainian politics will inevitably lead to a zero-sum outcome. Instead, Ukraine needs to be perceived as "a

multiethnic [state] with different cultural vectors of development", which will further the cause of national reconciliation and conflict transformation (Korostelina 2014, 285).

To further aggravate the issue, Putin has recurrently denied Ukrainian identity on the basis of Ukrainians and Russians constituting "one nation", not to mention emphasized the "artificial" nature of the Ukrainian state. Beginning in 2007, his administration started to endorse the concept of "Russkiy mir" ("the Russian world"), a supranational community of Russians and Russophones united around the Russian language, culture, and Orthodoxy. According to it, Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus are the three core East Slavic nations cherishing shared cultural and spiritual principles. This soft power project aims to "contain and counteract the expansion of alien Western values" (Zhurzhenko 2014, 259). While the latter are claimed to be utterly foreign to them, such European values, as freedom, democracy, equality, respect for human rights, and the rule of law resonate with many Ukrainians, especially the younger generation, the middle class, and the educated; conversely, the senior generation and the less cultivated respond positively to Russia's "heroic narratives and symbols of military glory", namely that of the Great Patriotic War (Zhurzhenko 2014, 260). In Ukraine, the Russkiy Mir Foundation and its initiatives are seen through the prism of the military intervention and perceived as Putin's revanchist ambitions of restoring Russia's might and clout reminiscent of that of the Soviet Union. The historical term "Novorossiya" ("New Russia") used in the days of the Russian Empire in relation to the southern part of present-day Ukraine re-emerged in 2014 to designate both DPR and LPR. Moreover, the Saint George's ribbon, which epitomizes the victory over fascism in the post-Soviet space, took on a new meaning in the light of pro-Russian separatism.

On the whole, the Revolution of Dignity contained elements of "civil disobedience" since it was staged publicly and was clearly in breach of the law in order to achieve social and political change. As is often the case, estimates vary from 400,000 to 800,000 Euromaidan participants, making it the largest protest event in Ukraine thus far (Whitmore 2013). The Ukrainians proved again that they are capable of organizing themselves for a true cause and resisting even a hardline regime. Diuk takes the view that Euromaidan differed markedly from the Orange Revolution in the sense that "no political leader could provide a quick solution to Ukraine's troubles, and the people themselves must be responsible for working and organizing for a better future" (Diuk 2014, 16). It was the idealistic youth movements Black Pora! and Yellow Pora! that were the key protagonists of the 2004 protest campaign, whereas middle-class citizens,

whose mean age was 36 years old, took the lead in 2013-2014. Unlike the Orange Revolution, Euromaidan grew increasingly violent; yet, Shapovalova and Burlyuk deem it necessary for the sake of "protecting democracy" from illegitimate authority (Shapovalova and Burlyuk 2018). State violence that produced the radicalization of the protesters hindered the progress of democratization, exacerbated by the Russian operations in Crimea and southeastern Ukraine. Concurrently, far-right elements that gained strength with an upsurge in violence feed ethnolinguistic and religious intolerance. The growth of uncivil civil society is closely linked to internal divisions as well as the armed conflict. Were it not for the loss of territory and the outbreak of hostilities, the Ukrainians would reap the benefits of their heroic 93-day resistance and pro-democracy activism, specifically the fall of the dictatorship, political and economic reorientation toward the West, and unprecedented civil society mobilization.

Conclusion

Michael McFaul, who provided his expertise in democratic development to pro-democracy protesters in the post-Soviet space, considers Georgian and Ukrainian popular revolutions to be success stories of post-Soviet democratization (McFaul 2005, 7; Fukuyama and McFaul 2007, 24). These democratic breakthroughs together with the Bulldozer Revolution had four critical elements in common: electoral fraud as a catalyst for change, an unpopular national leader, a campaign of civil disobedience in defense of the existing constitution, and nonviolence (McFaul 2005, 6). All three leaders of the opposition used to be part of the system: Koštunica and Saakashvili were both parliamentarians, whereas Yushchenko served as Kuchma's premier. In all three instances, security forces defected from the old regime as a gesture of solidarity with the protesters. Likewise, the people were buoyed by the Belgrade, Tbilisi, and Kyiv city authorities; the latter provided the Orange challengers with food, hot beverages, warm clothes, and shelter to endure protests during the coldest months of the year. Similarly, the independent mass media proved instrumental in bringing about political transformations, particularly Radio B-92 (Serbia), TV-channel Rustavi-2 (Georgia), and an Internet publication Ukrayinska Pravda (Ukraine). Arguably, the Orange Revolution is the first-ever change of government that was to a significant extent staged online due to the fast-growing Internet usage (Kuzio 2006, 56). In each case, PVTs were performed, confirming vote rigging, raising public awareness of the fraud, and adding fresh

impetus to the cause. In addition, the crucial role played by civil society members as well as transnational and local governmental and non-governmental organizations should not be underestimated in the countries in question.

By the same token, there were several overlaps between two out of the three countries, namely abortive crackdowns on mass demonstrations in Belgrade and Kyiv, while Shevarnadze made no such attempt. Shevarnadze and Kuchma equally aimed to maintain democratic appearances, and, consequently, often refrained from using draconian methods that flatly contradicted European values and principles. Serbia and Ukraine alike held presidential elections, with Milošević standing for re-election and Kuchma handpicking a successor, whereas Georgia had less significant parliamentary elections. Salient female opposition politicians Nino Burjanadze and Yulia Tymoshenko spearheaded the Rose Revolution and the Orange Revolution respectively. Finally, the Serbs were embroiled in the border dispute over Kosovo, and so were the Georgians over Abkhazia, South Ossetia, and Adjara prior to similar disagreements arising on the territory of Ukraine in the light of the annexation of Crimea and the self-proclaimed Donetsk and Luhansk People's Republics.

Both the Orange Revolution and Euromaidan, which draw on protest experience of the Revolution on Granite, the Donbas miners' strikes, and "Ukraine without Kuchma", along with the Bulldozer Revolution in Serbia and the Georgian Rose Revolution, vividly illustrate the phenomenon of people power in Ukraine. The acts of civil disobedience performed during the Orange Revolution proved to be public, genuine, peaceful, political, and illegal. The demonstrators managed to shun violence regardless of Tymoshenko's rather radical rhetoric and heightened police presence. The people of Ukraine were supportive of each other, sympathetic toward police officers, united in their opposition to the Kuchma government, and determined to spur regime change. While the acts were carefully prepared beforehand by both opposition leaders and Pora youth activists, they were to a certain degree spontaneous. The Orange demonstrators accomplished quite a lot, notably election nullification, a re-run of the presidential election, as well as Yushchenko's victory over Yanukovych. Grassroots activism helped energize Ukraine's civil society, stimulate rapid growth in the numbers of civil society groups and organizations, and accumulate social capital.

These took on an added importance in the course of Euromaidan protests, which can be characterized as overt, conscientious, directed against a tyrannical regime, and unlawful. It was

mature-aged citizens who took part in a series of protest events on Maidan compared to predominantly student activism of the Orange Revolution. However, belonging to a certain age group does not explain the use of violence. A bloody crackdown on essentially peaceful protesters, as well as the infiltration by hardline agents provocateurs, precluded the possibility of their sticking to peacefulness on many occasions. The Ukrainian people sought to adhere to this principle nonetheless. They showed self-organization, courage, perseverance, and solidarity with other protest participants while making political change. This time, they also achieved their objectives, such as toppling a dictator, attaining early presidential re-election, signing the EU Association Agreement, let alone initiating constitutional, electoral, judicial, anti-corruption, and decentralization reforms. Yet, the people took over the primary functions of the state, security and defense, contributing to the government's weakening power. In addition to internal struggles, Ukraine was faced with a violation of its territorial integrity and sovereignty, not to mention the use of armed force by the Russian Federation. As of 2020, the existing regime is a hybrid one, with civil society lacking engagement by regional actors and awareness of the headway made with the reform process.

CONCLUSION

By and large, both the Orange Revolution and the Revolution of Dignity include outstanding acts of defiance that fit the description of civil disobedience. Capitalizing on the experience of student and labor union activism, that is, the 1990 Revolution on Granite and the Donbas miners' strikes of 1989 and 1991, as well as that of mass mobilization against President Kuchma (2000 – 2001), the Ukrainians took advantage of the protest methods and techniques tried and tested in the Yugoslav Bulldozer Revolution (2000) and the Rose Revolution in Georgia (2003).

In the course of the Orange Revolution, youth involvement was fundamental, notably that of Black Pora! and Yellow Pora! activists as well as the students of the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy (NaUKMA). They were actively involved in raising political awareness as well as getting out the vote. The exit polls conducted by the Kyiv International Institute for Sociology (KIIS) and the Razumkov Center exposed the electoral fraud that helped bring the people out on Maidan. Equally, domestic NGOs made a positive contribution to preventing the fraud as well as fighting democracy-related issues, such as corruption and oligarchy. For instance, Znayu! was in charge of voter mobilization and education, especially the youth, whereas Chysta Ukraina was primarily engaged in election monitoring and anti-corruption efforts. In turn, the International Center for Policy Studies (ICPS) encouraged dialog between political elites, while the Center for Political and Legal Reforms strongly appealed to follow Ukraine's constitution. To confront the regime's propaganda machine, civil society actors made extensive use of cell phones and the Internet, with the *Ukrayinska Pravda* newspaper, the Maidan website, and that of Pora! coming to the fore due to their social media activism. In addition, Channel 5 owned by Petro Poroshenko provided coverage of the anti-government protests, giving voice to the opposition and letting the demonstrators respond to state-run information warfare. Likewise, the Orange challengers protested outside Kuchma's residence in Koncha-Zaspa, Kyiv, to put additional pressure on the long-ruling post-Soviet head of state. They also blocked government buildings, namely the Ukrainian Parliament (Verkhovna Rada), the Presidential Administration, and the Supreme Court, along with occupying the Trade Union House and the International Convention Center (the Ukrainian House). Last but not least, the demonstrators used the power of humor and street performance to demonstrate that they are no longer afraid of the "bandit" regime and make direct contact with the public respectively. Among

the noteworthy examples of the use of humor, there are the *Jolly Eggs* performance, the *Yanukdote* book of anecdotes about Yanukovych, caricatures of the latter by the *Silski Vesti* newspaper, and an *Operation ProFFessor* Internet series. By the same token, Pora! performed together with Znayu!, wearing prison uniform and campaigning on behalf of an ex-convict Yanukovych.

In sum, the 2004-2005 electoral revolution produced the desired outcome, namely the ouster of President Leonid Kuchma and the victory of his political opponent Viktor Yushchenko. The anti-government demonstrations staged on Maidan Nezalezhnosti, the main square in Kyiv, were driven by public conscience, directed against the oppressive regime, and conducted peacefully, all of which are compatible with the fundamental requirements of civil disobedience. The leaders of the protests, including Yushchenko's campaign staff, kept reminding the people of the major significance of nonviolence for accomplishing their ends. Regardless of two months of protests that coincided with the coldest period of the year (November – January), the Ukrainians showed great determination and courage, feeling that it was their patriotic duty to oppose election manipulation and a thoroughly corrupt regime. They fraternized with police and security forces officers, many of whom chose to defect to the side of the demonstrators as a gesture of solidarity. Therefore, the Orange Revolution gave rise to citizen empowerment, greater political participation, as well as bonding and bridging social capital. That being said, the transition toward democracy was hampered by the political survival of the ruling oligarchy and Kuchma loyalists, Yushchenko's ineffective presidency, and, as a consequence, the growing popularity of the Party of Regions that promoted a pro-Russian orientation along with the rights of Ukraine's ethnic Russians and Russian-speaking population. With the long-awaited reforms not being introduced, the Ukrainians mobilized themselves anew to follow through on European integration and democratization that inevitably translated into the overthrow of President Viktor Yanukovych.

In the sequel, Euromaidan participants made repeated attempts to express their resentment peacefully, when Yanukovych refused to sign the Ukraine-EU Association Agreement so as to foster closer economic relations with the Eurasian Economic Union led by Russia. However, the violent dispersal of students taking part in a strike on November 30, 2013, had a considerable influence on the scale of the protests as well as their rapid transformation from merely pro-European to anti-government. The protesters organized marches to the Presidential

Administration, Verkhovna Rada, and Maidan, with the latter being remembered as the "March of a Million" due to an enormous number of people gathering in support of European integration (albeit it fell short of 1,000,000 participants). The authorities and law enforcement officers under their control chose to ruthlessly repress peaceful protests, while the former continued enacting ever more tyrannical laws. Particularly, the adoption of anti-protest legislation dubbed the "dictatorship laws" triggered a campaign of civil disobedience on January 16, 2014. The demonstrators put on pots, bowls, and colanders on their heads along with masks, costumes, and flippers in defiance of one of the laws that criminalized wearing personal protective equipment (such as helmets) or uniform when holding peaceful assemblies, the penalty for which was up to 10 days of arrest. One of the most egregious statutes was that designed to punish the participation in mass protests with 10-15 years of imprisonment, whereas power holders and government forces responsible for a series of bloody crackdowns could go unpunished. In addition to breaching illegitimate laws, the people of Ukraine occupied the Kyiv City State Administration and the Trade Union House in a nonviolent manner, the latter building became the headquarters of the revolution. Ultimately, the demonstrators refused to accept Yanukovych's presidency for another year, that is, until December 2014, after the opposition leaders negotiated a deal with the government. Owing to their continued effort and determination, the ex-President was forced to flee to Russia the next day in the early hours of February 22.

The Revolution of Dignity turned out to be a much more mature, horizontal, and heterogeneous protest event in contrast to the Orange Revolution with its largely youth activism and salience of the opposition leaders. The major grassroots initiatives undertaken are the Get-to-Maidan Initiative, AutoMaidan, EuromaidanSOS, the Maidan Self-Defense, an economic boycott of the Party of Regions, the Initiative E+, the Injured and the Wounded in Maidan Initiative Group, the Hospital Guard, the People's Hospital, the People's Guard, the Maidan Search Initiative, the Reanimation Package of Reforms Coalition, the Open University of Maidan, the Maidan Library, the Maidan Post, the Maidan Press Center, the Ukraine Crisis Media Center, Babylon'13, the Diana Makarova Foundation, the Maidan History Preservation Foundation, the Heavenly Hundred Heroes Family, and the Maidan Museum. It is worth noting that Facebook occupied a special place in the organization of the revolution. Not only did Mustafa Nayyem, a former television and *Ukrayinska Pravda* correspondent, called for civil

disobedience by means of a Facebook post, but a vast number of civic activists also created Facebook pages to reach out to a greater number of people with their civic groups, associations, and organizations.

Remarkably, AutoMaidan activists drove all those concerned to Independence Square, not least because of ruthless titushki sponsored by Yanukovych's administration. On top of that, the car owners associated in AutoMaidan demonstrated outside the senior politicians' private homes, namely President Yanukovych's luxurious Mezhyhirya residence, that of the Prosecutor General Viktor Pshonka in the village of Gorenichy, the Deputy Prime Minister Andriy Klyuyev's mansion located in the village of Rudyky, Koncha-Zaspa, the Minister of the Interior Vitaliy Zakharchenko's property in the village of Pidhirtsi, as well as the Zakarpattya residence of the pro-Kremlin politician and oligarch Viktor Medvedchuk. For their part, EuromaidanSOS and the Maidan Self-Defense were launched in response to the brutal beating of the students on November 30, 2013. EuromaidanSOS volunteers (particularly those trained by the human rights organization Center for Civil Liberties), human rights activists, and attorneys provided legal and other types of assistance to individuals persecuted, beaten, arrested, and tortured by the state, let alone helped find missing persons nationwide. One of the most notable initiatives is the Reanimation Package of Reforms (RPR), the largest coalition of NGOs in Ukraine, which develops a multitude of reforms long overdue, including but not limited to anti-corruption, judicial, administrative, electoral, healthcare, and police reforms. Among them, judicial, anti-corruption, and police reforms are of primary importance, taking into consideration a lack of justice post-Euromaidan, deeply ingrained corrupt practices, and the integration of former Berkut riot police officers into law enforcement agencies. For its part, the Open University of Maidan gained salience due to providing non-formal civic education both on- and offline and covering the topics of self-development, self-governance, nonviolent resistance, advocacy, sustainable development, social capital, tolerance, legal awareness, and responsible parenthood, for instance. Equally important, the Ukraine Crisis Media Center (UCMC) is an NGO that seeks to provide accurate information regarding Crimea's occupation and the armed conflict in Ukraine's southeast as a counternarrative to Russian state-sponsored media outlets. UCMC additionally promotes Ukraine's political independence and self-reliance alongside civil society development. Last but not least, the Maidan Museum was created to immortalize the heroic deeds of the Ukrainian people performed during Euromaidan, collect personal testimonies of participants, as

well as preserve Maidan artifacts, including one of the most recognizable of them, namely the Christmas tree decorated with flags and banners.

All in all, by means of Euromaidan, the Ukrainians defied the government's decision not to sign the Association Agreement between Ukraine and the EU in harmony with the central principles of civil disobedience, namely publicly (on Maidan Nezalezhnosti), conscientiously, and nonviolently. Yet, large-scale state violence and police brutality compelled peaceful protesters to arm themselves and fight back, stepping up their demands for Yanukovych's impeachment. The people of Ukraine not only exposed themselves to danger but also gave their lives for the cause of freedom and dignity. As a result, they accomplished the signing of the aforementioned agreement and ratification thereof, President Yanukovych's deposition, not to mention early presidential re-election. Despite the fact that the achievements of the Revolution of Dignity were eclipsed by Russia's occupation of Crimea and the ongoing war in Donbas, civil society members did not cease to fight for Ukraine's political independence and self-reliance as well as democratic consolidation.

All things considered, the Orange Revolution and its next chapter Euromaidan, based on the protest experience of the Revolution on Granite, the Donbas miners' strikes, and "Ukraine without Kuchma" along with the Serbian Bulldozer Revolution and the Georgian Rose Revolution, are notable for an array of acts of civil disobedience that came into being on Ukrainian soil and continue to steer Ukraine's more authoritative and pro-Western course of development.

REFERENCES

Afineevsky, Evgeny. “Winter on Fire: Ukraine’s Fight for Freedom.” Netflix documentary, 2015.

Albert Einstein Institution. n.d. “198 Methods of Nonviolent Action.” Accessed September 11, 2020. https://www.aeinstein.org/nonviolentaction/198-methods-of-nonviolent-action/.

Aleksashenko, Sergei, Oleg Kashin, Ayder Muzhdabayev, Olga Shorina, Yekaterina Vinokurova, Leonid Martynyuk, Alfred Kokh, and Ilya Yashin. 2015. “Putin. War.” An Independent Expert Report. Based on materials from Boris Nemtsov. Moscow. http://4freerussia.org/putin.war.

Angley, Robyn E. 2013. “Escaping the Kmara Box: Reframing the Role of Civil Society in Georgia’s Rose Revolution.” *Studies of Transition States and Societies* 5 (1): 42-57. https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-362472.

Beichelt, Timm, and Wolfgang Merkel. 2014. “Democracy Promotion and Civil Society: Regime Types, Transition Modes and Effects.” In *Civil Society and Democracy Promotion*, 42-62. Palgrave Macmillan.

Berger, Miriam. 2019. “The U.S. Relationship with Ukraine Runs Deep. Here’s Why.” *Washington Post*, November 12, 2019. https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2019/11/12/us-relationship-with-ukraine-runs-deep-heres-why/.

Binnendijk, Anika Locke, and Ivan Marović. 2006. “Power and Persuasion: Nonviolent Strategies to Influence State Security Forces in Serbia (2000) and Ukraine (2004).” *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 39: 411-429. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.postcomstud.2006.06.003.

Burlyuk, Olga, and Natalia Shapovalova. 2018. “Ukraine’s Civic Progress and Partial Reform.” Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, January 8, 2018. https://carnegieendowment.org/2018/01/08/ukraine-s-civic-progress-and-partial-reform-pub-75181.

Center for Applied Nonviolent Action and Strategies. n.d. “About Us.” Accessed September 10, 2020. https://canvasopedia.org/about-us/.

Diuk, Nadia. 2014. “EUROMAIDAN: Ukraine’s Self-Organizing Revolution.” *World Affairs* 176, no. 6: 9-16. http://www.jstor.org/stable/43555086.

Dubovyk, Volodymyr. 2018. “Ukraine and Russia: Peace, War, and the Future.” An article based on a paper presented at a conference on Regime Evolution, Institutional Change, and Social Transformation in Russia: Lessons for Political Science, April 27, 2018, MacMillan Center, Yale University. https://yaleglobal.yale.edu/content/ukraine-and-russia-peace-war-and-future.

Dubovyk, Volodymyr. 2016. “Ukraine and Georgia: How Much of a Common Faith?” Georgian Institute of Politics. http://gip.ge/ukraine-and-georgia-how-much-of-a-common-faith/.

European Commission. 2019. “EU Report: Implementation of Reforms Continues to Bring EU and Ukraine Closer Together.” December 13, 2019. https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/IP_19_6736.

Dzhygyr, Yuriy. 2014. “Why Did AutoMaidan Become the Frontline of Ukraine’s Civil Protest?” *Euromaidan Press*, January 29, 2014. http://euromaidanpress.com/2014/01/29/why-auto-maidan-became-the-frontline-of-ukraines-civil-protest/.

Fukuyama, Francis, and Michael McFaul. 2007. “Should Democracy Be Promoted or Demoted?” *Washington Quarterly* 31, no. 1: 23-45. https://muse.jhu.edu/article/224702/pdf.

Gandhi, M.K. *Non-Violent Resistance (Satyagraha)*. New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 2001.

Habermas, Jürgen. 1985. “Civil Disobedience: Litmus Test for the Democratic Constitutional State.” *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 30: 95-116. http://www.jstor.org/stable/41035345.

Howard, Marc Morjé. 2003. “Civil Society and Democratization.” In *The Weakness of Civil Society in Post-Communist Europe*, 31-56. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Howard, Marc Morjé. 2003. “Post-Communist Civil Society in Comparative Perspective: An Empirical Baseline.” In *The Weakness of Civil Society in Post-Communist Europe*, 57-91. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kandelaki, Giorgi. 2006.“Georgia’s Rose Revolution: A Participant’s Perspective.” Special Report. United States Institute of Peace (USIP). https://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/sr167.pdf.

Kariakina, Angelina, Kateryna Sergatskova, and Alevtyna Kakhidze. 2017. “The Maidan Cases in Numbers and Pictures.” *Hromadske International*, February 17, 2017. https://en.hromadske.ua/posts/the_maidan_cases.

Katchanovski, Ivan. 2008. “The Orange Evolution? The Orange Revolution and Political Changes in Ukraine.” *Post-Soviet Affairs* 24, no. 4: 351-382. https://doi.org/10.2747/1060-586X.24.4.351.

King, Jr., Martin Luther. 1963. “Letter from Birmingham City Jail.” In *Why We Can’t Wait*, 68-84. New York: Harper & Row.

Kuzio, Taras. 2006. “Everyday Ukrainians and the Orange Revolution.” In *Revolution in Orange: The Origins of Ukraine’s Democratic Breakthrough*, edited by Anders Åslund and Michael McFaul, 45-68. Washington DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Kuzio, Taras. 2005. “From Kuchma to Yushchenko. Ukraine’s 2004 Presidential Elections and the Orange Revolution.” *Problems of Post-Communism* 52, no. 2 (March – April): 29-44. https://doi.org/10.1080/10758216.2005.11052197.

Kuzio, Taras. 2005. “Pora! Takes Two Different Paths.” *Eurasia Daily Monitor*, February 2, 2005. https://jamestown.org/program/pora-takes-two-different-paths/.

Korostelina, Karina V. 2014. “Conflict of National Narratives of Ukraine: Euromaidan and Beyond.” *Die Friedens-Warte* 89, no. 1/2: 269-290. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24868496.

McFaul, Michael. 2005. “Transitions from Postcommunism.” *Journal of Democracy* 16, no. 3: 5-19. https://www.journalofdemocracy.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/McFaul-16-3.pdf.

Miller, Christopher. 2019. “Death Toll Up to 13,000 in Ukraine Conflict, Says UN Rights Office.” *Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty*, February 26, 2019. https://www.rferl.org/a/death-toll-up-to-13-000-in-ukraine-conflict-says-un-rights-office/29791647.html.

McFaul, Michael. 2007. “Ukraine Imports Democracy: External Influences on the Orange Revolution.” *International Security* 32, no. 2: 45-83. https://doi.org/10.1162/isec.2007.32.2.45.

McNorton, Dan. 2014. “Number of Displaced Inside Ukraine more than Doubles since Early August to 260,000.” The United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR), September 2, 2014. https://www.unhcr.org/news/latest/2014/9/540590ae9/number-displaced-inside-ukraine-doubles-since-early-august-260000.html.

Murthy, B. Srinivasa. 1987. “Letters.” In *Mahatma Gandhi and Leo Tolstoy Letters*, 19-62. California: Long Beach Publications.

National Memorial to the Heavenly Hundred Heroes and Revolution of Dignity Museum. n.d. "Maidan Initiatives." Accessed September 17, 2020. http://www.maidanmuseum.org/en/node/1096.

National Memorial to the Heavenly Hundred Heroes and Revolution of Dignity Museum. n.d. "Orange Revolution." Accessed September 16, 2020. http://www.maidanmuseum.org/en/node/1093.

Nikolayenko, Olena. 2017. "Pora! Youth's Mobilization in Ukraine." In *Youth Movements and Elections in Eastern Europe*, 172-203. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nikolayenko, Olena. 2007. "The Revolt of the Post-Soviet Generation: Youth Movements in Serbia, Georgia, and Ukraine." *Comparative Politics* 39, no. 2 (January): 169-188. https://www.jstor.org/stable/20434032.

Onuch, Olga. 2017. "The Revolution on the Granite (1990): The Legacy Contention in Independent Ukraine." *New Eastern Europe* 3-4: 131-138.

Open University of Maidan. n.d. "About Us." Accessed September 12, 2020. https://vum.org.ua/about-us/.

Petrov, Nikolai, and Andrei Ryabov. 2006. "Russia's Role in the Orange Revolution." In *Revolution in Orange: The Origins of Ukraine's Democratic Breakthrough*, edited by Anders Åslund and Michael McFaul, 145-164. Washington DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Popović, Srdja. 2015. "How to Topple a Dictator." Filmed July 2015 at TEDxKrakow, Poland. Video, 12:00. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uo7w3g24DWo&t=521s.

Rawls, John. 1999. "Duty and Obligation." In *A Theory of Justice*. Revised ed. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press: Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Reanimation Package of Reforms. n.d. "About Us." Accessed September 17, 2020. https://rpr.org.ua/en/about-us/.

Right Livelihood Foundation. n.d. "Gene Sharp." Accessed August 2, 2020. https://www.rightlivelihoodaward.org/laureates/gene-sharp/.

Roper, Willem. 2020. "Popularity of NATO Across the Globe." Statista, February 10, 2020. https://www.statista.com/chart/20780/nato-favorability-across-world/.

Sakwa, Richard. "The February Revolution." In *Frontline Ukraine: Crisis in the Borderlands*. I.B. Tauris: London, 2015.

Sharp, Gene. 2010. *From Dictatorship to Democracy. A Conceptual Framework for Liberation*. Fourth ed. The Albert Einstein Institution: Boston.

Shapovalova, Natalia, and Olga Burlyuk. 2018. "Civil Society and Change in Ukraine Post-Euromaidan: An Introduction." In *Civil Society in Post-Euromaidan Ukraine: From Revolution to Consolidation,* edited by Natalia Shapovalova and Olga Burlyuk, 11-40. Ibidem-Verlag: Stuttgart. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/328744272_Civil_society_and_change_in_Ukraine_post-Euromaidan_An_introduction.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. 2017. "John Rawls." Last modified January 9, 2017. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rawls/#:~:text=The%20first%20principle%20affirms%20that,of%20law%2C%20and%20so%20on.

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. 2014. "Jürgen Habermas." Last modified August 4, 2014. https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/habermas/.

Statista. 2014. "Ukraine: If a Referendum Were Held Today on Ukraine Joining the European Union, How Would You Vote?" Published April 15, 2014. https://www.statista.com/statistics/296711/ukraine-survey-on-joining-european-union/.

Thoreau, Henry David. 1866. "Civil Disobedience." In *A Yankee in Canada with Anti-Slavery and Reform Papers*, 28-48. Boston: Ticknor & Fields.

Ukraine Crisis Media Center. n.d. "Who We Are." Accessed September 17, 2020. https://uacrisis.org/en/pro-nas.

Vyshnytska, Alyona, and Anastasia Vlasova. 2019. "Strike. Donbas Miners Recall Protests of the '90s." *Hromadske International*, September 23, 2019. https://en.hromadske.ua/posts/strike-donbas-miners-recall-protests-of-the-90s.

Wezeman, Siemon T., and Alexandra Kuimova. 2018. "Ukraine and Black Sea Security." Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). https://www.sipri.org/sites/default/files/2018-12/bp_1812_black_sea_ukraine_0.pdf.

Whitmore, Brian. 2013. "Ukraine's Threat to Putin." *Atlantic*, December 6, 2013. https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2013/12/ukraines-threat-to-putin/282103/.

Wilson, Andrew. 2015. "The Orange Revolution and Its Aftermath." In *The Ukrainians: Unexpected Nation*, 311-341. Fourth ed. Yale University Press: New Haven and London.

Wilson, Andrew. 2009. “Ukraine’s “Orange Revolution” of 2004: The Paradoxes of Negotiation.” In *Civil Resistance and Power Politics: The Experience of Non-Violent Action from Gandhi to the Present*, edited by Adam Roberts and Timothy Garton Ash, 335-353. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, Andrew. 2015. “Yanukovych’s Disastrous Presidency: Another Attempt at Revolution Ends in War.” In *The Ukrainians: Unexpected Nation*, 342-358. Fourth ed. Yale University Press: New Haven and London.

York, Steve. “Bringing Down a Dictator.” Documentary film. Washington: York Zimmerman, 2002. https://www.nonviolent-conflict.org/bringing-dictator-english/.

York, Steve. “Orange Revolution.” Documentary film. Washington: York Zimmerman, 2007. https://www.nonviolent-conflict.org/orange-revolution-english/.

Zhurzhenko, Tatiana. 2014. “A Divided Nation? Reconsidering the Role of Identity Politics in the Ukraine Crisis.” *Die Friedens-Warte* 89, no. 1/2: 249-267. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24868495.