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Abstract

Recent years have seen an explosive increase in the number of English-language signs held by political protesters in autocracies throughout the world, signaling activists’ desire to capture the attention and interest of a global audience. Innovations in telecommunications make it easier than ever before for people in one country to know what actors elsewhere are doing, and to solicit their attention and assistance in an increasingly interconnected global context. How does this awareness of a global audience shape citizens’ decisions to protest in authoritarian regimes today? How might support from external support from democracies elsewhere or intervention from dictatorships affect protesters’ perceptions and decision-making strategies?

I propose several causal mechanisms to answer these questions in the following dissertation. First, I posit that external support from democracies elsewhere bolsters protesters’ resolve to campaign against the regime. This attention provides protesters with four types of benefits, each of which alters their perceptions and strengthens their decision to maintain their efforts – 1) a psychological benefit of purposeful solidarity (the cognitive and emotional sense that they are not alone and that their movement will succeed); 2) a strategic benefit of transnational learning from activists elsewhere; 3) a physical benefit through the credible threat of checking and sanctioning should autocrats’ response to activists become too forceful; and 4) a material and political benefit by establishing strong linkages with diaspora or democratically-minded citizens abroad that provide logistical support to protesters on the ground and lobby their own leaders to support the movement.

Conversely, what effects might autocratic intervention have on protesters’ perceptions? I predict two competing effects at the individual level, dependent on the
domestic context at hand. Outside intervention to support an embattled leader can signal incumbent vulnerability by suggesting that the regime cannot stay in power without help from abroad, but external support can also cause fear of increased repercussions should the incumbent stay in office. I posit that in semi-authoritarian regimes, the first effect will dominate and cause an unexpected backlash in which protesters see their leader as increasingly fragile, subsequently strengthening their efforts to remove him or her from power. In fully autocratic states where the regime is already equipped with a powerful security apparatus, however, I propose the second mechanism will dominate – intervention will cause deterrence and intimidation as protesters perceive the dangers involved in challenging the regime as even more threatening than before.

I test these hypotheses in the following dissertation in three ways. First, I present a case study of Ukraine's 2013-2014 Euromaidan movement to illustrate my causal mechanisms in action. I spent six months in Ukraine interviewing and surveying more than 120 Members of Parliament, reporters, activists, and civil society leaders to examine how protesters' beliefs about Western support and Russian intervention shaped their behavior. These interviews illustrated the fact that for many protesters, attention and support from Western states and organizations (particularly the European Union, the United States, and the Ukrainian diaspora) was central in strengthening their will to continue campaigning against the regime. Further, many of my interviews showed how protesters resented overt Russian support for ex-President Viktor Yanukovych; their actions were driven partly by the need to keep Ukraine from becoming “the next Russia.”
Second, I independently designed and implemented an original survey experiment at three Ukrainian universities, recruiting nearly two hundred students to learn about their willingness to protest in future movements should one arise. I asked all participants to read a vignette stating that they lived in a repressive state where students had begun to protest against an authoritarian government that was reversing recent democratic reforms in favor of retrenched autocracy. Participants in the first treatment group learned that democracies elsewhere were supporting the protest, participants in the second treatment group learned that autocracies elsewhere were intervening to suppress the protest, and participants in the control group received no information about external actors at all. Following this, all subjects rated their willingness on a ten-point scale to engage in three forms of protest, each of which represented an increasingly intense form of participation. Findings show that for the most intensive type of protest activity, individuals are significantly more likely to protest when they believe that democracies elsewhere support them (p < 0.001).

Finally, I provide a series of five comparative case studies—Ukraine’s 2004 Orange Revolution, a 2011 uprising in Bahrain, a failed revolt in 2005 Uzbekistan, Lebanon’s 2005 Cedar Revolution, and Venezuela in 2019— to examine how these trends hold across temporal and geographical contexts. This project has a number of pressing and timely implications both theoretical and normative, given the current crisis that liberal democratic governance is facing across the globe amidst the rise of right-wing, populist illiberal regimes. Supporting movements in authoritarian regimes that champion respect for human rights, civil liberties, and freedom of speech is of critical importance, and I show in this dissertation that such considerations should play a prominent role in the foreign policies of democracies the world over.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

October 1, 2019 saw the Communist party celebrate the seventieth anniversary of the People’s Republic of China (PRC) on the country’s mainland, marking seven decades since the party was able to push Kuomintang forces to Taiwan and consolidate its firm hold on the state’s power. The streets of Beijing were full of parades, with 15,000 troops and 580 vehicles and missiles making their way through the city’s roads in commemoration. In Hong Kong, however, the day was marked instead by intense clashes between armed security forces and largely unarmed protesters, many of them students and civic activists. Over the course of the day, police forces would fire 1,400 rounds of tear gas and 900 rubber bullets into the crowd in efforts to quell their uprising. Certain parts of the city even saw police employ live bullets in their battle against protesters, with some forces going so far as to shoot an 18-year old in the chest.

The violent conflicts marking October 1 in Hong Kong were the latest and most dramatic events in more than four months of widespread protests for increased autonomy from China and greater respect for democratic norms, human rights, and civil liberties. The movement was initially sparked by Hong Kong Chief Executive Carrie Lam’s decision to support a bill that would allow the Chinese government to extradite residents of Hong Kong who had been charged with a crime and bring them to China for a sentencing before courts on the mainland. This plan would upend a lengthy tradition in which Hong Kong citizens faced trial instead before their own courts, judicial institutions with a reputation for being far more free and fair than their counterparts in Beijing. The campaign grew actively throughout the summer of 2019, leading tens of thousands of the city’s residents to take to the streets in increasingly contentious gatherings and demonstrations.
Consistent throughout the protests were activists’ impassioned appeals to the outside world for assistance and support. Protesters regularly held signs and banners brandishing messages written in English, clearly demonstrating a desire to reach a broader audience beyond their immediate East Asian neighborhood. Leading oppositional figures conducted interviews and recorded videos for international news agencies, soliciting global attention in outlets including *Time*, the *Washington Post*, and the *New York Times*. Furthermore, thousands of protesters joined hands in August 2019 to create the “Hong Kong Way,” a human chain that was designed to mimic the “Baltic Way” of 1989 that served as a signal from the occupied Soviet territories of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania that citizens there desired freedom and independence from the Soviet Union’s repressive and authoritarian form of government.

While the 2019 Hong Kong protests represent one specific protest movement at one specific point in time, it is broadly emblematic of a number of other popular mobilizations that have taken place in contexts from Egypt to Zimbabwe to Nicaragua to Algeria. Across the world, citizens in the twenty-first century have become increasingly emboldened to take a stand against autocratic leaders in hopes of securing greater provisions for human rights and civil liberties. At the same time, it is easier now than ever before for activists to transmit their messages to states across the globe through social media, streaming online services, and cable television. Unlike the heavily censored and closed environments that characterized the Soviet Union and China in the twentieth century, today’s world provides a multitude of opportunities for savvy activists to intentionally solicit aid and support from sympathetic forces located thousands of miles away.
What effects do international actors, both democratic and authoritarian, have on protesters’ decision-making strategies and calculations regarding the risks and rewards of joining an anti-governmental movement in autocratic states? How might expressions of solidarity towards the movement or signals of support for an embattled leader alter citizens’ beliefs and shape the campaign’s broader chain of events? These are important questions, and I address these pressing topics in the following dissertation to explore the role they play in shaping states’ domestic politics today.

This introduction will proceed by outlining and detailing each of the theoretical and empirical chapters that follow, describing how each piece contributes to the broader framework of the dissertation. In doing so, I demonstrate the ways in which my project address the fundamental questions posed above and illustrate the many original and valuable contributions that my research makes to existing studies in this area.

In Chapter 2, I begin by presenting and exploring the fundamental theoretical framework that forms the core of my dissertation and informs the three subsequent empirical chapters. I study the ways in which international forces such as external democratic support and autocratic intervention can shape the decision-making strategies of protesters in authoritarian and hybrid regimes. My explicit focus on the interplay between the global and national spheres is the core contribution of this project, as few existing analyses have systematically taken into account both sets of variables in determining how they jointly affect activists’ perceptions and beliefs. Studying both the domestic and international domains is of critical importance in a world that is becoming ever more globalized and interconnected. External forces will become increasingly influential as technology continues to develop, making this project’s contributions highly relevant and timely in the contemporary world.
First, I hypothesize that external support from democracies elsewhere bolsters protesters’ resolve to campaign against the regime. This attention provides protesters with four benefits, each of which alters their perceptions in important ways—1) a psychological benefit of purposive solidarity (the cognitive and emotional sense that they are not alone and that their movement has a greater chance to succeed); 2) a strategic benefit of transnational learning through which oppositional strategies can transcend national borders; 3) a physical benefit through the credible threat of checking and sanctioning should autocrats’ response to activists become too forceful; and 4) a material benefit by establishing strong linkages with diaspora or democratic groups that provide logistical and political support to protesters on the ground. Each of these mechanisms can reduce individuals’ perceptions of threat and raise the likelihood that their movement stands a chance at success, increasing the probability that they will remain steadfast in their cause.

Conversely, what effects might autocratic intervention have on protesters’ perceptions? I predict two competing effects. Assistance from autocrats elsewhere to support an embattled leader can signal vulnerability by suggesting that the regime cannot stay in power without help from abroad, but external intervention can also cause fear of repercussions should the incumbent stay in office. I posit that in semi-authoritarian regimes, the first effect will dominate and cause an unexpected backlash in which protesters see their leader as increasingly fragile. In fully autocratic states where the regime is equipped with a powerful security apparatus, however, I propose the second mechanism will dominate—intervention will cause deterrence and intimidation as protesters perceive the dangers in challenging the regime as even more threatening than before. In addition to the important power of domestic capacity, media
freedom and independence matter a great deal as well – when media sources are unable to relay an unbiased account to an international audience, this enhances leaders’ ability to repress protests and decreases the likelihood that the campaign will prevail.

In addition to detailing the main theoretical claims that inform my analysis, I present a brief literature review that situates my work within the broader range of scholarship that has been published on these topics. This includes numerous examples of specific mechanisms from my framework that highlight the ways in which my theory’s components operate in practice. These provide evidence that the theory travels to a range of contexts and is not limited to one time or place alone, extending the veracity of my broader claims.

Following this presentation of my theoretical framework, I turn to empirical analysis in Chapter 3. Here, I provide a detailed case study of Ukraine’s 2013-2014 Euromaidan protest movement involving dozens of first-hand interviews and surveys that I conducted across six months of fieldwork in 2017. This event is highly relevant for testing the mechanisms of my theory for multiple theoretical and contextual reasons that I explore more deeply in later sections of this project. Euromaidan, or the Revolution of Dignity, represents a case in which protesters seeking reforms, democracy, and control of rampant corruption took to the streets to demand change. In doing so, they secured a significant amount of support from democratic forces and organizations elsewhere. At the same time, protesters were also highly cognizant that Vladimir Putin and his allies in Russia were playing their own part in propping up Ukraine’s autocratic President at the time, Viktor Yanukovych.

I interviewed more than 120 Members of Parliament, reporters, activists, civil society leaders, and academics to examine ways in which protesters’ beliefs about
Western support and Russian intervention shaped their behavior. Speaking with such a wide range of individuals provided me with both a breadth and depth of perspectives, ensuring that I did not speak with only one particular type of respondent alone. Moreover, the fact that I spoke with people who were largely “elite” in their knowledge and experience guaranteed that these individuals were credible experts on the topic at hand. All participants whom I interviewed were either specialists in policy analysis and activism or were participants who had been centrally involved in Euromaidan from its inception, meaning that in many cases I was speaking with people who had been on the front lines from the movement’s very first days until its final conclusion.

In speaking with my respondents, I adapted a range of strategies to secure as comprehensive and reliable a trove of information as possible. I procured a significant amount of qualitative data, as each interview lasted anywhere from thirty to ninety minutes and provided me with a great deal of quotations and thematic observations. Conversations were open-ended and loosely structured, allowing respondents to focus on the topics most important to them. Following each interview, I asked all participants to complete an anonymous, closed-ended twenty-question survey concerning the same topics that we had discussed during the preceding interview. This provided me with a large volume of quantitative data as well, allowing me to aggregate participants’ responses for certain key questions to discern the broader trends in attitudes among my interview subjects.

My findings show that many protesters heavily considered external support when deciding how to act, noting that the world’s attention deepened their willingness to challenge leaders. Several respondents (particularly those who were on Kyiv’s Maidan square from the start) stressed that their emotional and psychological fortitude was
bolstered by the fact that 1) activists in other countries were holding protests to show solidarity and 2) politicians were making statements to recognize and commemorate their cause. This boosted their spirits, and in many cases increased their determination to remain on the streets in the dead of winter to remove Yanukovych from power. Equally important was the assistance of human rights groups and the Ukrainian diaspora in other countries – members of the diaspora lobbied officials in their adopted homelands to lend the movement prominence and sent material resources and funding to strengthen the campaign’s durability and persistence.

Furthermore, many of my interviews showed how protesters resented overt Russian support for ex-President Viktor Yanukovych and the fact that Russian state media attempted to discredit their movement by alternatively portraying Euromaidan as either hopelessly small and weak or full of right-wing fascists. These mounting observations of the Putin regime’s attempts to undermine their chance at success led many to protest in order to keep Ukraine from becoming “the next Russia,” or a state in which media freedoms and political competition were muzzled by a powerful state apparatus. In this case, then, both external democratic intervention and autocratic support played a significant part in shaping activists’ decision to maintain the protests.

I turn to my project’s second empirical component in Chapter 4, in which I present the design, implementation, and results of an original field survey experiment that I carried out in Ukraine. Whereas Chapter 3 analyzed the motivations and beliefs of protesters who were participating in Euromaidan, a movement that has already taken place, Chapter 4 extends this framework to understand when contentious behavior might be likely in the future. During my time in the field, I recruited nearly two hundred Ukrainian undergraduates to participate in the experiment to learn about their
willingness to protest. In selecting universities to approach for recruiting subjects, I intentionally found institutions that would have produced prominent activists during both the Euromaidan movement and Ukraine’s 2004 Orange Revolution. As a result, I established contacts at three universities with reputations for being hubs of activism that were also largely free of the corruption pervading much of Ukrainian higher education – the National Academy of Kyiv – Mohyla Academy (NaUKMA), where I procured an affiliation as a visiting scholar; Taras Shevchenko National University in Kyiv; and Ukrainian Catholic University in Lviv, a city that is widely regarded as one of Ukraine’s most pro-European places to live.

Every subject who participated in the experiment was therefore a student – the vast majority of individuals were undergraduates, while a small number were Master’s candidates in their mid-twenties. It is important to be clear and transparent about the experimental sample one is using and the population about which one is making inferences, as the results of an analysis conducted on students clearly cannot be extrapolated to describe the political behavior of all Ukrainians writ large. Indeed, students differ from other members of society on many relevant demographic characteristics, including age, education, and political knowledge. Nevertheless, this sample pool proved to be the exact group of individuals about whom I am making inferences – many studies have found that university students and young people in general are often at the forefront of protest movements, meaning that these are the precise set of actors whose behavior I aim to understand in this project.

I asked all participants to read a vignette stating that they lived in a repressive state where students had begun to protest against an authoritarian government that was reversing recent democratic reforms in favor of retrenched autocracy. Participants in the
first treatment group learned that democracies elsewhere were supporting the protest, participants in the second treatment group learned that autocracies elsewhere were intervening to suppress the protests, and participants in the control group received no information about external actors at all. Following this, all subjects rated their willingness on a ten-point scale to engage in three forms of protest, each of which represented an increasingly intense form of participation – signing a petition, contacting an elected official, or joining a lawful protest movement. No other difference between the vignettes existed other than the content regarding international factors, meaning that any significant variation in protest willingness among groups could be attributed to the experimental manipulation at hand. Participants were randomly assigned into each treatment, ameliorating concerns over bias or misrepresentation. Further, balance checks were later conducted on each group to insure that participants across treatments resembled one another on the most relevant traits at hand.

T-tests comparing the average expressed rates of protest inclination between groups provided null results for the first two types of behavior that I was testing – there was no significant difference between participants in the treatment groups and those in the control for signing a petition or contacting an elected official. However, the results for the most active form of protest behavior – committing to joining a hypothetical movement should one arise in the future – strongly support my theory. For this third variable, participants in the democratic actor treatment were far more likely to protest than others (p < 0.001). In fact, on the ten-point range of possible responses that participants could have chosen, those in this group expressed an average rate that was more than 1.6 points higher than the average rate of the control group. This suggests
that for the most dangerous form of activity tested in this study, respondents were heavily inclined to consider external democratic support when the stakes were highest.

My final empirical chapter extends my analysis to contexts beyond present-day Ukraine. In Chapter 5, I present **five comparative case studies that illustrate my theoretical mechanisms in action.** I analyze five distinct cases in this chapter – Ukraine’s 2004 Orange Revolution, Bahrain’s 2011 failed uprising, an unsuccessful rebellion in the Uzbek city of Andijan in 2006, Lebanon’s 2005 Cedar Revolution, and the protests against Nicolás Maduro that have rocked Venezuela since the mid-2010s. These cases represent a wide variety of geographical and temporal contexts, spanning a range of sixteen years and representing Eastern Europe, the Middle East, Central Asia, and Latin America. This diversity shows how my theory’s mechanisms apply to a number of different circumstances, extending this project’s applicability and relevance to other corners of the globe.

Each of the cases that I profile illustrates a different aspect of the theory outlined in Chapter 2. Not every mechanism operates fully in every movement that I analyze; instead, I show how distinct parts of the theory operate in different contexts, depending on the situational factors at hand. My analysis of Ukraine’s 2004 Orange Revolution highlights the significant role that can be played by external democratic support for a protest movement. In this case, liberal actors elsewhere were vocal in lending their backing to the more democratic candidate in that year’s Presidential race, Viktor Yushchenko. According to several scholarly reports and news sources, this international attention was heavily desired by protesters and played a part in bolstering their battle against the regime’s corruption.
Similarly, my studies of both Lebanon’s 2005 Cedar Revolution and the 2019 protests in Venezuela illustrate the important role played by external democratic actors. In Lebanon, protesters actively solicited the aid and attention of outside forces, and this strengthened their willingness to continue challenging authorities. Lebanese activists were also protesting against the autocratic Syrian regime’s decision to station troops on Lebanese soil for more than three decades, demonstrating a situation in which local domestic capacity was sufficiently open for the movement to succeed. While the events in Venezuela are in a much greater state of flux due to the fact that they are still ongoing, numerous reports indicate that protesters have intentionally tried to secure the help of global actors to remove Maduro from office and that international sanctions are playing a deterrent role in keeping the regime from repressing protesters in an overly harsh way.

The two remaining case studies in Chapter 5 present instances in which repressive domestic capacity and external authoritarian intervention proved to be too costly for protesters to overcome, dramatically raising the perceptions of risk and danger should one decide to campaign against the state. In Uzbekistan, the regime’s imposing ability to suppress independent media coverage of the uprising was central to the event’s undoing – activists were stymied in their ability to transmit a message to the outside world, inhibiting the movement from growing. Countries such as the United States of America and the United Kingdom did offer some signals of support, but Uzbek leaders’ domestic capacity coupled with several Western forces’ decision to defer to authorities for geopolitical reasons kept protesters from achieving their goals.

Bahrain’s failed 2011 uprising also shows that external autocratic intervention, when compounded with a resilient regime and a lack of counterbalancing democratic assistance, can effectively contain a movement. Indeed, in Bahrain, liberal outside
actors failed to exert any pressure on the regime, sending a signal to activists that they were alone in their cause. Moreover, the movement was effectively ended when Bahrain’s neighbors Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates deployed troops to the country in order to put down the rebellion. Taken together, the lack of democratic aid and the presence of autocratic intervention dramatically shifted protesters’ perceptions of threat and dissipated the movement into nothingness.

Finally, Chapter 6 provides an effective conclusion to this dissertation. Here, I restate the main themes and points that were highlighted in earlier chapters, showing how each piece of empirical evidence connects with one another to support the claims that constitute the core of my theoretical framework. This underscores the fact that my propositions extend to multiple real-world situations and are not restricted to one temporal or geographical period alone. Following this, I discuss the myriad reasons why this topic is of critical importance from both an analytical and a normative perspective. Activists in authoritarian and hybrid regimes are struggling to secure respect for basic human rights and civil liberties, often risking their freedom or even their lives in doing so. Liberal external actors can affect the dynamics of these protests in multiple ways, and such forces should support pro-democratic movements when they arise to increase the chance that their campaign can succeed. It is to Chapter 2, presenting the central theoretical framework and analytical contributions of this project, that I now turn.
CHAPTER 2: THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

As the preceding introduction has shown, anti-governmental protest is a highly viable form of political activity in authoritarian and semi-authoritarian regimes around the world today. I begin this theoretical chapter by briefly restating the main research questions that comprise the core of my dissertation, demonstrating how my analysis focuses on this contemporary phenomenon. At a broad level, my project studies protest participation and political behavior by citizens in autocracies – why do citizens decide to protest against leaders in undemocratic regimes, despite the myriad dangers involved in doing so? Deciding to protest in an autocracy is a risky undertaking, as situational constraints and imbalances in information between leaders and the population force citizens to act within an environment of permanent uncertainty. While clearly an important area of study, this question is broad and has been analyzed by scholars from a wide variety of diverse theoretical and methodological perspectives.

In differentiating my own unique contribution from this extensive area of research, I point specifically to my focus on the modern global context in studying protest behavior in authoritarian states. Recent years have seen an explosive increase in the number of English-language signs held by political protesters in autocracies across the world, signaling activists’ desire to capture the attention and interest of an international audience. At the same time, innovations in telecommunications make it easier than ever before for people in one country to know what actors elsewhere are doing, and to solicit their attention and assistance in an increasingly interconnected world. How does awareness of a global audience shape citizens’ decisions to protest in autocracies today? Could pro-democracy support from democratic states or international organizations affect protesters’ decision-making calculations? Conversely,
how might intervention from other autocratic leaders aiming to bolster a flagging dictator’s power affect the dynamics of these social movements? Would autocratic intervention suppress or increase protest participation? These are the questions that I address in my dissertation, and I turn now to the theoretical framework through which I analyze these critical issues.

At a fundamental level, domestic factors and local opportunity structures are important for understanding citizens’ decisions to protest in non-democracies. Focal points provide logical channels for centralizing discontent, making it obvious why such events have the power to mobilize passive segments of the population in the absence of a free and open media environment. I build upon this domestic explanation by proposing that international actors also matter heavily as well, however, as they alter protesters’ perceptions of success or failure in ways that have not yet been as carefully studied. I open this chapter by introducing and specifying the key theoretical concepts and actors that play a central role in my analysis, to ensure that the ways in which I utilize these terms are as clear as possible.

**Defining and conceptualizing the core components of my theory**

Before presenting my argument, I must first define key concepts so that my reasoning and logic are understandable. In the following section, I therefore explain my perceptions and usage of essential concepts such as protest movements, protest participants, and authoritarian governance.

Protests – what events constitute this specific type of social movement?

To begin, when I speak of *protests*, I refer to social movements that share several key features – they are wholly voluntary and participatory in nature, they operate at the mass level in society, the vast majority of participants are peaceful and non-violent, and
their goals are to achieve political change and societal liberalization. I begin by stressing protests’ *voluntary and participatory nature* because I am interested in understanding why someone would intentionally *choose* to join a movement, despite the costs of doing so. It is true that in some cases, protest participants are covertly being provided financial or political compensation for their participation. This is often true in autocracies, when leaders coerce otherwise apathetic citizens into publicly denouncing anti-governmental protesters and proclaiming their support for the incumbent regime. A 2012 report from the Institute for War & Peace Reporting provides clear evidence of this, showing how the autocratic government in Uzbekistan employs a “Rent-a-Mob” tactic in which individual citizens are literally employed by the state to harass anti-governmental forces while simultaneously pretending to act as private citizens in order to maintain some semblance of autonomy from the regime.

On the other side of the equation, the IWPR report indicates that the political opposition in Kyrgyzstan is also fond of using similar techniques to pad the size of its rallies as well. Radnitz (2010) provides further evidence of this phenomenon in Kyrgyzstan through a comparative case study with Uzbekistan, showing how oppositional elites in Kyrgyzstan build ties with local communities to challenge the regime in a way that simulates genuine opposition while simultaneously benefiting these “outsider” elites. In a different context, a 2011 report from the German news source *Der Spiegel* explores the accounts of several rural Egyptians who were paid by Hosni Mubarak’s regime to rally in Cairo in opposition to the nascent Arab Spring protesters.

---

gathering there at that time\footnote{Windfuhr, Volkhard and Daniel Steinworth. “Rural Poor Paid to Attack Opposition Supporters,” Spiegel Online. Published February 4, 2011. Available online at http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/mubarak-s-hired-thugs-rural-poor-paid-to-attack-opposition-supporters-a-743537.html.}. In all of these situations, event participants were being directed by higher powers in their actions and were not acting autonomously.

In many cases, this “employment” is surprisingly nuanced – the IWPR report indicates how different types of participation (taking part in a demonstration, heckling, and so on) resulted in different levels of payment from the regime depending on how much involvement was required. When citizens participate in social movements on behalf of other actors, this is a clear example of Kuran’s (1995) “preference falsification.” In these situations, an individual’s true feelings are essentially unknowable – instead, citizens are incentivized to publicly present one particular viewpoint despite the fact that their own true feelings might be extremely different. These situations do not fall within the universe of cases that I study because such participants are not protesting to achieve any real change. Instead, they are being paid to publicly support a position about which they privately might have little to no opinion. As a result, their decision-making strategies are driven more by considerations of patronage and resource allocation than by ideology, and their reasoning is unaffected by the causal mechanisms that I present in subsequent sections of this chapter.

Considering my second main specification of cases, it is also important that protests operate at a \textit{mass level} in society – that is, the movement must be large and significant enough so that leaders are aware of its existence and other citizens can monitor its development. Individual protesters can certainly sometimes have significant influence on their own – a Tunisian vendor’s self-immolation and its ability to spark the Arab Spring provide an example of this – but truly meaningful change is often more
likely to emerge when the movement is large enough to sustain itself and catch the eye of the country’s residents and possibly the global community as well\textsuperscript{3}. This is particularly true in cases where protesters hope to generate international attention – in large and dynamic countries such as the United States, citizens are already often woefully unaware of events happening within their own borders, and do not pay much attention to international affairs.

The relative importance of size is often contingent on domestic opportunity structures and media openness, of course, as even large protests might not gain international traction if activists’ local access to various forms of media (both network media and social media) is constrained by the regime. This might be the case in states with highly coercive capability such as China, for example, where authorities can block citizens’ access to social media accounts and censor the images that are transmitted online\textsuperscript{4}. Still, greater size generally leads to greater visibility across cases, meaning that the two concepts are often linked. If a protest movement hopes to make the news in countries around the world, size can certainly help.

\textit{Non-violence} and peaceful tactics are often essential for generating support for a movement, particularly when considering the interests of outside actors. Thomas and Lewis (2014) show through an experimental study that perceptions of non-violence in collective action convey a sense of efficacy and legitimacy to those who are not currently protesting. Similarly, Chenoweth and Stephan (2011) indicate in a cross-national analysis of anti-governmental movements between 1960 and 2005 that non-violent

\textsuperscript{3} Indeed, this closely matches Tarrow’s (1994) definition of what fundamentally constitutes a social movement – such campaigns must be able to endure and sustain themselves in order to be considered a wholly realized event, rather than existing temporarily and in isolation.

\textsuperscript{4} Though it predated the rise of social media and online communication, the unsuccessful 1989 Tiananmen Square protests that took place in China are an example of a large movement that failed to attain its goals.
movements were more than twice as likely to achieve their objectives as were violent campaigns. Further, Ulfelder (2005) shows that non-violent movements are more effective in creating regime change because peaceful campaigns signal coordination and capacity. This is attractive not only to ordinary citizens, but also to regime elites who consider defecting and joining the push against their former colleagues.

Several historical examples provide evidence of this, ranging from the Velvet Revolution in 1989 Czechoslovakia to the Solidarity movement in Poland in the 1980s. Similarly, the civil rights era of the 1960s in the highly repressive racial regime of the United States’ Deep South is a case of this as well. Protesters (often including student-led organizations like the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee) made civil disobedience a central part of their resistance to segregation, employing strategies such as sit-ins and boycotts rather than resorting to violence. As a result, the images and videos of policemen violently assaulting protesters with high-powered jets of water and dogs were jarring, and played a role in convincing onlookers that change was needed. Other examples falling within the theoretical scope of this dissertation include the “Color Revolutions” that spread throughout Eastern Europe and Central Asia in the mid-2000s. Citizens took to the streets to demand democratization and reform in cases ranging from Yugoslavia’s 2000 Bulldozer Revolution to Georgia’s 2003 Rose Revolution to Ukraine’s 2004 Orange Revolution. Protesters largely remained non-violent, and were successful (at least in the short term) in achieving their goals.

5 In addition, Engler and Engler (2016) show that non-violent protests are becoming increasingly common in the twenty-first century as activists take advantage of the many opportunities that it can provide. 6 There are a few notable exceptions to this trend, in which protesters use violence strategically. For example, according to Kudelia’s (2018) analysis of Ukraine’s Euromaidan revolution, certain protesters occasionally used acts of violence within a movement that itself was decidedly non-violent on the whole. These acts of violence were met by even more violent governmental repression, which caused a backlash and stirred moral outrage among the broader society. On the whole, however, effective movements tend to be wholly non-violent overall.
Identifying the goals of the cases which I am studying here

Finally, in defining the cases to which my theoretical expectations apply, it is essential to stress that I am focusing on protests that aim to produce real and legitimate political change in a given country, promoting the movement of a state in a more democratic, less authoritarian, and increasingly politically transparent direction. This is of central importance because my theory is fundamentally about the political orientation of a regime (how authoritarian it is) as well as the political natures of outside countries and organizations that may affect protesters’ calculations. Protests can obviously take place for a variety of different reasons, and so it is essential that I clarify the exact type of social movements about which I am making assertions.

I study movements in which the goal is to implement policy change in a democratic direction, to combat corruption, to protest electoral fraud, or to improve the quality of human rights and civil liberties in a country. Broad cases falling within this category include the 2013-2014 Euromaidan revolution in Ukraine (a case study which I explore more deeply in subsequent chapters), the Arab Spring of 2013, 2017 protests against autocratic rule in Venezuela, the aforementioned “Color Revolutions,” the 2011 protests in Russia following Vladimir Putin’s reelection, 2018 student-led protests in Nicaragua, and the 2013 Geza Park protests in Turkey that aimed to combat Recep Tayyip Erdogan’s crackdowns on dissent. These cases all clearly differ significantly in their geographical locations and the specific causes that underpinned each movement’s development, but at a broad level, each campaign was fundamentally aimed at improving the quality of political discourse, life, and human rights in their country through reforms and (in some cases) regime change.
Utilizing this framework, I therefore do not study protests driven by religious fundamentalism (such as the Iranian Revolution of 1978-1979 that aimed to install a theocratic Islamic government) or ethnic hatred (such as the 2010 riots in Kyrgyzstan driven by clashes between ethnic Kyrgyz and Uzbeks). These types of protests are spurred by religious beliefs (which can overlap with but are still distinct from ideological beliefs) or disagreements about resource allocation and psychological group hatred. The motivations underpinning those movements are far removed from the behavior that I am interested in, because protesters in these incidents were not motivated by concerns over democratic rule, human rights, or freedom in civil society. As a result, these cases do not belong within the scope of this theoretical framework.

Additionally, while much of my subsequent discussion and a good deal of my methodological framework employs terms like “the West” in discussing the roles of outside actors, particularly with regards to democracy promotion, my theory is not geographically driven. I do not theorize that protesters' specific views about the United States of America, Germany, and Sweden on the one hand or about China, Zimbabwe, and Cuba on the other will guide their decision to join an anti-governmental movement, and this is certainly not a dissertation about American foreign policy or the relationships between the United States and countries around the world. If this were the case, this theory and its implications would not be able to travel to regions of the globe in which American influence is less salient or popular.

Instead, I am interested in understanding how democracy-minded protesters think about external forces that are pro-democratic or anti-democratic in nature – the ideological orientations of the outside actors is key. While this does tend to map onto common views of what comprises the global West, this correlation is not absolute –
South Korea and Japan are important democratic leaders in East Asia, for example, and there are several countries in the “West” such as Venezuela and Cuba that are clearly not liberal democracies. (This is to say nothing of increasingly illiberal regimes that operate within democratic organizations like the European Union, as Hungary under Viktor Orban is becoming far less invested in democratic norms than it once was.) As a result, the central consideration here is a regime’s political orientation, not its status as a member of the global West.

Identifying my universe of cases – regime type and media openness

Related to this, it is necessary to specify that I am theorizing about movements in regimes that are authoritarian, but not totalitarian. As scholars including Levitsky and Way (2010) have noted, regime types fall along a continuum from full democracy to full autocracy, encompassing everything from Schedler’s (2006) “electoral authoritarianism” to Diamond’s (2002) “hybrid regimes.” Opportunity structures and feasible outcomes differ significantly when one compares these types of regimes. For example, even if a critical mass of citizens were secretly dissatisfied with the machinations of the government in North Korea, it would be nearly impossible for anyone at the current time to coordinate a successful protest movement there. The regime’s complete control of social media, the Internet, and all forms of telecommunication make the procurement of information about developments within the country difficult to obtain and knowledge about support from abroad essentially impossible to find. Additionally, the punishment for protesting in a state like North Korea is much more akin to punishments meted out by totalitarian regimes like Nazi Germany or the Soviet Union, meaning that citizen decision-making options in these countries are simply too limited to fit into my framework.
At the same time, it does not make sense to apply this research agenda to countries that are fully democratic. While countries such as the United States certainly have some questionable traits and histories (whether related to racial or gender issues), anti-governmental movements have long been a vibrant and important part of the political culture in modern democracies, serving as a forum for debate over policies, elected officials, and the direction of society. Citizens in democracies do not face the same types of dangers for speaking out against the government, meaning that joining a protest movement like Occupy Wall Street, Black Lives Matter, or Tea Party rallies is not as costly or threatening as it is in autocracies and hybrid regimes due to the protections afforded to protesters.

Because of this, I focus on countries that are classified as authoritarian or semi-authoritarian. These are states in which political freedoms are seriously constrained, and in which participating in a protest carries real implications and dangers for one’s well-being. At the same time, these are states in which basic political protest is still a fundamentally available option—leaders may be at high risk, but merely joining a movement is not a certain death penalty. Critically, within this universe of non-democracies, I am specifically focusing on ones in which the media environment is relatively open to international sources. Because much of my analysis rests on the effects of international support and statements made by other countries, it is essential that citizens are able to know and monitor what countries elsewhere are doing and that they can transmit their own messages abroad.

If a regime is so totalitarian that the government fully controls the flow of information into and out of the country, it would be impossible for international forces to have any effect on citizen perceptions because the population would have no way of
knowing what the international response has been. This again underscores the importance of excluding such totalitarian or highly authoritarian states from my framework because my arguments focus on protester response to external cues. In countries like North Korea or Somalia, the flow of information that I have described would be constrained by a powerful state apparatus or the presence of warlord factions dominating the country, and my theoretical mechanisms would all be prevented from operating.

I therefore focus on non-democracies that nonetheless have some degree of media freedom and openness. What are some empirical tools for delineating between these cases and states which are more severely repressive? I follow Freedom House ratings in identifying the states to which my framework applies. I focus on Freedom House because these ratings take into consideration not only procedural and institutional political parameters in assessing a state’s regime type, but also substantive concepts such as freedom of the press (a concept that is of central importance to my theory), freedom of expression, freedom of civil society, and so on. Furthermore, while average citizens in autocratic societies certainly care about the basic political traits of their country’s regime, substantive concepts related to civil society such as human rights and individual liberties often have a more direct and tangible impact on their day-to-day lives, and should be more instrumental in driving them to the streets.


As explained here, I choose to utilize Freedom House ratings due to the reasons listed in the text rather than Polity IV ratings, another common metric for measuring regime type in the social sciences. I do so partially because Freedom House encapsulates a larger and more comprehensive number of variables in assessing regime type than does Polity IV, which only considers four factors. Additionally, Polity’s factors of choice are strictly political and institutional in nature, studying concepts including executive turnover and judicial independence, meaning that it does not capture as wide a range of societal factors that average citizens would consider in their daily lives.
This selection process applies to countries that are “Partly Free” (or semi-authoritarian), including states such as Guatemala, Mozambique, Singapore, Zambia, all of which received a score of 4 on the Freedom House scale. This also includes autocracies that are more repressive, if not totalitarian – this refers to countries such as Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Iran, all of which received scores between 5.5 and 6.5. However, because this theory does not apply to states in which protests are essentially impossible, I do not focus on states that received a score of 7. This excludes countries such as the Central African Republic, Eritrea, North Korea, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, and Turkmenistan because the political realities and media environments there are too stark for the elements of this theory to apply.

Who is protesting? Specifying my key actors of interest

One final concept to discuss concerns the type of actor about which I am making inferences. Protest movements (particularly those that grow to be mass events) obviously have several different stages, and the costs and benefits of joining at each stage will vary dramatically. As studies including that of Karklins and Petersen (1993) make clear, the barriers to joining a movement are much lower as the protests grow – it becomes more difficult for individual citizens to be identified and punished by security forces when hundreds of thousands of people have already taken to the streets. The motivations and decision-making strategies that drive participants at these different stages of the protest will therefore vary significantly as well.

While there is a great deal of theoretical insight that can be gained by focusing on protesters who join at the later stages of a movement, it is important to clarify that within the scope of this dissertation, I am specifically interested in understanding the perceptions and motivations of those who join near the beginning of a protest. These
actors are not necessarily the very first ones on the streets, but they do join at a point that is sufficiently early such that there is still a great deal of danger facing those who choose to participate, and the movement’s success is not guaranteed. These actors play an important role in the overall arc of a protest – they give legitimacy and added force to the first individuals who took to the streets, and they can bring in other citizens and build the movement to a tipping point where victory is more likely. Understanding their motivations is therefore essential for a number of important reasons.

The preceding section has aimed to define several key concepts that play an important role in the framework I present here. Rather than attempting to generate an overarching theory that can be applied to all different types of protests and social movements taking place around the world, I am theorizing specifically about the motivations of early joiners to democracy-minded mass movements in authoritarian and hybrid countries today. I now turn to the core concepts and arguments of my theory itself, stressing the different ways in which I believe international factors can shape domestic anti-governmental movements aimed at attaining liberalization and democratic reform.

**Identifying my primary theoretical expectations**

In the following section, I first show how pro-democratic support from liberal states elsewhere can shape protesters’ decision-making strategies, introducing the causal mechanisms that influence activists’ behavior. Following this, I discuss the effects of intervention from autocratic allies of a dictator, presenting the key variables that guide protesters’ actions in those situations as well.
Understanding the potential effects of democratic support from abroad

First, it seems plausible that support from liberal democracies elsewhere – whether expressed tangibly through direct aid and civil society administration or abstractly through diplomatic statements and press conferences – would have a positive effect on protesters’ willingness to agitate against the regime. If citizens believe that they are not alone in the world and that they have attracted the attention of outside forces, this could persuade them that their movement stands a chance at succeeding. This can be useful not only for retaining key activists and preventing members of the protests’ inner circle from defecting, but also for persuading hesitant observers that joining the movement is a winning decision.

Ample amounts of evidence show that protesters actively desire and solicit this support in hopes of strengthening their movement. As an example, the numerous English-language signs that appear throughout crowds in authoritarian regimes are a clear testament to the fact that protesters seek outside attention. In cases where English-language signs equal (or surpass) the number of signs written in the country’s local language, the intended audience is clearly not domestic, as it is unlikely that the majority of citizens there understand English. Instead, the intended audience is the international media – by capturing the interest of the news, protesters can broadcast their message to an international community in hopes of obtaining their attention and soliciting their support. As evidence of this, a CNBC report stresses the power that protesters themselves recently ascribed to international forces in Nicaragua – the report indicates that “[p]rotesters have been calling on international governments and organizations for help, expressing frustration via social media that the turmoil in their
home is being largely ignored. Further, Bećar (2015) notes that for many protesters, consciously deciding to wage a campaign in the English language can effectively “globalize” their movement, situating it within an international community and context that values political and social justice. Outside democratic support matters, and is often sought actively by protest participants in a direct and intentional manner.

In what specific ways does this attention matter? I posit that external democratic support increases the likelihood that individuals will decide to join a protest movement because of four primary causal mechanisms – 1) the ability to create a psychological sense of purposive solidarity, 2) the possibility for transnational linkages and learning effects, 3) the important role of international monitoring and checking ability, and 4) the potential for building ties with and procuring further assistance from citizens and members of their state’s diaspora in other countries. In each of these cases, individuals’ perceptions of potential success and victory will increase, ultimately outweighing their fears about costs or the chance that the movement will fail.

Creating a sense of purposive solidarity

The first main claim that I make here concerns protesters’ psychological, emotional, and mental states. Participating in a non-governmental campaign is costly. Not only must protesters invest the time and effort needed to occupy a space and make themselves visible, but this can also result in time missed from work or in some cases,
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10 Similarly, Jacobson (2009) posits that protesters participating in anti-governmental movements against Iranian leaders in 2009 were using English-language signs and banners in a similarly direct attempt to communicate with and catch the attention of an international audience. Moreover, a 2019 piece from the South China Morning Post recommended that protesters in Hong Kong intentionally utilize their English-language skills to make a larger number of signs in English, as this could provide activists with many more connections to outside forces than would be available by protesting in Cantonese alone.
even the loss of one’s occupation. Additionally, protesters know that by taking to the streets, they are potentially putting themselves in harm’s way by facing arrest, beatings, or even death. This can be mentally, emotionally, and physically draining, particularly when the movement reaches a stage in which one’s friends or acquaintances have been arrested or accosted by governmental forces.

While these factors will still exist whether or not the protest receives support from actors elsewhere, I propose that aid from abroad can provide a much-needed emotional and mental boost to individuals who are protesting, bolstering participants’ belief that their cause is just and that they stand a chance at success. Even if attention from the international community does not ultimately translate into material benefits, this external attention can still motivate individuals to persist in their cause. If no one in the international community appears to care (or even know) what the goals of the campaign are, conversely, this would lead protesters to feel isolated, ignored, and distressed, and would undermine their willingness to agitate against the regime. In these cases, protesters would fail to see much potential for their movement’s victory in the long term, and their decision-making strategies and calculations would be adjusted accordingly. In contrast, when people elsewhere care enough to pay attention and send signals of support to protesters, this can help activists feel fundamentally validated as human beings with inherent rights, value, and worth. As noted above, therefore, this mechanism is deeply rooted in emotion and feeling rather than rational choice or strategic calculations about costs and payoffs.

While much of my logic rests upon the notion that solidarity from powerful democratic states matters to protesters in authoritarian countries, it is also important to consider the role played by democratic organizations fighting their own battles in other
autocratic states. In these cases, the outside forces are still democratically-minded, but they reside in countries that are heavily repressive as well. An excellent example of this is the “Baltic Way” of 1989. In that year, citizens in the Soviet-occupied states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania came together to form a human chain of two million people that stretched across all three territories. In this case, the term “purposive solidarity” applies quite well – residents of each Soviet territory had their own battle to fight against the central authorities in Moscow, but each movement also shared the same purpose, and their affirmation to one another that their causes were worthwhile and that they were supporting one another surely played a role in strengthening their resolve.

According to Eglitis and Ardava (2012), this “collective ritual” played an important part in sending signals to the international community about protesters’ aspirations. Similarly, Muiznieks (1995) suggests that leaders of the three Baltic independence movements worked actively to make connections with reformers and civic activist groups in other parts of the Soviet Union, showing how democratic activists in one state or region can bolster the enthusiasm of protesters in autocratic territories elsewhere. Beissinger (2002) also shows how the spread of this nationalist uprising in the Soviet Union was not limited to the Baltics alone, but was in fact present in several different parts of the regime – this mobilization spread throughout the country and played a large part in causing the collapse of the Soviet state.\footnote{Indeed, Beissinger stresses the fact that not only were Baltic activists inspiring protesters elsewhere in the Soviet Union to take action in their own Soviet Socialist Republics, but they were also fostering a regional environment that would dramatically increase their own chance at achieving success against Communist authorities.}

Transnational linkages and learning effects

Closely related to the notion of psychological purposive solidarity explored above is a second distinct causal mechanism. In addition to providing protesters with basic
emotional fortitude and strength by reinforcing the notion that their cause is worthwhile and can succeed, international democratic actors can also influence one another by forming models and strategies that are intentional and strategic. Bunce and Wolchik (2006, 2011) show how democratic movements spread from one Central and Eastern European country to another in the mid-1990s and early 2000s, pointing to the role of transnational networks and linkages in a way that evokes the ideas of Levitsky and Way (2006). According to Bunce and Wolchik (2006), democratic forces supported one another through diffusion, or situations in which “a key factor is the existence of networks, wherein actors in other states confer with innovators about goals and strategies; innovators take on the responsibility for peddling their ideas outside their state; or “rooted cosmopolitans” based in one country travel to other countries promoting their pet idea, model, or policy” (288).

This is different from mere imitation, or situations in which protesters simply co-opt strategies from a different country – an example of imitation can be seen in a 2017 Reuters news report stating that protesters in Venezuela watched screenings of “Winter on Fire,” a Netflix documentary about Ukraine’s Euromaidan revolution, to study techniques to use in their own movement. While this is an interesting case of international actors influencing one another, it also highlights the difference between diffusion and imitation because there were no direct links between Ukrainians and Venezuelans here12.

Keck and Sikkink (1998) note that these strategic types of interactions are a relatively recent phenomena in their study of transnational group linkages and human

rights promotion in Latin America, defining these networks as “forms of organization characterized by voluntary, reciprocal, and horizontal patterns of communication and exchange” (8). These networks of activists intentionally communicate with one another, willingly working to aid their counterparts and help them achieve their goals. Other examples of the importance of transnational linkages and learning can be seen in the collapse of Communism throughout Central and Eastern Europe in the late 1980s and 1990s, when numerous protest movements galvanized at the same time and supported one another. Here, the support was not merely symbolic as was the case with the Baltic Way; instead, Oberschall (1996) notes how civic actors in different contexts intentionally and strategically aided and assisted one another. Additionally, Weyland (2012) finds that a similar processes occurred during the Arab Spring, as democracy-minded activist groups in one state were helped by movements elsewhere in their attempts at success. From a broader perspective, Meyer and Whittier (1994) suggest that protest movements “spillover” from one territory into another thanks to four factors – 1) organizational coalitions, 2) overlapping social movement communities, 3) shared personnel, and 4) broader changes in the external environment. This is characteristic of the process taking place in the examples provided here.

The role of international monitoring and checking ability

The third aspect of democratic support from abroad and its ability to shape protesters’ perceptions is less about emotional and solidary benefits, and more about guaranteeing basic safety and security. Support from abroad matters because the more attention that the international community is paying to an anti-governmental campaign, the more difficult it becomes for an authoritarian regime to brutally crack down and repress members of the protests. No autocratic leader wants to be labeled a global
pariah, and leaders know that television, the Internet, and social media can instantly transmit images of disturbing violence around the world. Essentially, police brutality and harshness can go “viral” in one moment, potentially leading to a barrage of international condemnation, sanctions, and other repercussions for dictators who would have been much less constrained in the past.

As an example, one can consider protests that took place in Russia in 2017 – at the time, tens of thousands of citizens in cities across the country gathered to protest corruption and the extravagant wealth of Prime Minister (and former President) Dmitri Medvedev. Led by opposition activist Alexei Navalny, the protests never became truly massive. However, one notable aspect of this event was the ability of protesters on the ground to capture and transmit images and videos of security forces beating, detaining, and arresting scores of young people. Because citizens had this ability to spread first-hand evidence of what was taking place, regime authorities knew that they could not go too far in their repression, potentially convincing others in Russia that meaningful checks existed and that joining the movement was not be as risky as would have been the case several decades ago.

A clear example in which international attention towards repression caused actual, real-world ramifications for a dictator can be seen in Belarus in 2011. According to a report by the British Broadcasting Company, Western governments closely watched that year’s Belarusian presidential elections, in which incumbent (and ruling leader since 1994) Alexander Lukasheko won re-election handily. Following the announcement of the results, thousands took to the streets and hundreds were severely beaten, arrested, and detained. Western governments quickly responded by freezing Lukashenko’s assets in the European Union and placing travel bans and sanctions on
individuals within the administration. It is likely that this crackdown would have been even more brutal had no international monitors and news sources been present, echoing my arguments about checking and its ability to deter repression by autocrats.

The dynamics of this international checking can also be seen in the case of Mexico in the 1980s. According to Maney (2001), a group of left-wing Mexicans pushing for indigenous rights (and, in some cases, independence from the Mexican state) began to wage a campaign against the country’s autocratic regime. Maney notes that when the world began to pay attention to the conflict, security forces decreased the intensity of their crackdown. As soon as the world’s engagement turned elsewhere, however, the security forces dramatically re-amped their repression against the Zapatistas. This example does not fit perfectly within the framework of my research, of course, as the indigenous group does not meet all of the democratic criteria that I presented earlier in terms of non-violence. However, the logic involved – a repressive regime checking itself when the world is watching – is still illustrative.

Venezuela provides yet another example of this logic. According to the United States Department of State, President Barack Obama issued Executive Order 13692 to target “persons involved in or responsible for the erosion of human rights guarantees, persecution of political opponents, curtailment of press freedoms, use of violence and human rights violations and abuses in response to antigovernment protests, and arbitrary arrest and detention of antigovernment protestors” in Venezuela. Here, Obama’s sanctions were of course driven by considerations broader than merely the
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government’s response to protesters alone, but the clear reference to protests in the order still indicates a situation in which a leader’s harsh crackdown on citizens was met by punishment from other countries. Similarly, a 2017 *Miami Herald* article indicates that the Trump administration forced a new round of sanctions against Venezuela’s President Nicolás Maduro for violence against the opposition. In this case, a dictator’s actions are monitored and checked when said actions become too forceful.

**Procuring support from like-minded citizens and diaspora members abroad**

Whereas the first three points stress the importance of emotional solidarity, strategic guidance with tactical groups and governmental organizations elsewhere, and the ability to check an autocrat’s security forces due to the presence of international media coverage, the fourth and final point presented here is about financial, material, and political support that protesters might receive from ordinary citizens abroad. This factor is particularly relevant in cases where members of a country’s diaspora have moved to other states, but are still able to send food, blankets, clothing, or other material possessions that can sustain protesters and allow them to viably remain on the streets for an undetermined period of time. Members of the diaspora might have access to a deeper pool of resources than do compatriots in their home country, and their support can be critical for keeping a movement from collapsing due to internal strain – if protesters receive aid and assistance that can alleviate the physical dangers or discomforts that are involved in campaigning against a regime, this can alter their decision-making calculations and lower their perceptions of danger.

---

The role of social media and international communication is critically important here. If protesters either have pre-existing links with ordinary citizens in other countries or are able to build connections with them online, this can increase the chance that people elsewhere will voluntarily contribute to the movement or lobby and pressure their own governments to become involved in some way. This is particularly true in democracies, where legislators are more apt to listen to vocal or politically influential segments of the population. Again, members of a state’s diaspora and their allies are often of central importance – several scholarly studies have shown how many prominent ethnic diaspora communities including Armenians; Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians; Ukrainians; Cubans; and Ethiopians have all affected policy-making in the United States in efforts to influence developments in their home countries. Person-to-person connections are important due to the many reasons presented here, and are increasingly viable to create.

This part of my analysis underscores my earlier discussion on regime type. Totalitarian states such as North Korea do not allow for any type of communication whatsoever between citizens and the outside world – families in South Korea have
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relatives in the North with whom they have not spoken in more than half a century. In semi-authoritarian and authoritarian countries like Russia or Venezuela, however, it is much easier to cross borders and communicate with people elsewhere, potentially turning to them as a way to generate political and social responsiveness in their own states from the bottom up.

*Tangible support and symbolic support*

I conclude this section with a brief discussion regarding two distinct types of support across all four mechanisms. Considering the effects of these processes, it seems likely that tangible and concrete measures of support would be more effective than abstract statements praising protesters for their resolve. For example, if the United States were to monitor protests and human rights abuses in Zimbabwe and decided to threaten sanctions against the regime, this would carry more heft than a formal declaration from the Secretary of State calling for leaders’ removal. As noted above, convincing citizens that the movement can actually win is instrumental, and concrete support from abroad could provide the spark for persuading a cautiously optimistic neighbor to finally participate in the campaign.

This does not undermine the fundamental significance of symbolic support itself, of course. While statements of praise do not have as many “teeth,” supportive statements can still bolster protesters’ drive by indicating that tangible aid and assistance might follow – international actors elsewhere have noticed the movement and might act if the regime does not change its course. It is impossible for protesters to know if symbolic support will actually lead to something concrete or whether statements are “cheap talk,” but the fact that they exist *at all* is better than a complete lack of engagement with the outside world – at the very least, someone is paying attention.
Further, it seems plausible that this symbolic support will most effectively received by citizens who are more open and trusting. In making this claim, I point to Benson and Rochon’s (2004) findings that citizens who trust others are more likely to join protests because doing so involves cooperation and working together. I test this dynamic in greater detail in a subsequent chapter, where I describe an original survey experiment that I carried out in Ukraine to test the claims that I am making in this dissertation.

When comparing the effects of targeted and tangible support with the effects of more abstract forms of assistance, it is important to stress that the intensity of each factor also plays a role. For example, while I argue here that sanctions targeting an autocracy’s key imports and exports are more powerful than diplomatic calls for democracy, it is also possible to envision a scenario in which individual state sanctions are relatively weak and ineffective while a powerful multilateral condemnation of autocrats’ repression might be more influential. As a result, while hypothesizing that concrete expressions of support are more effective in shaping protest behavior, I will need to carefully consider intensity in subsequent parts of my analysis. Because it can be difficult for citizens on the ground to make objective assessments and evaluations about the intensity of support while crafting their mental strategies, I test this dimension of my theory by employing qualitative methods like interviews and process-tracing to understand how citizens conceptualize and measure these factors.

**Interpreting the potential role played by autocrats in other countries**

How might autocratic intervention shape citizens’ decisions to protest? While not necessarily as prevalent in today’s world as democracy promotion, this type of “autocratic promotion” does indeed exist – as an example, Tolstrup (2014) analyzes Russia’s role as a “black knight” that affects its neighbors’ domestic politics, studying
ways in which the regime intervenes to support autocratic allies sympathetic to Russian interests. Similarly, while not a textbook case of direct intervention, Yom (2016) finds significant evidence that the authoritarian monarchical leaders of several Middle Eastern and Northern African nations consciously cooperated with each another in the face of widespread societal uprisings, offering aid to one another and sharing strategic initiatives to quell the dissent that each regime was experiencing at the time. Similarly, Whitehead (2014) finds that while such autocratic interference does not necessarily mirror democracy promotion in a directly countering manner, numerous dictators do intentionally employ this strategy for political gain. Further, Chyzh and Labzina (2018) propose through a formal model that autocrats often have the incentive to intervene on behalf of allies even if their ally is ultimately forced from office by the masses; their logic holds that this intervention should nevertheless make future protests less likely, stabilizing their international influence on the region more broadly.

I propose that in instances where this intervention occurs, there are three potential causal mechanisms that might affect protesters’ decision-making strategies, depending on the context at hand. The first two posited mechanisms make protest more likely – one mechanism signals the weakness and vulnerability of the incumbent authoritarian, while the other spurs a frustrated backlash at unwanted intrusion and intervention. The final mechanism that I present here produces an outcome diametrically opposed to the two discussed above. In this third and final mechanism, intervention intimidates and deters protesters from taking to the streets, making protest participation less likely.
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22 For further discussion of authoritarian sharing and cooperation in the Middle East, see Lynch (2016).
23 Abu-Bader and Ianchovichina (2017) also find that intervention (particularly military intervention) has been quite common among states in the Middle East and North Africa, and that this intervention can cause widespread societal conflict under certain circumstances.
When will these three mechanisms occur? Fundamentally, I argue here that the domestic capacity and power of the incumbent regime is of paramount importance. When the incumbent leader is weak and relatively powerless, I predict that the first two mechanisms will dominate. Protesters will grant more credence to the probability of movement success when making their calculations about the costs and benefits of joining the campaign, and participation will increase. When the authoritarian government is solidly in control and possesses an extreme capability to repress, however, I expect that the third mechanism will dominate — external autocratic intervention will deter individuals from protesting by convincing them that the dangers of doing so are simply too great. In this final situation, individuals update their assessments of costs and benefits, and conclude that the costs of repression outweigh the likelihood of movement victory. I expand upon each of these ideas and explore the logic and reasoning of these three processes below.

Signals of incumbent weakness and vulnerability

If rulers who struggle to contain a mass movement display signs of vulnerability and must turn to more capable despots in neighboring countries for help, this would seem to erode the remaining vestiges of legitimacy they might still enjoy among pockets of the population. For example, a leader who has maintained the full confidence and support of his or her armed forces and security troops is (on the surface, at least) still in command. Rational citizens know that participating in an anti-governmental campaign when the regime’s repressive capacity is entirely intact could pose a serious threat to their own safety, and will likely abstain from taking to the streets.

This relates closely to Ginkel and Smith’s (1999) analysis of revolutions and uprising in authoritarian regimes. According to these authors, autocrats who are
challenged by dissidents must choose whether to offer concessions to their opponents. On the one hand, offering concessions can mollify protesters by accommodating some of their demands. On the other hand, concessions also indicate a sign of weakness, as the incumbent regime evidently must permit some changes that it otherwise would prefer not to – the logic holds that only weak dictators must make concessions. Ginkel and Smith show that concessions made by the Czechoslovak government in 1989, such as allowing opposition groups to form, indicated to protesters that success was possible, increasing their resolve and leading to the downfall of the Communist regime.

Extending this logic to my framework creates similar implications – while incumbents here are not making concessions to protesters, the argument still applies in that only weak incumbents must turn elsewhere for assistance. This shapes the signals that the regime inadvertently sends to activists, tilting their calculations and making victory seem more attainable.

If a leader must admit that they are overwhelmed and in serious danger of being overthrown by the masses, this forces rulers to make appeals to autocratic allies elsewhere to provide funding, resources, weapons, or troops to quash the uprising and successfully avert a serious threat to his or her rule. As a result, I argue that citizens in these situations increasingly come to view their leaders as weak and the chance of a successful protest as stronger, deepening their determination to remove leaders from office. While it is an example of “soft” intervention rather than direct intrusion, Hong Kong’s 2014 “Umbrella Revolution” can provide an illustration of this mechanism. After students began to protest against local leaders, the mainland Chinese Communist

---

24 It is also important to note that in this particular example, the Soviet Union’s decision not to send in tanks or troops to dampen the uprising also sent a clear external signal to protesters that they stood a strong chance at achieving their goal of enacting regime change.
government attempted to undermine the movement, claiming that it was directed by Western forces. By discrediting the protests’ indigenous nature, regime authorities were clearly aiming to help local Hong Kong authorities maintain their tenuous hold on power. Ultimately, this portrayed a situation to protesters in which local leaders were too weak to suppress the protests on their own, undermining their image as capable rulers because they required support from more powerful forces elsewhere and prompting citizens to remain active and engaged in their campaign.

**Unanticipated backlash effect due to unwanted intervention**

I suggest that in the case of citizens who have long been frustrated with corruption within their own regime, such activists would become even angrier if their leader received defensive support from allies elsewhere. In these cases, autocratic intervention causes a backlash in which protesters resent perceptions of unwelcome meddling and double down against the regime. Here, intrusion backfires on the incumbent and makes the situation worse than if no outside assistance (whether invited or not) had ever been given in the first place. I propose two key processes that are at play in these types of situations. First, this outside intrusion essentially adds insult to injury for angry protesters – not only is the leader disliked, but activists become further incensed by the incumbent’s decision to call for help from an outside force that has no right to meddle in their affairs. Returning to the example of Hong Kong’s “Umbrella

---


26 While the goals of the Chinese government (and the goals of autocratic regimes elsewhere that employ similar tactics) was likely to discredit the movement and signal to other citizens in society that the protest was fraudulent and inauthentic, I posit that this de-legitimizing approach would actually make activists even more likely to continue their campaign and work harder to recruit others to join their cause. As the regime spreads false information about the true nature of their efforts, I suggest that this would motivate protesters to double-down and remain even more firm and resolute.
Revolution,” several reporters at the time described the movement as a “major pushback” against the Beijing regime’s anti-democratic agenda in Hong Kong specifically and in China more broadly. Protesters resented the fact that mainland authorities were undermining their efforts to chart their own course, producing a desire to push back against this external intimidation. As another example, Delcour and Wolczuk (2015) agree that Russian intervention into its neighbors’ affairs is significant, but they argue that this type of action from the Russian government instead causes unexpected backlash in places such as Georgia and Ukraine. As Russian manipulation and support for autocrats becomes ever clearer and more blatant, alarmed citizens and elites become more resolute in achieving their goals of liberalization and democracy.

Second, citizen anger in these situations could stem from the fact that democratically-minded activists abhor the fact that their country is now closely linked with their leader’s autocratic allies. In these cases, support from other autocrats causes a phenomenon that is essentially an inverse of Weyland’s argument about representativeness and availability heuristics. According to Weyland (2012), citizens in one state are often highly aware of political conditions in neighboring states, and individuals use this knowledge in deciding how to act—this explains why citizens in Middle Eastern countries began to protest during the Arab Spring, as they imitated the actions of neighbors who had successfully forced leaders from office. In Weyland’s case, protesters in one state wanted to emulate outcomes that took place elsewhere. In my framework, the opposite is happening—when citizens in one state believe that an


28 One could very clearly also argue that these same factors are motivating the vast majority of protesters who again took to the streets in Hong Kong throughout 2019, as anger at unwanted influence from Beijing has been a significant cause of the movement’s growth.
autocratic ally is intervening in their affairs, this deepens their resolve not to become like their neighbors. The specter of similar (or worse) forms of authoritarianism could lead them to perceive their country as being on a precipice, or a critical juncture where crucial actions are needed to reverse their own state’s autocratic trajectory.

A third competing causal mechanism – when might autocratic intervention deter protest?

Finally, I present an alternative proposition regarding situations in which autocrats elsewhere step in to support a struggling dictator. While I have suggested in my discussion of the two preceding mechanisms that autocratic intervention would backfire and cause resentment by signaling the incumbent’s weakness and enflaming public anger through perceptions of unwanted intervention, I posit that this will occur only when the incumbent regime is weak and incapacitated due to the fact that victory becomes a more probable outcome to individuals. When the incumbent is strong and forcefully repressive, however, I hypothesize that the opposite scenario will occur instead – increasing security forces arriving from other countries (or, in cases of credible autocrats, even the threat of security forces) might deter citizens from protesting by intimidating them through repressive force and violence.

From this perspective, the incumbent’s allies’ support would achieve when the incumbent themselves could not – stopping protest through sheer numbers and force. Several scholarly articles provide evidence that expectations about autocratic intervention can effectively preempt challenges to a dictatorial leader. As an example, Crabtree et al (2016) suggest that oppositional leaders in Belarus strategically lessened the scope of their resistance to Lukashenko in advance of the country’s 2015 Presidential elections – the opposition had paid close attention to Russia’s occupation of Crimea and
the chaos brought about by Russian intervention in Ukraine after Euromaidan, and became fearful that protests in their own country could invite a similar reaction from Russia. Additionally, Shraibman (2018) argues that this fear of external autocratic intervention affected the calculations of the general Belarusian public as well – he finds that Belarusians’ expressed interest in protest dropped following the conflict in Ukraine, even as Belarus’s economic situation deteriorated, hypothetically making anti-governmental sentiment more salient and appealing.

As noted above, I suggest that the likelihood of any of these three mechanisms emerging depends fundamentally on the regime type of the incumbent autocrat – its repressive capacities and the extremity of its authoritarian nature. In regimes that are more semi-authoritarian and politically open, I expect that citizens will feel more comfortable taking to the streets in the first place, and that threats of intervention from autocrats elsewhere will have less of an effect on their calculations than in a state that is closer to the “totalitarian” end of the scale. In countries that are heavily authoritarian, the threat of severe violence or death is more valid, and intervention from leaders elsewhere will amplify a repressive domestic context that is already intimidating and threatening in nature. Additionally, media openness matters – in heavily autocratic states, the government is also more likely to quash the flow of images into and out of the country, reducing protesters’ ability to gain international attention or support.

Deterrence is also more likely when autocratic intervention is explicitly material rather than simply symbolic. For cases in which autocratic support for a leader is symbolic or “soft,” I would expect this intervention to spur protest participation. As an example of this, when autocrats elsewhere attempt to sow dissent within a state’s population by spreading disinformation or “smear” campaigns about a movement, this
would strengthen protesters’ resolve to continue their fight. If autocrats claim that the movement is being financed by the Central Intelligence Agency or promote conspiracy theories that protesters are violently attacking anyone who does not wholeheartedly support their views, for example, this should spur further protest behavior. When autocrats actually send in material troops or security forces to quell the anti-governmental campaign, in contrast, this indicates to protesters that the stakes have been dramatically raised; in these situations, outside intervention should suppress individuals’ willingness to join a protest movement.

While I therefore argue that both an unanticipated backlash and deterrence are possible reactions to outside intervention depending on the situation at hand, I posit that spurring an unwanted backlash will be more prevalent overall. I argue this to be the case because protest has become more and more common over the past several decades, and protesters know that increased international attention will reduce the chance that leaders will brutally crack down. Additionally, the number of regimes that are hybrid rather than fully authoritarian has risen, meaning that the space for these types of movements to occur has grown as well. Because of these reasons, I hypothesize that the first two authoritarian mechanisms above are more likely to occur.

**Presenting my theoretical framework visually**

I now present a simple summation and schematic description of my core theoretical components. My argument on these dimensions can be (roughly) mapped out as follows:

\[ A) \text{International liberal support} \rightarrow \text{increases protesters' perception that they are supported by the global community and that meaningful change is actually possible} \rightarrow \text{more citizens will join the movement} \]
B1) International autocratic intervention when domestic regime is weaker and less repressive -> causes backlash against unwanted intrusion in domestic affairs and makes leader appear weak and surmountable -> more citizens will join the movement

B2) International autocratic intervention when domestic regime is stronger and more repressive -> deters and intimidates protesters by raising threat level -> fewer citizens will join the movement

The preceding sections have shown that my theoretical framework is more nuanced than these simple statements, but these assertions are an effective way to present my ideas in a concise manner. The logic underlying both claims can be expressed visually in Figures 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 below:

![Figure 1.1](image1.png)

**Figure 1.1. Effects of external democratic support on protest participation**

![Figure 1.2](image2.png)

**Figure 1.2. Effects of autocratic intervention on protest participation when the domestic regime is weak**
Citizens begin to protest against the regime
External autocratic forces support the dictator, intimidating citizens and raising perceptions of threat and danger
Protests are unable to attract new participants and grow smaller

Figure 1.3. Effects of autocratic intervention on protest participation when the domestic regime is strong

Conclusion

The preceding components of this chapter have presented the main theoretical arguments and logic underpinning this dissertation’s propositions. Stated briefly, I argue that international factors can have a great effect on the calculation and decision-making strategies of political actors, both at the societal and at the governmental level. These international forces will not always trump (or even affect) domestic political dynamics, as conditions in one’s home country generally have the largest effects on how that person perceives their surroundings and then chooses how to act accordingly. However, I still posit that international forces matter to a much more significant degree now than they did half a century ago thanks to the global increases in technology and telecommunications, and that they must be included in any careful study of modern political protests. I turn now to my dissertation’s first empirical chapter, a detailed case study of Ukraine’s 2013-2014 Revolution of Dignity, to illustrate the specific causal mechanisms and broader theoretical framework that I have presented above.
CHAPTER 3: UKRAINE’S EUROMAIDAN PROTESTS: A CASE STUDY

On the evening of November 21, 2013, Mustafa Nayyem, an investigative journalist known for exposing fraud and corruption among officials in the Ukrainian government, posted a simple note on Facebook urging his friends and followers to join him at a gathering on Kyiv’s central Maidan square. The reason for gathering was disillusionment with President Viktor Yanukovych’s recent decision to abruptly abandon a planned Association Agreement with the European Union that would have deepened Ukraine’s European ties, integrating the country into the continent’s political and economic networks. Rather than charting a European path, however, Yanukovych focused on strengthening ties with the Russian government, sending a clear signal that the state was heading East rather than West. A group that initially began as a small congregation of journalists, students, and dissidents grew rapidly over the next three months into what became known as Euromaidan, or the Revolution of Dignity. By the time that the movement ended in February 2014, more than 100 protesters had been killed, hundreds more were wounded, and Yanukovych had fled the country to seek refuge in Russia.

The purpose of the following chapter is to present a detailed case study of the Euromaidan protests, utilizing the revolution as a framework for testing the theoretical mechanisms concerning protest behavior and international influences that I have outlined above. By presenting and analyzing the results of more than 120 detailed interviews and surveys that I gathered over six months of fieldwork, I illustrate the ways in which the Euromaidan movement provides strong evidence for my claims about the effects of democracy promotion and autocratic intervention on protesters’ beliefs and strategic calculations. This study will analyze the how and why of my theoretical
propositions, focusing on the specific dynamics of one particular movement in order to capture a great amount of detail regarding individuals’ perceptions, and decision-making strategies.

This chapter proceeds in the following manner. First, I begin by explaining the methodological approach that I adopt in this study. It is important to be transparent about how my interviews and surveys were conducted, and to discuss the types of individuals that I contacted and the methods through which I reached them. Following this, I present an overview of the Euromaidan movement’s fundamental goals in order to contextualize the revolution and to situate the basic motivations that initially drove people to the streets. I then turn to the core of this chapter – a detailed analysis of the ways in which different components of the Euromaidan movement illustrate each of my theoretical claims in action. Finally, I conclude by presenting a brief discussion concerning substantive changes that the movement produced and the likelihood that Ukrainian citizens will be motivated to initiate a similar protest campaign in the future.

**Methodological Overview – Utilizing Interviews and Surveys to Gather Data**

The majority of discussion presented here is based on in-person interviews and surveys that I conducted in Ukraine across two separate rounds of fieldwork – one lasting from March to May 2017, and another from October to December 2017. I begin my analysis by detailing the types of individuals whom I interviewed for this project.

**Interview subjects – whom did I reach?**

Thanks to individuals’ remarkable willingness to meet with me, I was able to speak with a wide variety of people – over the course of my research, I met with people
ranging from activists to parliamentarians to reporters\(^1\). This can therefore be described as an expert survey – the vast majority of my participants were either exceptionally knowledgeable about Ukrainian politics or were active participants in Euromaidan from its beginning to its end. Those in the first category are “elite” in the sense that their professions involved a high amount of political sophistication and specialization in Ukrainian affairs. Among these individuals were professors of political science at institutions including the National University of Kyiv – Mohyla Academy, Kiev Polytechnic Institute, and Ukrainian Catholic University; analysts at policy centers such as the Institute for World Politics, the International Renaissance Foundation, and the European Union Advisory Mission to Ukraine; reporters for *BBC Ukraine, Hromadske International*, and *Radio Free Europe – Radio Liberty*; and elected officials including four current and one former Members of the Verkhovna Rada. As is clear from the preceding list, these people are not representative of Ukrainian society in general. I am therefore not claiming to have spoken with a representative sample of ordinary people; instead, I posit that this is an “expert” survey due to the specific nature of my respondents’ backgrounds.

The second category of individuals whom I contacted were not as “elite” in the traditional sense as those in the first group, but their insights were still very valuable because many were dedicated participants in the Euromaidan movement. This includes individuals who were on the Maidan from the first day to the last, or people that regularly volunteered to help sustain the protests. These people can therefore provide first-hand accounts of what people at the time were thinking and feeling. Figure 3.1

\(^1\) As evidence of individuals’ willingness to speak with me, my solicitations for interviews were met with a roughly 65% response rate; this certainly exceeds the rate that I would expect to find in the United States.
below presents a simple descriptive overview of the professional occupations of my interviewees, in order to illustrate the types of people with whom I spoke².

![Pie chart showing occupations of interviewees]

**Figure 3.1. Occupation of interviewees – “Which of the following categories best describes your current occupational status?”**

One can see that these individuals were quite diverse in their professions. A plurality of respondents (20.14%) identified as academics or professors, while other significant groups included non-governmental organization employees (18.05%), policy analysts and think tank scholars (15.28%), and those who self-identified as “activists” (13.89%). Other groups that I interviewed included politicians and elected officials, consultants, students, and reporters, as well as those whose job did not fit into any of these categories.

² This descriptive information is based on subjective and self-reported closed-ended surveys that I asked each respondent to complete. These questions were among a battery of demographic queries that were included to illustrate the variety of individuals whom I contacted.
Similarly, one can easily see from Figure 3.2 below that my interviewees were more educated than the typical Ukrainian, further reinforcing the nature of my respondents as experts on political affairs. When asked to self-report the highest level of education that they had completed, 44.07% indicated that they had earned a Master’s degree, while another 31.58% reported earning a doctoral degree. In addition to this, 7.89% of respondents mentioned that they had earned a Bachelor’s degree, meaning that 83.54% of interviewees in total earned either a university or post-graduate degree.

![Pie chart showing educational attainment of interviewees](image)

**Figure 3.2. Educational attainment of interviewees – “What is the highest level of education you have completed?”**

Finally, it can be helpful to discuss my interviewees’ involvement in Euromaidan. As is clear from Figure 3.3 below, a majority of respondents (68.64%) indicated that they joined the protests near the beginning of the movement, while another 11.02% reported joining near the middle. These individuals were therefore highly relevant for me to interview, as I am chiefly interested in determining what protesters themselves
thought at the time. By interviewing people who were physically on the ground as the revolution was taking place, I can gain a better sense of what protesters perceived and believed as they took to the streets.

Figure 3.3. “Were you personally involved in the Euromaidan protest movement?”

It is important to note that the majority of my interviewees resided in either Kyiv or the Western city of Lviv. This is partially due to the fact that these were the two places where I spent most of my time while in Ukraine. However, this was also driven by more than convenience – because Kyiv is the capital and the political center of Ukraine, this is where much of the country’s “political class” resides and where the central Euromaidan protests occurred. Similarly, Lviv is the one of the largest and most politically active cities in Ukraine’s Western region, a part of the country from which many Euromaidan
participants came. As a result, many of the protests’ most passionate leaders resided in Lviv and its surrounding villages.

I was also able to interview individuals from other parts of the country as well. I had the opportunity to speak with several individuals from Donetsk and Luhansk who became Internally Displaced Persons following the Russian invasion of Ukraine’s Donbas region, as well as several Crimean Tatars who had been forced to move to Kyiv after Russian forces and separatists incorporated Simferopol and other Crimean cities into the Russian Federation. While these people comprised a minority of my overall sample, their perspectives were still extremely valuable and add a great deal of detail and insight to my broader analysis.

Snowballing – how did I recruit my interview subjects?

In general, I relied upon two strategies to contact interviewees – utilizing the “snowballing” approach to finding interview subjects and relying upon a simple “cold call” strategy in which I contacted individuals directly without any previous connection.

As noted by Fujii (2017), the process of snowballing typically involves the task of utilizing one’s existing contacts to reach other people who might be important or

---

3 Recent research indicates that this variation in regional behavior persists to the present day. A 2018 International Republican Institute survey of all regions of Ukraine (excluding Crimea and the Donbas) asked respondents, “How likely would you be these days to attend a demonstration or related event if you sympathized with the cause?” Among respondents residing in oblasts that were deemed the “West” of Ukraine, 42% replied either “Definitely yes or somewhat yes.” In contrast, respondents in the “Center” expressed a combined rate of 25% for these two questions; respondents in the “South” expressed a combined rate of 13%; and respondents in the “East” expressed a combined rate of 12%. This report is available online at https://www.iri.org/sites/default/files/june_2018_national_survey.pdf.

4 Numerous surveys have also presented compelling empirical evidence that Western Ukrainians are more favorably oriented towards the West than people in other parts of the country. A different 2018 International Republican Institute survey asked respondents, “How do you evaluate your attitude toward each of the following countries?” For the European Union, 60% of respondents in the “West” expressed a warm opinion, while only 40% of respondents in the “East” had a similar stance. Feelings towards the West were also more positive among younger Ukrainians in the aggregate. Across all regions of Ukraine, 59% of those who were between 18 and 35 expressed a warm feeling towards the European Union, while only 43% of those who were over 51 years old felt the same way. This report is available online at https://www.iri.org/sites/default/files/2018.12.4_ukraine_poll.pdf.
relevant to one’s research project. This was particularly helpful in demonstrating to new contacts that I had already been in touch with their acquaintance (and often cross-copying those people in the e-mail message itself), allowing me to provide deeper credentials than would otherwise have been possible – this gave me legitimacy and showed that though I was not Ukrainian, I could still be trusted to implement a secure and confidential conversation.

Taking this into consideration, I relied on snowballing in two phases. The first took place in July 2016, when I visited Washington, D.C. to do preliminary research for this project. Before beginning graduate school at the University of Illinois, I worked for several years as Program Manager for the Joint Baltic American National Committee, a non-governmental organization that advocates for increased support towards democracy and human rights in Central and Eastern Europe. Because much of my work at that time involved speaking with Congressional staffers and think tank experts on Russia and Ukraine, I was able to contact people at several leading foreign policy institutions including as the Atlantic Council, the United States Institute for Peace, the Congressional Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and the Brookings Institution during this first wave of snowballing.

Additionally, I relied upon a cold call strategy in which I directly e-mailed people asking to meet; this allowed me to speak with individuals from Freedom House, the National Endowment for Democracy, and the McCain Institute. I was also fortunate to speak with three former Ambassadors of the United States to Ukraine whose insight into the country’s affairs was particularly helpful. Though this was done entirely in the United States, this stage of my project was enormously beneficial because it provided me
with names and contact information for several influential activists in Ukraine whom I then pursued once abroad.

The second phase during which I utilized the snowball method was actually in the field. I was sure to conclude each interview by asking participants for recommendations about others in the country who might be interested in speaking with me; this yielded many fruitful connections, and provided me with a larger number of other contacts. Finally, I relied upon the “cold call” method in Ukraine as well. After identifying relevant individuals through Internet searches, I contacted people via e-mail when an address was available. In situations with no e-mail information, I reached out to people through Facebook. While this might seem odd to Americans who primarily use Facebook to communicate with friends and family, many Ukrainians utilize the site in a more professional manner. Interestingly, this method was as successful as e-mail solicitations in terms of response rates – I was even able to secure three of my five interviews with Members of the Verkhovna Rada by contacting them through Facebook, pointing to the site as a potentially underutilized source for finding interview subjects.

How were the interview conducted?

In the following section, I briefly discuss the language in which the interviews were held, the formatting of the questions and surveys that I asked of respondents, and the mechanisms of how the surveys took place.

Because the majority of people whom I interviewed were highly educated, many were fluent (or at least proficient) in English. As a result, more than ninety percent of my conversations took place in English. For a small number of cases, the person whom I was interviewing did not feel that their English-speaking ability was sufficient for discussing complex political concepts. In those situations, I relied upon assistance from
other Ukrainians, who served as interpreters. In only one of these cases, I provided financial compensation to a translator; in all other situations, the individual who was translating did so entirely voluntarily and refused any type of payment.

The interview format that I chose to adopt was semi-structured and flexible. Within each conversation, I was sure to at least touch upon the same set of topics – very rarely did I omit any question entirely from a given interview⁵. However, I also recognized that each respondent brought their own particular expertise to the conversation. Because of this, I was flexible in terms of the order of the questions that I posed, emphasizing some more than others when appropriate. In this way, I was able to bring each of my theoretical concepts into every conversation while also adjusting the parameters of my questions to meet the individual respondent at hand.

Each conversation lasted approximately thirty to ninety minutes, dependent upon the interviewees’ availability. After each interview concluded, I asked respondents to complete an anonymous, closed-ended twenty-question survey⁶. I had all questions translated into Ukrainian by a Ukrainian law student and provided a certified copy of the translations to the University of Illinois Institutional Review Board. Some questions were demographic in nature, in order to provide me with comprehensive evidence about the types of people I interviewed, while others asked participants to express their opinions on questions that echoed the themes I raised in my conversation. By mixing surveys and open-ended interviews, I was able to procure simple quantitative data that illustrates trends across my entire pool of participants while also generating qualitative

⁵ The questions and concepts that I included in my interviews were thoroughly evaluated and approved by the University of Illinois Institutional Review Board prior to the beginning of my fieldwork. It was important to guarantee that the questions were appropriate, as many of the conversations asked participants to recall a particularly dangerous or emotionally challenging time in their lives.

⁶ These questions were also approved by the Institutional Review Board prior to their implementation in Ukraine.
findings that provide nuance and specificities. I have included a list of these questions in Appendices A and B at the end of this dissertation.

In order to follow Institutional Review Board guidelines carefully, I was sure to ask all participants to sign a detailed consent form before the conversation began so that they could understand the nature of my project. I have included a copy of this form in Appendix D. The vast majority of interviews were recorded, as most participants expressed no worries about my retaining the conversation for later transcription. For situations in which participants preferred to merely speak with no recorder, I wrote down notes on the topics that were raised instead.

One final topic that must be mentioned here concerns the physical spaces where the interviews occurred. The majority of my conversations were fairly casual, and took place in cafes, coffee shops, or restaurants. All participation was voluntary, and no one was compensated financially for their time. A smaller number of interviews took place in individuals’ offices – this was true for professors at different universities and a few analysts at think tanks. Finally, a small subset of interviews took place in more formal settings that actually required me to obtain clearance before I could proceed to the meeting. This was the case for several Members of the Verkhovna Rada with whom I spoke (as several of those interviews were conducted in their parliamentary offices) and also with a representative of the European Union delegation to Ukraine.

**Setting the Stage: What was the Euromaidan movement about?**

The majority of this chapter will be devoted to tracing the effects of international factors including external democratic support and autocratic intervention on the Euromaidan movement. Before I turn to this analysis, however, it is important to first
introduce the fundamental causes of Euromaidan to understand why people took to the streets in the first place.

I begin by presenting a short and simplified summary of the event’s primary causes and turning points, before going into more detail regarding each significant development in subsequent sections. The following text therefore highlights the most important days of the protests.

**Key Moments in the Euromaidan Protests – A Summary**

**November 21, 2013**
President Viktor Yanukovych announces plans to withdraw from an announced Association Agreement between Ukraine and the European Union, changing course from his administration’s earlier pronouncements.

Journalist Mustafa Nayyem creates a post on his Facebook page urging concerned citizens to come together in a peaceful protest based in Kyiv’s central Maidan square. Over the next week, crowds of students and activists participate in calm and orderly rallies largely aimed at promoting Ukraine’s European integration and support for the Association Agreement.

**November 30, 2013**
Members of the Berkut, a special forces unit, move onto the Maidan at approximately 4:30 AM and violently attack students and other protest participants with batons, tear gas, and stun grenades. As protesters were unarmed, they were unable to defend themselves and 35 individuals were wounded in the clashes.

**December 1, 2013**
Angered by the level of Berkut brutality aimed at protesters the morning before, hundreds of thousands of citizens rally in central Kyiv to stand against repression and the regime’s lack of respect for human rights. This stage of the movement therefore drew large numbers of people who were no longer concerned with the Association Agreement, but were instead worried about the quality of life in their country. These rallies would continue regularly over the next month, as protesters continued to put pressure on the regime and called for international sanctions against leaders.

**January 16, 2014**
The Verkhovna Rada, Ukraine’s parliament, passes a series of so-called “dictatorship laws” that aim to severely restrict the rights of assembly in an effort to suppress the ongoing protests. Clashes intensify between activists and security forces, raising the level and depth of conflict between the two sides.
**February 20, 2014**

Snipers – the precise identity of whom still remains unknown in 2019 – begin to fire upon the protesters from a variety of locations. At least 21 activists are killed on this day alone, out of a total of nearly 130 killed throughout the protests’ overall duration.

**February 22, 2014**

Viktor Yanukovych secretly leaves Kyiv during the middle of the night; later reports indicate that he then travels first to Eastern Ukraine before finally entering Russia. Later that day, the Verkhovna Rada formally calls for a new Presidential election to be held on May 25, 2014.

**Phase 1: Euromaidan and participants’ orientation towards the West**

As I interviewed more and more respondents about the protests, two themes repeatedly emerged that I must emphasize. The first was that protesters at any stage of the movement were not monolithic. Indeed, the protests at various times saw the presence and participation of socially liberal activists who wanted to move their country in a European direction⁷; far-right nationalist groups⁸; pensioners and grandparents⁹; middle-class business owners¹⁰; ethnic Ukrainians, ethnic Russians, and members of American and European diaspora groups¹¹; Orthodox priests¹²; and scientists and health care professionals¹³. Indeed, many interviewees marveled at the fact that so many disparate groups were able to unify for the duration of the movement¹⁴, while others

---

⁷ Interview with Ukrainian philosopher and theorist, conducted in Kyiv, April 25, 2017.
⁹ Interview with Irish business owner, conducted in Kyiv, December 6, 2017.
¹⁰ Interview with civil society activist at Chesno organization, conducted in Kyiv, March 22, 2017.
¹¹ Interview with Professor of History at Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, conducted in Lviv, December 1, 2017.
¹² Interview with Vice Rector of Ukrainian Catholic University, conducted in Lviv, May 4, 2017.
¹³ Interview with Professor of the Applied Physics Department of Physicotechnical Institute, National Technical University of Ukraine “Kyiv Polytechnical Institute,” conducted in Kyiv, May 24, 2017.
¹⁴ Interview with official at the International Renaissance Foundation, conducted in Kyiv, December 6, 2017.
pointed to the fact that this exemplified the movement’s organic, fundamentally bottom-up nature.\footnote{As one lawyer and former fellow at the Woodrow Wilson Center put it, “It shows that the movement was genuine, because everybody could participate in the way that he or she could contribute. And just another distinctive feature when I discuss the genuine nature of the protest movement, especially with the Russians, is the outlook of the movement, say the posters, the way people were dressed, the way they built the tents. If it’s genuine, it’s always very diverse. Because you’ve got very different people with very different social and educational backgrounds. And you see the creativeness, you see many different inputs. But when you see some Russian protests, like pro-Putin or in Crimea, you see the posters which have actually been printed in a very industrial way. There’s no creativity about them. So I think these small features also distinguish the genuine nature of the movement” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, May 19, 2017).}

Also pressing is the fact that any study of the movement must carefully delineate it into two distinct phases, as each had different goals and triggers. Reid (2015) and Plokhy (2015) both discuss how the first phase, known by most Ukrainians as “Euromaidan,” was spurred by President Viktor Yanukovych’s decision to abandon a proposed Association Agreement with the European Union in favor of increased ties with the Russia-led Customs Union.\footnote{Interview with current Member of the Verkhovna Rada and former civil society activist, conducted in Kyiv, May 22, 2017; interview with civil society activist and prominent Twitter user, conducted in Kyiv, April 19, 2017; interview with analyst at Transparency International Ukraine, conducted in Kyiv, December 5, 2017; interview with historian, conducted in Kyiv, December 8, 2017; interview with analyst at the Institute for Economic Research and Policy Counseling, conducted in Kyiv, November 15, 2017.}

According to these authors and the people that I interviewed, citizens had been gathering in Kyiv’s Maidan square while Yanukovych traveled to Lithuania to meet with European Union officials, congregating to watch the proceedings live on television. Several interviewees stated that while they were determined to express their support for Ukraine’s European identity at that time, many people initially had no sense that the movement would grow to become as large as it eventually did.\footnote{Interview with analyst from Aktis Strategy, conducted in Kyiv, March 31, 2017.}

As noted above, Yanukovych’s decision was the early spark for this part of the protest, and was compounded by Mustafa Nayyem’s Facebook post calling for activists...
and students to gather peacefully on the Maidan. As Nayyem himself informed me, the majority of participants at this stage were “experts, journalists, media, the so-called creative class. Young people” (interview with Mustafa Nayyem, conducted in Kyiv, May 26, 2017). For them, the main reason for standing on the Maidan at that time was to express support for Ukraine’s Western integration. Videos and photos make this clear, as several participants brandished European Union flags and chanted slogans about Ukraine’s European identity. Indeed, Yekelchyk (2015) notes that the Association Agreement itself was actually quite technical, dense, and difficult to understand; as a result, rather than protesting against this specific piece of legislation not being adopted, Ukrainians were frustrated with the broader cultural and political implications of what this perceived turn away from Europe would mean.

These protests were wholly peaceful in nature, which made the events that took place on the night of November 30 all the more shocking for participants and Ukrainians at large – those who were assembled on the Maidan were brutally dispersed at approximately 4:30 AM, with riot police and forces known as the Berkut using batons, clubs, and other weapons to violently attack protesters. Images spread through social media and television stations the following morning, incensing average Ukrainians and spurring the second phase of the movement – the so-called “Revolution of Dignity.”

---

19 Interview with reporter from the Ukrainian Crisis Media Centre, conducted in Kyiv, March 29, 2017.
20 Jacobs, Harrison. “Why Ukraine’s Berkut Special Police Force Is So Scary.” Business Insider. Published January 27, 2014. Available online at https://www.businessinsider.com/meet-the-ukraines-brutal-berkut-police-force-2014-1. Written during the middle of the Euromaidan protests, this article details how the Berkut have traditionally been associated with violence, brutality, and torture since being formed in Soviet Ukraine in 1988. Prior to their disbanding following Euromaidan’s conclusion, Berkut consisted of men with either army or police training, guaranteeing that they would be able to use force violently and effectively.
21 Interview with think tank analyst at East Europe Foundation, conducted in Kyiv, March 29, 2017; interview with Director of European Projects at Internews Ukraine and reporter at Hromadske International, conducted in Kyiv, May 16, 2017; interview with medical student and Euromaidan activist,
this sense, the police beatings perfectly exemplify Schelling’s (1960) idea of a focal point, or a solution to a problem that can bring disconnected actors together in the absence of any strategic communication or interaction. Latent anger and discontent had been brewing in Ukraine for years, and the regime’s response to the Euromaidan protests was the spark that lit the fire of revolution. As a singer and activist who was instrumental in organizing a parallel Euromaidan movement in Lviv at the time succinctly put it, “Euromaidan was like the last drop in a full cup of hatred towards what was going on here in Ukraine” (Interview with singer and activist, conducted in Lviv, May 2, 2017).

Phase 2: The Revolution of Dignity

According to scholarly authors and many of my respondents, the second phase can be conceptualized as a distinct era that lasted from December 1 until the revolution’s conclusion in February 2014. Appalled by the regime’s violence towards protesters, millions of Ukrainians took to the streets to challenge what they saw as an encroaching slant towards authoritarian rule22. According to Wilson (2014), there is empirical evidence of this – surveys conducted among protesters at different points in time found that while initial activists were angry about Ukraine’s pivot towards Russia, more people after the beatings were upset about the regime’s use of violence (70 percent) as compared with those who were protesting the regime’s policy decisions (54 percent). It was at this point that the movement began to capture the attention of the international media and news community as well, with telecommunications corporations eventually sending reporters including Anderson Cooper to cover the events on-the-ground in Kyiv.

---

22 Interview with historian at “Historical Truth” organization, conducted in Kyiv, December 8, 2017.
Many interviewees specifically pointed to the fact that so many of those who were beaten were students and young people as driving them to participate – older Ukrainians who saw echoes of their own children in the protesters felt that this was simply going too far. Indeed, as a former activist detailed to me in an interview: “Very emotional, very specific is that young students were beaten up by the riot police, which also was a demonstration of everything that was happening throughout [Yanukovych’s] presidency...People’s rights are not being respected. The government is kind of a regime that established totalitarian rule, and nobody has right to protest for their lives. So at that point, people understood that students are being beaten now, that tomorrow pensioners will be beaten up, and the next day the veterans will be beaten up, and that’s when the people from different environments, different communities, they stood up and said no, if today the students are beaten up, we have to protect them” (Interview with former Euromaidan activist and current project manager for the Lviv Education Foundation, conducted in Lviv, December 5, 2017).

Sakwa (2015) finds that many participants during this second stage of Euromaidan were quite a bit older than the students who dominated the first phase – he notes reports that the median protester after the beatings was aged between 34 and 45 with a full-time job. Onuch (2014) presents an illustrative study with similar conclusions, drawn from original surveys that she and her team conducted as the protests were taking place. She finds that respondents under 30 indicated that they were protesting for democracy, human rights, and closer ties to Europe; respondents between 30 and 55 stressed the need to live in a “European” democracy with economic

---

23 Interview with television reporter at Hromadske TV, conducted in Kyiv, April 27, 2017.
opportunity and opposing the regime’s use of violence; and those over 55 were there to safeguard the country’s tenuous hold on democracy for future generations.

Numerous interviewees pointed to the notion of a Revolution of Dignity as emblematic of the reasons why people took to the streets between December and January – the sense that because of Yanukovych’s lack of respect for democratic norms and procedure\textsuperscript{24}, his corruption\textsuperscript{25}, and the notion that he and his family were benefitting themselves financially while the country suffered\textsuperscript{26,27}, the fundamental “dignity” of Ukrainians was at stake\textsuperscript{28}. Average citizens aspired to implement a culture that, if not distinctly “European” in the sense of social liberalism, was still “European” in the sense that rule of law should apply equally to everyone regardless of social standing and personal wealth\textsuperscript{29}. Beyond this, respondents indicated that people wished for their voices to be heard\textsuperscript{30}, to strengthen their children’s futures\textsuperscript{31}, to remove Yanukovych from power before he could further consolidate his rule\textsuperscript{32}, to reduce the centralized power of oligarchs in Ukraine\textsuperscript{33}, and to eradicate the bribery and corruption that pervades all sectors of Ukrainian life\textsuperscript{34}.

A sociologist spoke to me about interviews that she conducted with protesters at the time, and she supported the common view of Euromaidan as having two distinct

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{24} Interview with doctoral student and former protester, conducted in Lviv, December 4, 2017.
\item \textsuperscript{25} Interview with former television reporter, conducted in Kyiv, March 17, 2017.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Interview with Professor of Political Science at the National University of Kyiv – Mohyla Academy, conducted in Kyiv, April 5, 2017.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Interview with sociologist, conducted in Kyiv, May 19, 2017.
\item \textsuperscript{28} Interview with reporter and activist from Euromaidan Press, conducted in Kyiv, April 26, 2017.
\item \textsuperscript{29} Interview with activist at the Reanimation Package for Reforms, a transparency-minded non-governmental organization, conducted in Kyiv, March 23, 2017.
\item \textsuperscript{30} Interview with two undergraduate student activists, conducted in Kyiv, April 14, 2017.
\item \textsuperscript{31} Interview with medical student and former protester, conducted in Kyiv, May 23, 2017.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Interview with Project Director at American Councils for International Education, conducted in Kyiv, May 15, 2017.
\item \textsuperscript{33} Interview with German political analyst, conducted in Kyiv, May 23, 2017.
\item \textsuperscript{34} Interview with think tank analyst at East Europe Foundation, conducted in Kyiv, March 29, 2017.
\end{itemize}
stages. As she recalled, “After the students were beaten, it was a certain turn of expectations. And mainly when we were interviewing people, it was something that they were talking about. First we were for Europe, and later it was not so much about Europe, but more about us and our own state, about the political situation within it. The government cannot beat its own people. So it was a very general right...It was like, we are a citizen of this country, and our government cannot hurt us. We are humans and we have certain rights, so government has to protect people...At that point in time it was more about being against using force and violence” (Interview with sociologist at the Center for Urban History of East Central Europe, conducted in Lviv, December 3, 2017).

Similarly, an activist at the non-governmental organization Reanimation Package for Reforms recalled interviews that she herself conducted at the time, and expressed similar findings: “I spoke to one hundred people and interviewed them about their concerns, why they are there, what they are doing, and all of them noticed that shift which occurred after the night of 30th of November, when students were beaten...And obviously, people started with the unjust character of Ukrainian political establishment. In particular, the Yanukovych regime. That was first. Then it was corruption – we would like to live with dignity, not in a country that absolutely doesn’t take into account the voices of its citizens. And then it radicalized to the point where they wanted not just improvement of some institutions, but a total removal of the Yanukovych regime” (Interview with activist, conducted in Kyiv, March 23, 2017).

While much of this second phase of the protest was characterized by a series of clashes between protesters and the regime, many interviewees pointed to January 16, 2014 as a fundamental turning point. On that day, according to a 2014 article in the Washington Post, the Verkhovna Rada passed laws that severely restricted freedom of
assembly and freedom of speech\textsuperscript{35}. Popularly referred to as the “dictatorship laws,” the new provisions criminalized several activities, including the creation of a motorcade consisting of more than five cars designed to block traffic; gathering and disseminating any information about the Berkut, judges, or security forces; blocking or obstructing entrance into any governmental building; implementing and constructing tents, stages, or sound equipment; and an “anti-mask law” that restricted protesters from participating in peaceful gatherings while wearing any type of mask or scarf that would partially obstruct one’s face\textsuperscript{36,37}.

According to Menon and Rumer (2015), echoing similar laws that had been passed in Russia and other autocratic states, non-governmental organizations receiving funding from external actors would be now also forced to register as “foreign agents,” a designation that would bring increased taxes and oversight by the government. These laws were particularly galling to activists who had been on the streets for more than a month, as their implementation would have curtailed some of the more effective and non-violent strategies that protesters had been employing\textsuperscript{38,39}.


\textsuperscript{36} An activist and current analyst at the National Democratic Institute Ukraine recounted to me how many protesters refused to take these types of laws seriously; instead many began to work pots and other utensils on their heads as a way of circumventing the laws’ ban on head coverings or other types of facial protection (Interview conducted in Kyiv, March 24, 2017).

\textsuperscript{37} A report issued by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe in 2014 issued a similar assessment of the laws, noting that “a large number of the amendments did not meet key international human rights standards, in particular those concerning the freedom of peaceful assembly, the freedom of expression, the freedom of association, and the right to a fair trial.” For reference, see: OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights. “OPINION ON AMENDMENTS TO CERTAIN LAWS OF UKRAINE PASSED ON 16 JANUARY 2014.” Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. Published February 10, 2014. Available online at www.legislationline.org/documents/id/18720.

\textsuperscript{38} Interview with analyst at Transparency International Ukraine, conducted in Kyiv, December 5, 2017.

\textsuperscript{39} A comprehensive overview of the laws’ scope, as well as the ways in which they violated democratic norms and standards on human rights and civil liberties, is available on the website of the Kharkiv
Many protesters during this last month viewed Ukraine as being at a tipping point, with the country’s future hanging in the balance\textsuperscript{40,41}. One activist clearly agrees with the demarcation of the protest movement in this way, noting, “For me, Maidan is divided into three stages. And the first stage is about signing the agreement with European Union. And then after students were beaten, people said, oh hell, what happened just now. It’s not Moscow, it’s not Belarus for sure, and you can’t have the same actions that those countries have...But after 16th of January, when they had these ridiculous laws, it became like, we had to get rid of these authorities” (Interview with activist, conducted in Kyiv, December 9, 2017). Another former activist described the entire Euromaidan movement as being a decision between the future and the past, indicating the weight that participants ascribed to the event\textsuperscript{42}. As the preceding quote indicates, several interviewees indicated that based on their perceptions at the time, Ukraine was on the verge of becoming another Russia – a state where political competition was non-existent and dissent was swiftly repressed. This was key to bring many people to the streets, and sustained the movement in a way that otherwise would not have been possible\textsuperscript{43}.

The preceding section has contextualized Euromaidan, introducing the primary factors that drove Ukrainians to the streets. Considering these circumstances, this section will now justify Ukraine as an appropriate case for testing my mechanisms of

\begin{footnotesize}
40 Interview with Professor of Political Science at the Ukrainian Catholic University, conducted in Lviv, May 5, 2017.
41 Interview with Crimean Tatar lawyer and human rights advocate, conducted in Kyiv, April 27, 2017.
42 Interview with former activist and current analyst at the National Democratic Institute Ukraine, conducted in Kyiv, March 24, 2017.
43 One Greek Catholic priest and Professor at the Ukrainian Catholic University in Lviv whom I interviewed noted the spiritual nature of the movement for himself personally, stating that many Ukrainians underwent a type of spiritual transformation and sense of self by standing up for their rights and basic human values (Interview conducted in Lviv, May 4, 2017).
\end{footnotesize}
interest. Following this, I turn to the core empirical evidence of the chapter to show how my theory’s claims apply to Ukraine’s Revolution of Dignity.

**Justifying Ukraine as a relevant context for testing my theoretical claims**

**Ukraine’s status as a hybrid regime**

Ukraine is an appropriate case for testing my theoretical framework for several reasons. First, while Ukraine today is certainly more democratic than many of its neighbors, including Russia and Belarus, the country still lacks the rigorous institutions and the firm commitment to rule of law that are necessary for genuine and long-lasting democratic consolidation. Ukraine therefore falls into the category of a “hybrid,” or semi-autocratic, regime between the poles of full democracy and full autocracy.

According to Freedom House, Ukraine’s rating in 2019 was classified as 3.5 out of 7, or “Partly Free.” The institution assigned Ukraine a score of 3 out of 7 on Political Rights and a score of 4 out of 7 on Civil Liberties, noting specifically that “corruption remains endemic, and initiatives to combat it are only partially implemented. Attacks against journalists, civil society activists, and members of minority groups are frequent and often go unpunished.”

Ukraine has certainly made several important and significant strides towards liberalization and democratic government, but the country still has many significant

---


45 This characterization also applies to Ukraine in 2013, when the Euromaidan protests initially began. According to the 2013 Freedom House report on Ukraine, “Ukraine received a downward trend arrow due to a decline in the quality of its legislative elections, greater government pressure on the opposition, and a new language law that favored Russian speakers while neglecting smaller minorities... Over the course of the year, the administration continued to exert pressure on the judiciary, media freedom declined, and corruption opportunities increased with the elimination of tendering requirements for state companies.” That year, Ukraine also received an aggregate score of 3.5 out of 7, with a 3 for Civil Liberties and a 4 for Political Rights. This report is available online at [https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2013/ukraine](https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2013/ukraine).
political obstacles that must be overcome. Figure 3.4 below provides some empirical evidence of this – during the entire period between 2001 and 2019, Ukraine has only achieved scores of 2.5 and below (indicating a largely “free” society) five times, in the five years immediately following the country’s 2004 Orange Revolution. Interestingly, one can clearly see apparent signs of the Yanukovych regime’s creeping autocracy and deteriorating effects on Ukrainian politics, as the country’s scores markedly began to decline following his election to the Presidency in 2010 before then rebounding slightly in 2013 and 2014.

![Freedom House scores for Ukraine, 2001 to 2019](image)

**Figure 3.4. Freedom House scores for Ukraine, 2001 to 2019**

This was therefore particularly true of Ukraine under Yanukovych; people indicated that protesters were highly discontented with the autocratic bent that Ukraine had taken, with several referring to the regime as either “unconsolidated authoritarian” or heading down the path towards full autocracy with meaningless elections and a severely constrained civil society46. A significant number of interviewees recounted ways in which corruption and governmental repression inundated their daily lives in nearly

---

46 Interview with civil society activist and prominent Twitter user, conducted in Kyiv, April 19, 2017; interview with Ukrainian philosopher and theorist, conducted in Kyiv, April 25, 2017.
every aspect imaginable. As an example, one former reporter for the Ukrainian television station 1+1 recalled how station managers directed her and her colleagues away from reporting critically on Yanukovych, noting, “We had a big pressure from the administration of President Yanukovych. There even was a moment when one of our reporters came to us and he told, he knows each of you personally. And you are telling what he doesn’t want to be told” (Interview with former television reporter, conducted in Kyiv, March 17, 2017).

Still others noted the corruption that permeated Ukrainian society, with interviewees specifically pointing to paying bribes for everything from basic medical treatment47 to the ability to begin a small business48 to the ability to secure a degree from their university49. Yekelchyk (2015) also places special emphasis on the influence of corruption, pointing to beliefs that Yanukovych and his allies (dismissively nicknamed “the Family”) were profiting at citizens’ expense as instrumental in mobilizing people against the regime. These examples are not purely political; however, as the preceding discussion about the initial causes of Euromaidan makes clear, all of these problems contributed to a general dissatisfaction with life in the country that made protest increasingly likely over time.

Within the context of Euromaidan specifically, interviewees recounted episodes of severe intimidation and repression by security forces and riot police, who often beat and brutally dispersed groups of activists. These recollections point to the very real dangers that many activists faced, further justifying Ukraine’s status as a semi-

47 Interview with reporter, conducted in Kyiv, November 15, 2017.
48 Interview with former Euromaidan activist and current project manager for the Lviv Education Foundation, conducted in Lviv, December 5, 2017.
49 Interview with former activist and current staffer for the Ministry of Health, conducted via Skype, December 21, 2017.
authoritarian regime at the time. As an example, one respondent recounted her time as a university student who joined the movement in its first week to challenge Yanukovych’s decision to abandon the European Union’s Association Agreement. As she recounted to me:

“We knew that it was dangerous. We know that we were being followed. We knew the people that followed us. They changed the jackets, but it’s so stupid, you know, if someone has been following you...because it was so common, people were just arrested on the street and then took to some police office and beaten up. It kept increasing. And I just got back home and I entered the building, and I saw that in the part of the building where is my apartment, I saw this big guy standing near my door. And I just, I understood that he is probably waiting for me, and I just passed it and went upstairs, and I called my neighbors, and I asked them to go out and ask what he is doing there. And they asked him, and he said, oh, you know, I got cold and I went inside to warm up. (laughs) Near my apartment. And that’s when I started living not in my apartment, but in this apartment that was here at the Maidan. And my parents got calls. My mom knew someone in the security services, and he called her and was like, do you know where [your daughter] is right now? And she said, why are you asking? And he said, because I’m looking right at her and she’s OK right now. But if she continues what she’s doing, she won’t be OK” (Interview with former student activist, conducted in Kyiv, November 15, 2017).

Another interviewee described the physical violence to which he was subjected by riot police, noting that though he was unarmed and did not initiate any violence, he was still captured and physically assaulted for his participation. As he recalled, “We came to the street, Institutska, and I was harmed. They take me to the prison, how to say, occupied...they imprisoned me, and then beat me. So that’s why I lose a few of my teeth, and broken leg, and so I was harmed. And then I stayed imprisoned for six hours there. It was cold...it was not really a tradition that was common with the dignity of the person” (Interview with activist, conducted in Lviv, December 5, 2017).

Still another participant told me about an assault in the Western Ukrainian city of Ivano-Frankivsk. Because he was a prominent leader among university students at that time, he believes that he was targeted by police for his activism, noting, “The night
before the morning when I planned to leave to Kyiv, I was beaten by three unknown guys, which still [haven't been] found by police. And they beat me very strong, especially beat my legs, and I have no possibility to walk at all. And I moved to the hospital for a month and a half lying in the hospital...Because at the same time, young people were beaten in Kyiv, and in several smaller towns throughout Ukraine. They were beaten too, in the same night. So seems to me to understand that it is the work of security services to block the protests and to beat the most active persons” (Interview with former student activist and civil society organizer, conducted in Kyiv, December 8, 2017).

Another striking example concerns the memories of a Crimean Tatar who participated in a Euromaidan movement in Simferopol – his situation was particularly fraught, as the majority of ethnic Russians residing on the Crimean peninsula were hostile to the movement’s success. He recalled the ways in which he was publicly identified and branded a fascist for his participation, noting, “It was pictures with our faces everywhere. With labels. City transport, and the trolley was all over the city. And they have TV in trolleybus, and on these TVs, they show little videos how we were bad and how we were paid by America...If you see it is every day, one day you wake up, and it is normal, where you see a picture with your face and it is written something bad. It is normal...I can show you my picture, which was attached to my door [in the public space of my apartment building]. And they write I am Nazi. I do not understand. I am Muslim. I am a Tatar. How can I be a Nazi? It is ridiculous” (Interview with Crimean Tatar activist, conducted in Kyiv, November 20, 2017).

Three final examples illustrate just how dangerous participating in the protests became near the end of the movement, when riot police acted in an increasingly
authoritarian way, beating people to death and utilizing snipers to fire on the crowd. A professor of journalism at the National University of Kyiv – Mohyla Academy recalled the danger of merely being in proximity to the protests, recounting hearing signs of the regime's aggression during his class, as the university is located fairly close to the Maidan: “It was quite a terrifying experience, when we’ve all been sitting in the class and hearing the shooting. Actually, because it was happening on European Square, but actually you can hear it very well here. So it was like it was really happening just next door” (Interview with Professor of Journalism, conducted in Kyiv, December 6, 2017).

Other interviewees were even closer to the violence, recalling experiences in which their lives were literally at stake. One activist who was monitoring the protests and translating reports to share through Twitter stated, “On that particular day, the day of shootings...we were expecting tanks, and we were expecting soldiers. But the fact that we had snipers shooting from unknown location? I remember that I was just standing and I didn’t know what to do. Should I run, should I lie down, should I hide? Because you don’t know where the danger is coming from. And this is a horrible feeling” (Interview with civil society activist and prominent Twitter user, conducted in Kyiv, April 19, 2017). Finally, another activist recounted the sense of violence and gore that pervaded the movement’s last days, stating, “Exactly in that time, riot police start to charge into the square. And some people were killed. And when we went back to Institutska Street, we saw many wounded people who came back to Maidan. Men, women, with wounded heads, arms, legs. Very horrifying scene. Some people were with broken faces. In my life I haven’t watched more blood than in that time...Near us was a

50 Standard intelligence frames the snipers as being part of the Ukrainian security services. However, much uncertainty remains as to the snipers' true identities. Some people claimed that the snipers were in fact Russian security forces, though there is not yet any conclusive evidence as to this fact.
car with three covered, killed bodies, drove near us. One of the bodies was a woman, and I think that it was Antonina Dvoryanets, an old woman who was beaten by the riot police” (Interview with activist and doctoral candidate, conducted in Lviv, May 2, 2017).

For these protesters, therefore, the regime’s response was clearly and unequivocally autocratic in nature.

The preceding section shows that Ukraine fits well within the framework of this dissertation due to the dangers that protesters in the country faced, demonstrating the ways in which their calculations differ from those in more open societies. In addition to its regime type, Ukraine is also an excellent context for testing a theory about social movements because of the participatory nature of Ukrainian society. Several interviewees noted that in Ukraine, there is a joke that people regularly take to the streets every ten years, referencing protests in the early 1990s, the Orange Revolution of 2004, and Euromaidan. Still others suggested that Ukrainian culture is inherently prone to contention, with some referring to their society as anarchist and unwilling to tolerate monarchical rulers. Activism and political self-expression have become highly viable for many Ukrainians, meaning that this is an appropriate case for exploring the questions posed here. For external evidence of this claim, one can also look to two news reports published in 2017 and 2019 indicating that activism and civilian oversight of the government is alive and well.

51 Interview with activist, conducted in Kyiv, March 21, 2017; interview with political theorist, conducted in Kyiv, April 6, 2017; interview with singer and activist, conducted in Lviv, May 2, 2017.
52 Interview with analyst from Aktiv Strategy, conducted in Kyiv, March 31, 2017; interview with lawyer, conducted in Kyiv, May 19, 2017.
Understanding the role of external international forces in shaping Ukrainian politics

Ukraine is also a strong fit for this study due to the competing forces of democracy promotion and autocratic intervention that have heavily shaped developments in the country. As evidence of this, many people with whom I spoke pointed to the effects of increased Western influence in the years since Euromaidan. For example, one USAID officer described the ways in which money from the United States is channeled into Ukraine to support the development of a vibrant civil society, noting:

“USAID provides aid to a large portion of civil society, a lot of civil society groups that we were supporting before the revolution to build their capacity, to grow as organizations, also supporting them to advocate for and champion these democratic reforms, which made up a large part of the platform. So after the protests, on the Maidan, there was a lot of discussion about what it was that people wanted, and so post-protest, what we’ve been doing is working a lot with civil society groups. Like the Reanimation Package for Reforms coalition, and all those members to try to articulate the policy, the demands of the revolution and to help them articulate that into policy proposals, and help them build their capacity to advocate those policy proposals to lawmakers in parliament and the government” (Interview with American United States Agency for International Development case officer, conducted in Kyiv, October 25, 2017).

While this democratic support is notable, it is not new. According to Reid (2015) Western aid to Ukraine has been a significant foreign policy tool for years – as far back as 1994, Ukraine was actually the fourth largest recipient of aid from the United States. Similarly, Plokhy (2015) notes that in 1994, Ukraine became the first post-Soviet state to sign any kind of cooperation agreement with the European Union, indicating the depth

https://www.occrp.org/en/27-ccwatch/cc-watch-briefs/9442-ukrainian-nationalists-take-to-streets-in-protest-against-graft. Similar to the preceding article, this piece describes activists’ protests against reports that allies of then-President Petro Poroshenko benefited financially by purchasing military equipment from Russia and then selling it to the Ukrainian army at inflated prices.

A final piece of qualitative evidence to support this claim is the fact that the Euromaidan Press, an online English-language news source founded in 2014 to spread the word internationally about developments taking place in Ukraine, is still active and involved in its reporting on Ukraine’s political developments. It can be accessed online at http://euromaidanpress.com/
and extent of Western interest in promoting Ukraine’s economic and democratic development.

Interestingly, this democratic support (particularly within the context of Euromaidan) has often been weaponized by the Russian state media to undermine protests by depicting activists as paid puppets of the West. As one political analyst mentioned to me, “So when all this started, and people from Ukraine started to express their opinions right there...Russians was not supporting – they just thought that Ukrainians went crazy. So they are wasting their time, standing there, doing nothing, they all get paid by Western governments, because – you cannot pay more than 100,000 people. It’s really quite silly. But they do believe this stuff” (Interview with political analyst, conducted in Kyiv, November 22, 2017). Kasparov (2015) suggests that this tactic was utilized by the Putin regime to quell any imitations of dissent that might take place in Russia, a consideration that I discuss at greater length in subsequent sections of this chapter.

Beyond these tactics by Russian authorities, there is also strong evidence that many people feel that Putin and his associates were intervening in Ukrainian affairs to promote Russian interests. As one activist mentioned, “So if you really look at the broader picture, it’s obvious that Yanukovych and the oligarchs related to him, they were tied and they still are tied to Putin, and until today, most of the people who were engaged in those killings, very few were actually put to prison...It’s obvious that Putin

---

56 Interestingly, a 2014 Politifact article written on March 19, 2014, less than a month after Euromaidan concluded, examined reports – emanating first from Russia’s RT television station and later disseminated through online portals and social network sites such as Reddit and Facebook – that the United States government spent more than five billion dollars to overthrow Yanukovych and to promote regime change. After examining years’ worth of financial aid data and adopting a comprehensive analysis of American aid to Ukraine, the report labeled such claims as unequivocally false with the label, “Pants on Fire.” The report is available online at https://www.politifact.com/punditfact/statements/2014/mar/19/facebook-posts/united-states-spent-5-billion-ukraine-anti-governm/.
was using puppets in Ukraine who are letting everything unfold according to his scenario” (Interview with sociologist, conducted in Lviv, December 2, 2017).

A different activist expressed similar thoughts, suggesting that many protesters resented the Russian government’s involvement in Ukrainian politics. As he recounted, “Yanukovych was never seen as a truly independent guy. He was always trying to be friends with Russia. There was a short period right before the Maidan when it was looking like Yanukovych was going to sign the Agreement. But what we saw during the Maidan was that Yanukovych clearly turned his back on Europe and was asking for money from Russia and was actually selling the country to secure his power. It was clear in December, when he went to Moscow and got a loan from Putin...Ukraine is still very connected to Russia in many ways. It’s a post-Soviet country that only truly gained its independence in 2014, from my perspective. Economically, we were totally dependent. Politically, from time to time more or less, but usually so...So it was always clear for people on Maidan that Russia is an important actor in all of this” (Interview with former activist and current staffer for the Ministry of Health, conducted via Skype, December 21, 2017).

The vast majority of people with whom I spoke were firm in stressing that pro-Western Ukrainians are not inherently anti-Russian, as many have relatives in Russia and nearly everyone whom I interviewed was fluent in both languages. Instead, they were resentful of the Putin regime’s efforts to retain Ukraine within its sphere of influence. Taken together, the preceding section has shown that many citizens hold the perception that both democratic support from the West and autocratic intervention from the Russian government have helped shape much of Ukraine’s history, justifying its selection as the grounds for testing my claims in this case study.
Classifying the Euromaidan movement as pro-democratic

One final point to make in justifying my focus on Euromaidan concerns the movement’s goals and initiatives. As outlined earlier, I posit that my broad theoretical claims apply to protests that are democratically-oriented and that aim to pursue and promote social justice, transparency, and respect for human rights. Euromaidan was not ethnically or religiously driven, and while frustration with poverty and depressed living conditions were certainly on the minds of some protesters, the fundamental driving force was instead to achieve a more open, free, and democratic society in which the rule of law applied to everyone regardless of their stature and those who propagated the corrupt system would be accountable for their actions. Indeed, Zelinska (2015) describes her analysis of local Maidans in 57 cities through Ukraine. According to her research, “protesters’ primary identity emphasized their right to direct democracy, including influence over national and local policies. National-level factors played a key role: Human rights violations, deepening political crisis, total corruption and other institutional failures were, to the protesters, the key triggers of contention” (379). Similarly, Shore (2017) finds in her sociological study of Euromaidan that values and concerns over human rights were central to informing many activists’ decisions to protest. As a result, the Euromaidan movement meets the democratically aspirational framework within which I am operating.

I turn now to the core empirical and analytical focus of this chapter – an exploration of the ways in which Ukraine’s Euromaidan protests exemplify my causal mechanisms in action. In order to maintain a clear focus, I proceed through my posited

---

mechanisms in a linear fashion, discussing each one separately. Different types of mechanisms often operated in conjunction with one another at the same time, of course, but dividing them in this way makes it easier to understand how each one played a role. I begin by providing a more holistic, broad overview about Ukrainians’ perceptions of democratic support before then delving into each specific mechanism in greater detail.

**Dynamics of External Democracy Promotion – Exploring My Mechanisms**

I begin this section by presenting the results of one of my closed-ended survey’s key questions. Though survey questions are by nature more limited and restricted in scope than open-ended interviews, such questions are also valuable due to their ability to examine patterns in beliefs among a large number of individuals. Figure 5 below presents the findings of a survey question asking, “Based on your observations, did “Western” states or organizations (such as civil society groups based in the European Union member nations or the United States) have any effect on the protesters’ perceptions, strategies, or goals?” The purpose of this question is to determine whether individuals felt that activists during the Euromaidan movement were considering the possible influence or assistance of democratic outside actors while participating in the protests.

According to Figure 3.5, a fairly significant number of respondents felt that the perceptions and strategies of Euromaidan protesters were driven at least in part by the effects and influence of outside liberal actors. It is important to fundamentally stress there that I am in no way implying that protesters were directly ordered to behave a certain way, as many of my interviewees were intent on making this clear and requested

---

58 Because my respondents completed the closed-ended surveys after our interviews were completed, it is important to note that in some cases, certain individuals might have been primed to think in a particular way due to the nature of the immediately preceding conversation. I do not expect that this factor shifted interviewees’ beliefs in a highly significant way, but it is still worthy of note in interpreting the results.
that I do so as well\textsuperscript{59,60}. This is likely because (as I explore in greater detail in subsequent sections), propaganda emanating from the Russian government tried to characterize protesters as paid lackeys of the European Union and the United States\textsuperscript{61,62}.

\textsuperscript{59} Interview with Euromaidan protester and Svoboda party member, conducted in Kyiv, November 8, 2017.
\textsuperscript{60} Interview with student activist, conducted in Kyiv, November 23, 2017.
\textsuperscript{61} Dmitry Kiselev, the host of a popular news show airing on the Russian state-owned television channel Rossiya, regularly fixated on the Euromaidan protesters and the country’s newly elected leaders as fascist usurpers who were propped up and supported by NATO during their clashes with the Yanukovych regime, characterized by Kiselev as a “co-production” between the opposition and the West. For evidence, see: Yaffa, Joseph. “Dmitry Kiselev Is Redefining the Art of Russian Propaganda.” The New Republic. Published July 1, 2014. Available online at https://newrepublic.com/article/118438/dmitry-kiselev-putins-favorite-tv-host-russias-top-propogandist.
\textsuperscript{62} While Russian propaganda involving the role of the United States in the Ukrainian revolution and subsequent war with Russia is not the key focus of this chapter, it is still critical to stress that the Russian government repeatedly attempts to cast the United States and other Western allies as boogeymen in the region. As an example of this, a 2015 Foreign Policy article reports how the Russian newspaper Komsomolskaya Pravda released an alleged audio recording of two American CIA agents making preparations to bring down the MH17 airliner that crashed in Eastern Ukraine in 2014. The recording is available at: Standish, Reid. “Propaganda Watch: Listen to Two Russians Badly Impersonate CIA Spies to Pin MH17 on U.S.” Foreign Policy. Published August 12, 2015. Available online at https://foreignpolicy.com/2015/08/12/propaganda-watch-listen-to-two-russians-badly-impersonate-cia-spies-to-pin-mh17-on-u-s/. As the article notes, a quick listen to the recording casts great doubt as to its veracity, as the accents of the two men are questionable at best, and both use phrases in English that appear to be translated versions of Russian phrases, rather than true English slang, such as ending their conversations by wishing each other simply, “Luck.”
Nevertheless, the data above still show that many protesters were considering external influence in their behavior and decision-making strategies. 83.90% of the people whom I interviewed felt that the actions of Western forces had some impact on protesters’ beliefs – only 9.32% indicated that Western actors and organizations had no effect, while another 4.24% of respondents were unsure. Among those who felt that Western actors mattered in some way, the largest group was those who felt that Western forces had a moderate impact – this stance matched the views of 40.68% of respondents. Finally, an equal share of 22.89% felt that Western actors had either a “strong” effect or a “weak” effect. Taken together, this reinforces a notion that I argue elsewhere in this chapter – the fact that while protesters were primarily driven by domestic factors in their decision to take to the streets, considerations about external actors did have a notable and significant effect on their perceptions and calculations.

I now turn to my first mechanism of democratic support, the notion of purposive solidarity, to show how this affected people during the Euromaidan movement. 

Mechanism 1.1: Purposive Solidarity

As defined and explored in my theoretical chapter, I claim that protesters care a great deal about purposive solidarity – essentially, the psychological, mental, and emotional sense for protesters that their cause is just and that they are not alone in the world. Based on the results of my interviews, this appeared to be the single most powerful effect of external democratic support during Euromaidan. In this section, I focus on 1) the emotional support that members of the Ukrainian diaspora in other countries as well as their democratically-minded friends provided to protesters and

63 I disaggregate responses to this question into the perceptions of 1) those who did join the protests at some point and 2) those who did not join the movement, in order to determine whether these two groups display any meaningful difference in their beliefs, in Appendix C at the end of this dissertation.
2) statements and expressions of support that were made by elected officials and representatives of international organizations in other countries.

Of primary importance for many protesters in terms of emotional attention and support were the actions of both the Ukrainian diaspora and regular citizens in other countries. More specifically, several respondents recalled the fact that ethnic Ukrainians and others held smaller Euromaidan movements or commemorations in their own home states as a way to show solidarity and to bolster the resolve of people who were physically protesting in Kyiv. One activist and singer in Lviv mentioned to me,

“The very nice and pleasant part of Euromaidan, especially here, when we’ve got Internet and we’ve got a big screen, it was that people from all over the world, they were trying to recreate a message to Euromaidan. And we were broadcasting all these messages and videos here. We had messages from the countries where Ukrainians live, that’s one thing, but also we got messages, for example, from South Africa, from Nairobi, from South Korea, from Japan, from China. Actually, people were acting as a community, not united by some organization, but they wanted to do something for Ukraine. And in this way, throughout social media, they were spreading the word of what is going on” (Interview with singer and activist, conducted in Lviv, May 2, 2017).

For this particular activist, this type of support and emotional reinforcement clearly played a significant role in shaping her resolve to campaign against the regime. If external factors had not played any part in protesters’ calculations, it is unlikely that they would have seized upon these expressions of solidarity. Instead, they used these expressions of sympathy and support to reinforce their own determination to carry on the fight. Interestingly, this also points to the importance of social media and advancements in technology that were present in this situation. Protesters and their supporters in other countries can reach one another instantly and transmit images with no difficulty whatsoever, demonstrating the necessity of a free and open flow of communication for this mechanism to operate in practice.
Another activist in Kyiv echoed these claims, focusing specifically on the emotional ties and appeals of Euromaidan and the Ukrainian diaspora elsewhere:

“A very peculiar thing about the Ukrainian diaspora is that we have diaspora, as a definition, so Ukrainians who for several generations are already living abroad, and then we have this fourth wave of Ukrainian migration which started in late 90s and still continues. Those are economic migrants. Those are people who in most cases sometimes aren’t that well-educated and they just leave Ukraine to get any kind of job, because it’s so bad in Ukraine...Those were people who were ashamed of coming from Ukraine. Because Ukraine gave them nothing. It gave them no good level of life. So we had millions of Ukrainians who were just not paying any care or attention to what is going on in Ukraine. And Maidan changed that. An enormous amount of people realized that they are proud of being Ukrainian. They are proud of coming from a country that fights for its future, that fights for its values. And suddenly it became cool and very proud to be Ukrainian. So beautiful thing that started all around the world is, we had Euromaidans almost in every major city of the world. In Tokyo, in Paris, in Milan, in Toronto, in Washington, in San Francisco. Everywhere they were Ukrainians, they were gathering together, they were building those communities, they were looking for a way to help Ukraine. In China as well. And so if we can’t be in Ukraine right now, maybe we can send money, maybe we can build some local support here, and we can spread the word. A friend of mine who was living in Shanghai, he – and obviously in China it’s very hard to get Twitter and Facebook – he was getting information from his friends, and he started a page in Chinese, where he was just writing the stories. So all around the world, every single Ukrainian who was outside Ukraine at the moment when Maidan happened was thinking, what can I do for the movement?” (Interview with activist and prominent Twitter user, conducted in Kyiv, April 19, 2017)

The preceding quote contains a great deal of valuable information and explores the effects that people in other countries had in shaping protesters’ beliefs. This respondent points to the wide geographical range of the diaspora – while many reside in nearby Poland, others have traveled to nearly every continent on the globe. One civil society activist who works at Centre UA, a non-governmental organization aimed at promoting transparency and anti-corruption measures, expressed similar sentiments.

---

64 Existing studies have analyzed mobilization among the Ukrainian diaspora during the Euromaidan movement, showing how Ukrainians abroad pressured their own governments. As evidence of this, one can see: Krasynska, Svitlana. 2015. “Digital Civil Society: Euromaidan, the Ukrainian Diaspora, and Social Media.” In Ukraine’s Euromaidan: Analyses of a Civil Revolution, eds. David R. Marples and Frekerick V. Mills. Columbia University Press: New York. One of my main contributions here is to show clearly how this mobilization on the part of the diaspora was perceived by Ukrainians protesting on the ground.
when I spoke with her: “It was important for protesters when there were actions in support of Ukraine in different countries, organized by Ukrainian diaspora or just organized by locals. And I remember on our Facebook page, we had the special album of pictures and there were more than 100 different protest actions from different countries. Starting from Ecuador and finishing in Norway, all over, all over the world. And even just when people demonstrated the Ukrainian flag at some slogan or logo on the paper, it was very important. It was like, wow, great, great! They support us!” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, April 18, 2017). This quote again points to both the breadth and depth of support that Euromaidan protesters often received from people in other countries, and the fact that many individuals at Maidan were aware of and appreciative of these expressions.

One of the most powerful motivating factors within the area of purposive solidarity is the belief that protesters are not alone and isolated from the rest of the world. By holding rallies across the globe and transmitting knowledge of these protests to Ukraine, democratically-minded activists send a clear signal that they are watching the movement, they are supportive of its goals, and they believe that it stands a strong chance at success. The fact that solidarity rallies elsewhere involved a broader base of participants than merely the Ukrainian diaspora is made clear in the statement of a former activist and army veteran, who recounted:

“Yeah, actually speaking about the foreign support, it was felt as a strong one, because we all saw those – not the protests – but the supportive meetings in different parts around the world. Not only from the diaspora, but also from the citizens of those countries who showed their solidarity, who understood the problems. I don’t know whether those people and the citizens of the other countries got this information from their mass media or all of them had the friends who are connected with Ukrainian diaspora who are actually Ukrainians who told them word of mouth about this situation, but that all created the feeling that the world is with us, and the world understands this – Google translate,
because it’s very important – injustice. What is the antonym to justice? So we all felt this injustice, and we felt that the world also feels this” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, December 8, 2017).

Former investigative journalist and then-current Member of the Verkhovna Rada Serhiy Leshchenko stressed that this international attention kept movement participants from feeling overly isolated or alone. As he told me:

“People thought that European countries and America, friends of Ukraine, has to stand together, to stand with Ukraine. Because we were like alone. Inside the country, this was only protesters – government was against, ministers was against, deputies was against, President, so. The only hope was getting Western support. And that is why presence of international observers, Senators, diplomats, it was really useful. And the appearance of Vice President Biden was very useful too” (Interview conducted in the Rada cafeteria, May 25, 2017).

Finally, a Professor of Political Science at Ukrainian Catholic University in Lviv agreed with the emotional fortitude that support and attention from ordinary citizens elsewhere provided to protesters during Euromaidan:

“So yeah, definitely people were trying to speak and to be heard...we can see that new media played a great role in the sense that it provided these platforms for people speaking, and it was very important that people started to show their own ideas. It was important to share these thoughts with the international community, because that was part of the internationalization of the conflict. Not to make it local, but to make it international. Because it was happening. And suddenly this was also the period when the Ukrainian diaspora appeared in very strong force. Because they started answering all these messages, they started their own protests in their local territories all over the world. They started uniting themselves, presenting themselves, and showing that they are Ukrainians in diaspora. And this was very important for us, both the Euromaidan and citizens in general, understanding that yes, we are heard, and there are much more of “we,” even not standing somewhere on the street, but we were a great force that could have this change. So this understanding was really important and moreover, besides just we as a force, we can have a talk with our international counterparts. The authorities, at the private level, the universities, the businessmen, whatever. The people are ready to hear us! They are starting from the people, what is Ukraine, as something separate from Russia and the Soviet Union. So this part of the internationalization of the conflict, between the people and the authorities, was actually very important because it did help Ukraine to recreate itself as an actor in the international arena...I am very happy that many people were writing lots of papers and letters of support, and in the case of USA specifically” (Interview conducted in Lviv, May 5, 2017).
The effects that I am discussing here are clearly emotional and psychological, as this type of support did not provide financial or material goods to sustain protesters in their struggle. Instead, the goal was to lift protesters’ spirits and buttress their resolve.

Another important dimension of purposive solidarity in the Ukrainian case concerns statements and expressions of support that were made by elected officials and politicians from other countries. Many respondents stressed that Euromaidan was not led by any political party, and that the protests consisted of average citizens. However, when politicians from other countries intentionally recognized and commended the movement, this indicated again that the outside world was aware of what was happening in Ukraine and supporting the protests’ cause. According to a 2013 article from the *Guardian*, Senators John McCain and Chris Murphy visited the Maidan in early December 2013, with McCain standing on the square’s main stage and informing protesters, “We are here to support your just cause, the sovereign right of Ukraine to determine its own destiny freely and independently. And the destiny you seek lies in Europe.” McCain was not threatening to directly intervene in Ukraine’s
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65 One activist recalled the important role played by certain European politicians in expressing their solidarity with the Euromaidan movement. According to his recollections, “But we had strong support from local people...But some members of our movement were in the Euro parliament, flying there and giving speeches. So I think the invitation to Euro parliament was from Brussels, so it is a big kind of support...We felt support of all Western world, so it was very pressing, everybody with think that whole world is with us except Russia” (Interview with activist at Chesno civil society organization, conducted in Kyiv, March 22, 2017).

66 A former Deputy Prime Minister of Ukraine, former Member of the Verkhovna Rada (1994-2007) and 2019 Presidential candidate made this very clear in comparing Ukraine’s 2004 Orange Revolution and the Euromaidan, noting to me, “In 2004, when there was a revolution which was controlled, structured, and organized by political people, by politicians, and it was one kind of a revolution. But in 2014, the Ukrainian people were leading politicians by themselves” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, December 5, 2017).

67 Interview with Professor of Political Science at the National University of Kyiv – Mohyla Academy, conducted in Kyiv, May 11, 2017.

68 Assistant Professor of History at Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, conducted in Lviv, December 1, 2017.

69 The Guardian. “John McCain tells Ukraine protesters: ‘We are here to support your just cause’.” *The Guardian*. Published December 15, 2013. Available online at
affairs politically or to overthrow the Yanukovych regime from outside; instead, he used his political capital as a well-known advocate for democracy and human rights to speak directly to protesters in support of their cause.

A large number of my interviewees mentioned statements that were made by leading Western politicians as well, demonstrating that their statements were known and generally appreciate by many people on the ground. As a Program Officer at Fulbright Ukraine mentioned, “I must say that the Revolution of Dignity did gain a lot of support from the fact that the U.S. Ambassador at that point, Geoffrey Pyatt, was very active. He was out there. People knew that he was there. He would call meetings with other ambassadors, for them to have discussions about how things should be dealt with...John McCain, Chris Murphy, John Kerry, Victoria Nuland – she was a big player in all of this – the fact that people were coming and keeping Ukraine on the front page of the news really helped out a lot, I think, in pushing this forward” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, November 24, 2017).

Similarly, another respondent noted, “Even early on, McCain came out a week after it started. And that was a big deal, because it gave legitimacy to the opposition’s demand. If everyone’s screaming, oh, it’s bad, it’s bad, and the West agrees, then the opposition is de-legitimized, because it’s a battle of ideas. So the McCain visit was very important. It was McCain and Chris Murphy from Connecticut, so a bipartisan delegation. But the two of them came out, and it was a powerful message. When they spoke, it helped to energize and encourage people not to be afraid” (Interview with political analyst and consultant, conducted in Kyiv, March 29, 2017).


After McCain’s death in 2018, a street in Kyiv was renamed in his honor.

70 Interview with Vice Rector of Ukrainian Catholic University, conducted in Lviv, May 4, 2017.
According to these interview respondents, therefore, the mechanism that I am discussing here was primarily one about psychology and international attention. Many protesters knew that actors elsewhere were recognizing and commemorating their efforts, granting the movement an additional burst of legitimacy and power. As one sociologist stated, “I think the orientation to the West, the European Union and the United States, was quite obvious. To their reaction. And especially when Europe said, wow, and Maidan participants felt encouraged. But after that, they tried to appeal to European Union, but in, when you could see posters in English, when we try to translate some, to tell people in the West in English or to translate some notes or some articles that we had translated into English or other languages – into German, into Czech – to show how what’s really going on, and not what Russian media – or even Ukrainian media – is talking about. And so I think that people appreciate the attention, appreciate the support, and we saw that from that morally, Europe is with us” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, May 19, 2017). Reinforcing the notion of not being alone, it is particularly valuable to focus on this respondent’s mention that from a moral perspective, Europe was with the protesters – this underscores my point about psychology and emotion (because his focus is on moral, rather than material, support) and also my point about protesters not feeling isolated and abandoned on the global stage.71 72 73 74

71 This was further reinforced through an interview with an activist residing in Lviv. During our conversation, she recounted to me, “And yes, we were applying to European countries and US, because support was very important at that time. Because it was a shift to more democratic independent way, and their attention was very important. Because you are not just alone here, and the other side is just...of course, it’s one country, but what happened against people was putting the question bigger” (Interview conducted in Lviv, May 3, 2014). Again, what is interesting to note is the sense that she specifically referenced “not being alone” – the notion of having some type of company in the protesting space by means of international attention and support is quite evident.

72 Another interviewee mentioned the moral importance of international attention as well, stating, “The first feeling was, a lot of media attention to this, including Western media and European media, and that was very important, because basically, that was meaning that this has wider importance rather than just a local event. Because the feeling was like if we would not get international attention to this, that would be,
Within this section, it is important to also briefly note a trend regarding international support that does not fit cleanly with my argument; however, the issue was raised in enough interviews that it must be discussed here. According to several people with whom I spoke, as the Euromaidan revolution wore on and police brutality became more and more forceful, diplomatic expressions of support – particularly from the European Union – were increasingly viewed by some on the ground as rather toothless and ineffective. More specifically, several respondents pointed to the fact that European Union officials expressed that they were “deeply concerned” regarding the events that were taking place without actually taking much substantive

you know, just finished sooner, with no one watching, with no attention, which would mean nobody cares much. And if that attention was there, that means that yeah, people really do care” (Interview with Professor of Journalism at the National University of Kyiv – Mohyla Academy, conducted in Kyiv, December 6, 2017). The respondent stressed the importance of feeling as though people elsewhere knew what was taking place in Ukraine, and suggested that if this recognition had not been present, the movement would have burned out much sooner than it ultimately did.

75 This was also echoed in a conversation I had with a former protester and a war veteran, who mentioned the importance of both official recognition of the Euromaidan movement as well as trends on social media. As he mentioned to me, “And also we were watching the representatives of foreign countries coming to Maidan, Victoria Nuland, Joe Biden, it was always the great event, and the big tone to the protest wall that we were trying to build. So if we were trying to send some messages to the people, yes, I remember, there were some Twitter storms and Facebook storms, I don’t remember the different hashtags, something like #supportukraine or something, but I strongly remember the hashtag #russiainvadedukraine, when the war started” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, December 8, 2017).

76 One former activist with whom I spoke touched upon both the importance of support from officials and from activists elsewhere. As he mentioned to me, “I think Obama was very smart about not putting some radical steps like assisting Maidan in some kind of covert way, but he did issue a lot of statements and he was always saying that Maidan, was always trying to negotiate between the protesters and the Yanukovych regime. And I think Kerry was the Secretary of State – he was coming to Ukraine couple of times. There were a lot of Senators, Congressmen who were on Maidan. The Polish president was on the Maidan. There was a lot of international politicians who came, and they came to Maidan and spoke to the people and expressed their solidarity. At that time, there was also a revolution in Venezuela. So there were times when the people at Maidan taped some videos in support of the protests in Venezuela, and they taped videos in support of Ukraine” (Interview with former Euromaidan activist and current project manager for the Lviv Education Foundation, conducted in Lviv, December 5, 2017). This quotation is particularly interesting, as he points to both the actions of influential foreign politicians, as well as the fact that protesters in Ukraine and Venezuela managed to use technology and support to communicate with and support one another

77 Interview with student, conducted in Kyiv, November 22, 2017.
78 Interview with former student activist and civil society organizer, conducted in Kyiv, December 8, 2017.
79 Interview with former activist and current staffer for the Ministry of Health, conducted via Skype, December 21, 2017.
80 Interview with activist and assistant at the Ukrainian Embassy of Estonia, conducted in Kyiv, May 26, 2017.
81 Interview with Crimean Tatar lawyer and human rights advocate, conducted in Kyiv, April 27, 2017.
While the supportive intention behind such statements was initially well-received, disdain for the institution’s rather passive deep concerns became so widespread that protesters began sharing a meme-generating web site making fun of the officials’ statements. Protesters wished instead for the European Union to introduce sanctions against Yanukovych and his allies, indicating (for some participants) a hunger for more substantive forms of outside support.

In an interview with a diplomatic member of the European Union Delegation to Ukraine that I conducted in Kyiv, the official himself recognized the protesters’ negative reaction to the statements, saying, “Of course, they expected much more support from us, and unfortunately since we are 28 member states, on external and international political issues, we have to have consent of all of our members. And it takes time, until a common position is worked out. And we are unfortunately always late, like two three steps behind...We were mainly issuing statements, and unfortunately, the statements from Brussels, they were always starting with the famous phrase, ‘We are concerned.’ And when the violence was escalating, we were only adding some adjectives. Like, ‘we
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80 Interview with Professor of Journalism at the National University of Kyiv – Mohyla Academy, conducted in Kyiv, December 6, 2017.
81 Interview with political analyst from the Institute for Euro-Atlantic Cooperation, conducted in Kyiv, November 21, 2017.
82 Interview with analyst from Aktis Strategy, conducted in Kyiv, March 31, 2017.
83 Interview with former activist at analyst at the National Democratic Institute Ukraine, conducted in Kyiv, March 24, 2017.
84 Interview with noted philosopher and Professor of History at Ukrainian Catholic University, conducted in Lviv, May 8, 2017.
85 Interview with analyst at the think tank Institute for World Affairs, conducted in Kyiv, May 12, 2017.
86 Interview with Director of European Projects at Internews Ukraine and reporter at Hromadske International, conducted in Kyiv, May 16, 2017.
87 Rather humorously, a Google search regarding these topics produced a Twitter account named “Is EU Concerned?” Started in early 2014 and initially creating several messages regarding the Russian invasion of Ukraine, the account periodically produces Tweets such as “Extremely,” “Gravely,” “Slightly,” “Strongly,” and “Deeply, like we said earlier.”
88 However, several other respondents were critical of protesters who held these views; this second group of respondents placed more emphasis on Ukrainians being self-sufficient and generating the actual political change by themselves from within.
are GRAVELY concerned,’ ‘we are GREATLY concerned,’ ‘we are DEEPLY concerned,’ and it was causing people to be frustrated” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, December 7, 2017). The official followed up these remarks by correctly noting the many ways that European Union has helped Ukraine politically and economically since the protest movement ended, but his candor regarding protesters’ perceptions on the specific slowness with which the official organization itself responded to the movement was particularly striking and therefore worthy of mention.

Still, expressions of support and solidarity from individual member states within the European Union were better-received by protesters. Many interviewees pointed specifically to statements made by the leaders of formerly Communist democracies such as Poland89, Latvia90, and Lithuania91 as having an impact on protesters, suggesting a notable East-West division in terms of how participants perceived external support for their movement. Many individuals felt that these countries were particularly well-suited to offer advice and support, as these states were considered to be Ukraine’s neighbors, and all have managed to successfully integrate into Western alliances such as the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and have secured standards of democratic governance that protesters were seeking to emulate92.

The preceding section has shown how the dynamics of the Euromaidan movement illustrate the first causal mechanism of my theoretical framework – purposive solidarity. Individuals who were protesting received real emotional support and fortitude from abroad, receiving messages of encouragement and signals that the

89 Interview with activist and doctoral candidate, conducted in Lviv, May 2, 2017.
90 Interview with political analyst at the Ukrainian think tank Institute for World Politics, conducted in Kyiv, April 5, 2017.
91 Interview with noted philosopher and Professor of History at Ukrainian Catholic University, conducted in Lviv, May 8, 2017.
92 Interview with Director of the Wilson Center’s Kennan Institute, conducted in Kyiv, April 4, 2017.
world was watching and supporting their campaign. These messages were largely most influential when they came from members of the Ukrainian diaspora and their allies in other countries, though symbolic recognition and encouragement from non-Ukrainian political elites played a significant role as well. I now turn to an exploration of the second main causal mechanism that I discuss under the scope of democratic promotion – strategic and tactical support from democratically-minded civic forces elsewhere.

**Mechanism 1.2: Strategic and Tactical Support**

The second key mechanism that I analyze here differs from the first in that while the preceding section was primarily concerned with emotion and psychological feelings, this second mechanism is more about strategic and tactical support from governments and non-governmental organizations elsewhere. It is important to note that I did not perceive as much of this mechanism in my interviews as I did purposive solidarity; nevertheless, there is still significant evidence that this type of support mattered for altering protesters’ calculations and decision-making strategies.

Important to note is the fact that Ukraine is a country that receives a significant amount of attention from Western forces in terms of its democratic development, including the United States. Objective data shows clear evidence of this, as the figure below depicts the amount of funding provided to the Ukrainian government by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) between the years 2001 and 2018. The data presented here represents disbursements, or the actual amount of financial assistance that the United States provided to Ukraine, and the numerical data represent millions of dollars.

\[^{93}\text{All financial data and information come from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID)'s website, available online at https://explorer.usaid.gov/cd/UKR?fiscal\_year=2018&implementing\_agency\_id=1&measure=Obligations.}\]
Again, from an objective perspective, this makes clear that a significant amount of money is being funneled into Ukraine from the American government. The $190,246,254 that the country received in 2018 placed it well above the regional average for Eastern Europe – the average state in that part of the world only received $21,000,000 in 2018. Much of this went towards the general area of “Conflict, Peace, and Security” ($65,000,000), but a very large amount also went towards “Government and Civil Society” as well ($55,000,000).

How did this aid and training actually manifest itself during Euromaidan, and how did it affect protesters’ calculations? One USAID officer described the many ways in which money from the United States is channeled into Ukraine to support the development of a vibrant civil society, noting:

“I’d say that our support before the revolution was similar to our support today. We were funding PACT and others to support Ukrainian civil society platforms, the new citizen initiative. We supported different CSOs that focused on getting citizens involved in the democratic process, advocating for democratic reforms,
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towards corruption, to try to advocate for Ukraine’s system to be closer and closer to a European democracy. So in that sense, as you described it, that was the extent of our support then, and that’s the extent today. These CSOs (civil society organizations) that have this pro-democratic, pro-human rights, anti-corruption agenda, these are policy priorities for the United States. We think that a democratic Ukraine that’s free of corruption, that’s stable and secure, that’s in the best interests of Ukraine, it’s in the best interests of Europe, and it’s in the best interests of the United States. For foreign policy, security, and other areas” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, October 25, 2017).

Drawing clear and tangible linkages between funds invested in a country for the purposes of democratic development and that country’s democratization is obviously extremely difficult due to the many intervening factors that are involved. Nevertheless, my interviews provided evidence that many participants in the Euromaidan movement recognized the value of this type of strategic investments. One respondent noted,

“Since Maidan, people learned how to see and how to resist and how to stop these attempts to consolidate power in the hands of one person. And although Ukraine is an independent state, we have to see that of course we are and we will be independent from some foreign actors and powers, and it is better to be dependent on the democratic European world than to be dependent on dictatorship Russia. For example, this week we had a draft law in our parliament that proposed some ways how to avoid these anti-corruption bodies like NABU and others, but thanks to some pressure from the USA, from the EU, this draft law wasn’t adopted. And this is an advantage when democratic institutions of the Western governments could prevent our politicians from not democratic decisions. All in all, since Maidan, a lot of new people have come to the governmental bodies, and due to their initiative, they pursue progressive changes. They try to achieve reforms, even though some old politicians and public servants try to sabotage them” (Interview with historian, conducted in Kyiv, December 8, 2017).

This quote demonstrates that for several activists, direct democratic assistance from Western governments can be useful in implementing real political changes. Such initiatives have operated in Ukraine for a significant period of time, and it is likely that they played a significant role in helping motivate protesters.

A second topic regarding tactical support concerns not democratic training and assistance, but something more pragmatic – the housing of injured Ukrainian protesters
in hospitals in other countries during the movement’s most intense movements. While not directly influential in the sense of providing tactical strategies, this support was still extremely important because it showed that even when protesters were badly injured, refuge still existed in a nearby state. One activist who later worked as a civil society organizer pushing for reforms expressed this situation by noting,

“Another part is when protesters were harmed by policemen, so it was militsiya, and now it’s police. When protesters were harmed by state forces, lots of EU countries and also America, Canada, maybe somebody else were trying to support protesters who were injured. They were transferring these protesters to hospitals in other countries. There were really massive initiatives aimed to solve these people, because we had this situation when all the central hospitals were occupied by state forces. And basically, if you are injured and you come to the official institution, you would be kidnapped or took to jail...so it was very impressive back then. And I know the Czech embassy sponsored a lot of flights to Czech Republic. It was really massive. And maybe you can also Google “Initiative A+.” This is the initiative head by...they were insuring the safe transportation of injured Maidan activists to other countries – Poland, Czech Republic, Germany – and I also heard that Canadian Embassy helped a lot...So this is political support and very practical support” (Interview with activist at the Reanimation Package for Reforms, conducted in Kyiv, March 23, 2017).

As this interviewee noted, the situation under Yanukovych became so dire that many people who were admitted to Ukrainian hospitals with injuries were rounded up and kidnapped by security forces. Indeed, protesters who were captured faced very real danger – a Catholic priest recounted the situation at the time during our conversation, noting, “Then a son from our colleague was arrested by police, was brutally beaten, and well, we tried just to bring them abroad, to Poland. The big threat was that people who needed medical support and were brought to hospitals, they were stolen by police. Just disappeared. Nobody could find them by the police, they just disappeared” (Interview with Catholic priest and Professor at Ukrainian Catholic University, conducted in Lviv, May 4, 2017). By providing an outlet for injured activists to recover without fear of capture, officials in Poland showed participants that the movement would be able to
sustain itself. This theme came up in several other conversations, with some discussing the fact that the Polish government waived the European Union’s visa requirements at the time by allowing injured protesters to be transported across state lines.\textsuperscript{95,96,97}

The preceding discussion how shown how external democratic forces influenced protesters’ calculations regarding the proper ways to challenge the government and the dangers involved in doing so.\textsuperscript{98} Tangible foreign funding specifically aimed to develop the country’s democratic civil society has provided several activists with the tools to successfully mobilize fellow citizens against the regime, while the knowledge that medical help would be available in countries such as Poland reduced the threat calculus facing protesters. I turn now to the third primary mechanism in my framework – the knowledge that when the outside world is watching, autocratic leaders will be less likely to violently crack down due to the threat of international condemnation or sanctions.

**Mechanism 1.3: Threat of International Sanctioning in the Face of Violent Repression**

This third relevant causal mechanism within the context of the Euromaidan movement is about perceptions of threat and safety – more specifically, the likelihood in
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\textsuperscript{95} Interview with activist, conducted in Lviv, May 3, 2017. Ukraine is not presently part of the European Union, and obviously was also not a part of the organization in 2013 and 2014. While the European Union granted Ukrainians the ability to travel throughout E.U. members states without a visa in 2017, this provision did not yet exist during the time of Euromaidan. As a result, the Polish government was essentially disregarding the European Union’s requirements on restrictions for travel.

\textsuperscript{96} Interestingly, this same respondent recounted the lengths that injured protesters had to pursue in order to evade capture by the state. As she mentioned to me, “Poland helped us a lot. They sent a Polish ambulance and the first night when Yanukovych was still in, we were taking these guys to hospitals here with fake names and fake diagnoses, because if you are diagnosed with gunshot, you have to report to police...And we were trying to put them to Poland, because in Poland they were safe.”

\textsuperscript{97} Interview with activist and doctoral candidate, conducted in Lviv, May 2, 2017.

\textsuperscript{98} While this example does not fit neatly with the rest of my discussion on intentional and strategic coordination among democratic forces elsewhere and Ukrainians, this final example is still interesting and relevant for inclusion in this section. In my theoretical chapter, I note how protesters in one country are often inspired by the tactics used elsewhere. I found clear evidence of this when speaking with a prominent Euromaidan protester who prolifically used Twitter to communicate with the outside world. She noted, “I remembered the lesson of the Arab Spring, and how they used social media, Facebook, mainly Twitter, in order to spread the word. And in order to keep the movement together, and also to spread information about what is going on” (Interview with civil society activist and prominent Twitter user, conducted in Kyiv, April 19, 2017).
protesters’ views that the regime will crack down on individuals. To be sure, the Yanukovych regime often did clamp down violently and aggressively – earlier discussion has made that clear. More than a hundred people died, while hundreds of others were wounded. Still, I argue here that the presence of international media attention and monitoring was seen by informants as playing an effective role in checking Yanukovych’s worst impulses and providing protesters with the sense that the world’s attention would prevent things from becoming too authoritarian.

As argued elsewhere, Ukraine under Yanukovych was sliding away from democratic governance, but the state itself was more a hybrid regime than a full autocracy. International media were free to enter the country and monitor what was taking place, and protesters were able to communicate with people in other countries through social media and portals including YouTube. While some respondents expressed a wish that more media sources had been present in the movement’s earlier days, others noted that (particularly near the conclusion of Euromaidan) the country was full of foreign journalists who were there to report on what was taking place. Given all of this attention, I found ample evidence that Yanukovych and his allies were heavily aware that this attention existed, and I can conclude that this factor did have some effect on the ways that the regime reacted to protesters.

One former activist summarized the ways in which international attention checked Yanukovych’s reaction to protesters in some ways, noting, “In Ukraine, our authorities were afraid of that footage being shown on CNN. When there was violent crime on Maidan, and Victoria Nuland, she was in Kyiv on this night. So they didn’t like
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99 Interview with Director of European Projects at Internews Ukraine and reporter at Hromadske International, conducted in Kyiv, May 16, 2017.
to show it, but it depends on authority. Because in Russia and Belarus, they don’t care about those footage and images. Yanukovych cared. Because they are connected with West financially, so they didn’t want to have this bad coverage. They didn’t want to get sanctions, and they were afraid of their financial assets and property” (Interview with policy analyst at the Institute for World Politics, conducted in Kyiv, April 5, 2017).

According to this logic, protesters knew that because Yanukovych was dependent on some Western actors for aid, he largely tried to restrain his most forceful impulses. This respondent’s reference to CNN in particular is interesting, as this underscores my broader focus on media freedom. Because Ukraine’s hybrid regime does not prevent foreign journalists from entering the country, protesters are afforded a level of protection that does not exist in more repressive states like North Korea.

Several other interviewees echoed this focus on the role of international media in providing some degree of protection simply by virtue of being present in Ukraine at that time. One policy analyst at Centre UA, a non-profit organization aimed at promoting transparency and accountability, recalled, “I think that symbolic support of international governments and diplomats was important, because when it became public that somebody supports the idea of democratic protests in Ukraine, it meant additional international pressure on the Ukrainian government in order to stabilize it somehow. And any international attention to that protest, it enhanced the chances for peaceful protest. So when it became public for international audience, we hoped that the actions of riot police would be more peaceful” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, April 18, 2017). Examining the language of this respondent can reveal several important findings – again, the fact that *the world was paying attention* granted some Euromaidan participants the sense that things would ultimately not become too dire. Given the
violence that the Yanukovych regime did ultimately employ against activists, it is difficult to imagine how much worse things could have gotten without the presence of external media relaying images and videos to the outside world.

One Professor of Journalism whom I interviewed made an apt comparison between Ukraine’s situation and the effects that lack of international media had on protests in states such as Belarus. As he noted,

“The attention was always there. And this was important because again, Ukrainians were always quoting the experience of Belarus. Where they had a lot of protests, a lot of beatings up of protesters, but media attention was never there. So basically, it was always a domestic affair, and Belarusian police can do whatever they wish, nobody would be covering that, nobody would be caring much. Yes, some statements from the governments saying, yeah we are deeply concerned, but again, it doesn’t change the situation on the ground...Only media attention and media on the ground can change the attitude, because they are showing all those things...So it was almost impossible to do something without everyone else knowing about it. Even if journalists were not there 24 hours a day, there were streamings, and people could watch it basically from any part of the world, what was happening here in real time, and that was a big difference...sometimes you could have five different, seven different streams of the same event, so basically it provided the opportunity to observe the situation from anywhere. And that also encouraged more media attention...basically, people were watching live what was happening. And that connected Ukraine to many other newsrooms around the world, just ordinary people who become more and more interested in what was happening in Ukraine because that was just a unique experience compared to many other protests around the world” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, December 6, 2017).

Another activist also expressed a similar sentiment, stating, “Yes, we were streaming and trying to reach those people because we felt that if this protest became isolated, it could be easily vanished. So for our government, it was not actually the problem to stop the protest, but I think they felt that if they lose the connection with the foreign investments, with the programs, they won’t be for a long time. Those streams of money were strong source for their corruption, because although the Western investors are trying to strongly control this money that they put in Ukraine, our guys are very
experienced in putting it in their own pockets, unfortunately. And probably, I think this was one of the very strong reasons why they weren’t trying to vanish protest earlier. So this international support, for the so-called leaders of Maidan, it was sort of fundamental for their negotiation position” (Interview with former protester and army veteran, conducted in Kyiv, December 8, 2017). Again, the notion of being punished by the West in the case of severe repression of protesters is evident – those interviewed perceived that Yanukovych did not want to miss out on possible sources of funding, prompting him to temper himself (relatively speaking) in order not to disrupt this flow.

Here, the powerful and influential ability of the international media to harness the world’s attention and call foreigners to take note of what is happening in a certain context is clear. In comparison to Belarus, where a relative paucity of international media often leaves the Lukashenko regime free to abuse protesters, the fact that so many reporters were at Euromaidan meant that activists were aware that the world would know if they were brutally beaten or dispersed100. I conclude this section by briefly referencing an interview I had with a displaced Crimean Tatar activist who participated in a Euromaidan movement in Simferopol before separatists and Russian forces caused him to abandon his home for Kyiv. He mentioned to me that one of his acquaintances had been protesting while no media whatsoever were present, and that he was killed by forces while campaigning on the street. Following this incident, my source

100 An American reporter living in Ukraine offered a similar perspective, noting that the Yanukovych regime was cautious (at least during Euromaidan’s early stages) in its efforts not to alienate potential Western allies. According to my interviewee, “I think that as far as a global audience, I could say maybe not so much the protesters, but the government...like, Poroshenko knows that the government is watching him, to see how Ukraine has changed, and the way he treats protesters and the opposition movement...that affects how much support he gets from America and the EU. And foreign investors. You know, Ukraine is trying to court foreign companies to come here...so the last thing Kyiv wants is images of protesters getting the shit beat out of them in front of the Rada, which would just make Ukraine look like Russia. Which is what they don’t want.” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, November 16, 2017).
emphasized, all pro-Ukraine rallies in Crimea were sure to invite numerous media sources to their events to guarantee that they would not be murdered as well (Interview with Crimean Tatar activist, conducted in Kyiv, November 20, 2017). When international attention and media coverage were absent in Crimea, anti-Maidan forces felt emboldened to viciously repress pro-democratic protesters. Each of the cases that I have detailed in this section illustrate the mechanisms laid out in my theoretical framework – people were acutely aware of the importance of foreign media, and they duly recognized its ability to provide some degree of protection for protesters.

Taking the preceding information together, I turn now to my fourth and final mechanism of external democratic promotion – the sense that by connecting with people in other countries, whether it be diaspora members or other citizens, Euromaidan protesters were able to obtain certain resources and exert political pressure in other countries in a way that would have been impossible without these linkages.

Mechanism 1.4: Citizens Shaping Ukrainian Politics from Outside its Borders

This final mechanism involved in external democratic promotion concerns the material and political benefits that Euromaidan protesters gained by building connections with ordinary people in other countries and the effects these benefits had on their perceptions and beliefs. I begin this section by providing examples of several cases in which activists were intentionally trying to solicit help from abroad, before then showing how citizens in other countries (often members of the Ukrainian diaspora) were able to provide material resources and generate political pressure on their own domestic leaders to sustain the broader movement.

It is important to note that many Ukrainian protesters at that time were actively seeking support from people in other countries. As an example of this, one current
Member of the Verkhovna Rada recounted to me how she and several of her colleagues (none of whom were parliamentarians at the time) traveled abroad to solicit assistance: “We communicated with different international organizations, different institutions. We visited Strasbourg, and we had a meeting with the General Secretary, with the Commissioner of Human Rights (Mr. Muiznieks)...And I remember his visit to Ukraine was planned for March, and we came in January, and we were crying, demanding to make his visit earlier, to stop the violation of human rights. And to save people’s lives. And he changed his decision, he came to Ukraine as I remember February 1, and it somehow influenced the decision of the power to make pressure on the activists” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, May 22, 2017).

As another example, one prominent protester who became well-known for her usage of Twitter to garner international attention and support told me,

“I knew that Twitter was the perfect way to spread information on social media. And obviously there are a lot of politicians on there, so it’s much easier to reach them with your information than on Facebook. That is why I chose Twitter, and that is why I chose writing in English. Because I do remember that on the first very, very big demonstration, which happened on 24th of November, it was Sunday. More than 100,000 people showed up. And basically no one really believed that so many people would come...Even those Ukrainian friends that I had, on Facebook they were writing that, I joined Maidan, or I joined this demonstration. They were writing this. Also, I support Europe, Ukraine is Europe, but they were writing this in Ukrainian or Russian. And then just like the very basic idea – if you want Europe to knew there is a huge nation knocking on their door and saying, we are Europe as well, and we want to be part of your family, it’s very natural that you let Europeans know about it. And that I why I started Tweeting in English, and it’s just boom. I didn’t expect that it would get so big” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, April 19, 2017).

Interestingly, and much in the same vein, this particular interview touched upon a YouTube video entitled, “I Am A Ukrainian.” Filmed during the middle point of the protests, the video features a young, English-speaking Ukrainian woman informing viewers about the situation in Ukraine and directly urging them to contact their elected
officials and ask them to put pressure on the Yanukovych regime. Filmed with striking visuals and dramatic music, the video was clearly designed and disseminated with the express purpose of reaching an outside audience. Similarly, another activist who was one of the leading organizers of and translators for an online platform known as *Euromaidan Press* explained her interest in translating news stories into English, stating that “at that time, there were very few outlets covering Ukraine in English. There are more right now, but at that time, most foreign correspondents relied on Russian media coverage of the protests, which obviously skewed the picture. So we wanted to provide our own point of view.” For these protesters, building bridges with people in other countries during the revolution was clearly a significant priority.

I now turn to a discussion of ways in which actors in other countries played a role in affecting the dynamics of the Euromaidan revolutions. It is important to stress here that this mechanism is distinct from the second theoretical mechanism identified and explored above – strategic aid and support from governments and non-governmental organizations in other countries. I argue that ordinary citizens and members of a country’s diaspora should be viewed as a wholly separate set of actors that exists quite apart from governmental forces, as their support and assistance is entirely voluntary and is much more organic and bottom-up than is support emanating from governments or strategic democratic organizations. In contrast to more explicitly political figures, ordinary citizens rarely need to weigh their support against broader underlying geopolitical considerations or tactical priorities.
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101 I mentioned that this particular video in fact inspired my interest both in this thematic topic and in Ukraine more specifically, and my interviewee mentioned that she was close friends with this woman. As of November 2019, the video has 8.9 million views.

102 Interview conducted in Kyiv, April 26, 2017.
Key among these influential civilian actors were members of the Ukrainian diaspora, as they were uniquely plugged into the situation and were well-aware of what was taking place at the time\textsuperscript{103}. One of the most significant ways in which the diaspora played a role during Euromaidan was to provide tangible resources and donations that sustained protesters in their challenge against the regime\textsuperscript{104}. One sociologist recounted to me, “It was very interesting to see how people compare Euromaidan and Orange Revolution. Because the Orange Revolution was funded by the party [the Our Ukraine Bloc, a political party closely associated with 2004 Presidential winner Viktor Yushchenko] and Euromaidan was not. Funding was coming from different sources. And one of the sources was diaspora. Diaspora was collecting money and sending money. So somehow people from the diaspora also provided us with financial support as well. Also things, clothes, food, medicine...people got, like, whole boxes of medicine, for example, coming from somewhere. Usually it was medicine for seasonal diseases, like flu, cough, vitamins” (Interview with sociologist at the Center for Urban History of East Central Europe, conducted in Lviv, December 3, 2017).

\textsuperscript{103} As one interviewee mentioned to me, “During Euromaidan, the support of diaspora was very strong, as I know. Because even I was contacted several different times. Our diaspora in Switzerland, the Ukrainian diaspora in London – the so-called Euromaidan London – and also some guys from Canada. And I also have some friends in the United States, and they communicated with me, but they’re not diaspora – just simple friends” (Interview with former student activist and civil society organizer, conducted in Kyiv, December 8, 2017). This quotation demonstrates that while members of the diaspora were the key sources of support among actors in different countries, they were not the only important individuals – instead, many non-Ukrainian allies of the movement assisted as well.

\textsuperscript{104} Indeed, one interviewee noted, “There was definitely a huge support of Ukrainian diaspora in Canada. I would say that there was this Russian propaganda information circulating that the Maidan was sponsored by the Department of State in the US, but it actually was sponsored by the diaspora in Canada (laughs). Yeah, seriously, they sent a lot of money for this. They invested a lot of resources.” The same respondent also noted, “It was very important to get support from Ukrainian diaspora, from Canada, United States, and European Union. It was very important. It was financial support, goods, it was also very important to get their support during invasion and so it was like the main...and also support from our friends in EU. So from Poland, from Lithuania, these are our main friends. Baltic states – Latvia, Estonia. So this is important because it is our future” (Interview with policy analyst at the think tank Institute for World Politics, conducted in Kyiv, April 6, 2017).
Another interviewee echoed these claims, stating, “Our movement didn’t feel so much support from Western officials, but in the beginning of January, we start to get some help from Ukrainians abroad. From Canada, from USA, and from NGOs, from Western NGOs. It was warm clothes, medicine, I don’t have information about money. I think it was money too, but I didn’t see that” (Interview with civil society activist at Chesno organization, conducted in Kyiv, March 22, 2017). This type of support was particularly important for protesters given the fact that they were taking to the streets in a Ukrainian winter, a time of long, cold nights. If protesters knew that the diaspora was sending medicine and other resources to maintain the movement’s strength, it seems likely to conclude that this would alter their perceptions of the level of danger or discomfort that might be involved in joining the movement.

Other respondents pointed to more tactical types of resources that the diaspora and allies in other countries sent to protesters. One interviewee at the Fulbright Program Ukraine noted, “I think the most effective was this whole notion...of global Ukrainians. Ukrainians from all around the world bought those thermal binoculars, things, heat-sensitive night-vision things. And even more for drones, and even money for first aid. For the war, even things like socks. That all came from donations from not only Ukrainians, who were very, very generous, but they don’t have the means like Ukrainian-Americans, Ukrainian-Canadians...I mean, everybody stepped up to the plate. So I think a lot of that came from feeling the support – a lot of the will to continue going on – came from the support of these organizations” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, November 24, 2017). It is important here to underscore that the Euromaidan movement was of course heavily supported by many average Ukrainians. Indeed, Ukrainians in Ukraine donated time, food, money, clothing, and shelter to the protesters to sustain
them in their cause. In addition to this, however, the diaspora (many of whom are wealthier and more able to access certain goods) were influential in providing their own support as well\footnote{Another interviewee reinforced the notion that while the diaspora did play a central role in terms of providing resources from the outside, non-Ukrainians elsewhere played some role as well. According to my respondent, “There certainly were Ukrainian diaspora people who were bringing materials forward, and they were coming to participate. And they were coming from all over the place. And I imagine there were also friends of Ukraine who aren’t Ukrainian, don’t have Ukrainian heritage themselves, but they’re Poles, Lithuanians, and those kinds of people who had the time and the capacity to come and participate” (Interview with Program Manager at Freedom House Ukraine, conducted in Kyiv, December 4, 2017).}

Still other respondents pointed to different ways in which donations and money from the diaspora mattered. One former activist mentioned, “So people on Maidan felt a lot of support. And not just spiritual or emotional, but financial also. People in diaspora communities, they raised millions. They were sending money to different organizations, to different Maidan-related institutions who were kind of releasing the prisoners, for instance. At that time, a big issue was that police was arresting people and in order to release them, there was a lot of money involved, to pay lawyers. So yeah, in short, a lot of support. And not just from diaspora, but also from international governments supporting the revolution and understanding that Yanukovych is not the best President” (Interview with former Euromaidan activist and current project manager for the Lviv Education Foundation, conducted in Lviv, December 5, 2017). This quote is particularly interesting as it points to another financial aspect that would have mattered to protesters – the ability to pay lawyers for assistance. Again, if participants were aware that this type of money was available from actors elsewhere, this would bolster their willingness to continue agitating in the movement.

While the preceding section has shown that members of the Ukrainian diaspora and their allies were important in sustaining protesters’ willingness to fight by providing
resources to make the movement more likely to succeed, many respondents also pointed to the fact that Ukrainians abroad were petitioning their own governments to pay attention to and support Euromaidan. As one policy analyst noted, “Well, the Ukrainian diaspora all over the world joined and communicated their support very quickly. Especially the young people also who are studying all over Europe. They were joining and making their position very loudly and very quickly. So this happened, and it helped a lot. Ukrainian diaspora also played very important role of helping us get our message to the different countries, because they were the ones who were helping to connect with the foreign media, they were the ones who were helping to connect with foreign politicians, who were bringing foreign politicians to Ukraine to show them what was actually happening on the streets of Kyiv and other cities. And I think that international support during most of the time of Euromaidan was very important” (Interview with former activist and current staffer for the Ministry of Health, conducted via Skype, December 21, 2017).

Another interviewee provided an interesting and unique perspective as a Ukrainian activist who was not present in Ukraine for much of Euromaidan, but was instead in Washington, D.C. at that time. As he recounted, “But from my perspective and my close community, we felt more than enough support from the international community. You have at that time, for instance, in each of the large cities everywhere around the world where there were at least some Ukrainians, or people from our friendly countries, there were videos taped in support of Maidan. There were fundraisers in support of Maidan. There were – I mean, when I was in D.C., at least three or four times a week there were protests or gatherings near the White House, kind of demanding that the U.S. sign some kind of sanctions towards the Yanukovych regime.
And they were working” (Interview with former Euromaidan activist and current project manager for the Lviv Education Foundation, conducted in Lviv, December 5, 2017).

This strategy of citizens elsewhere lobbying their own government to support Euromaidan was also apparent to another interviewee, who told me, “Obviously the primary concern was that you should make your voice heard abroad and petition foreign governments to exercise pressure on the Ukrainian government at the time. And what many of the Ukrainians did – because Ukraine has a very big diaspora across the world, especially Canada and also in the Czech Republic, and in Italy, and Portugal, and so many other countries – and they had their own smaller Euromaidans and called their respective governments to put sanctions on the Ukrainian officials... what we really hoped for, back then, was for Western governments to convince Yanukovych to go" (Interview with analyst from Aktis Strategy, conducted in Kyiv, March 31, 2017).

Indeed, one common theme underscoring much of my interviewees’ discussions about pressure from outside recognizes that members of the Ukrainian diaspora and their allies proved themselves to be effective lobbying forces in their own countries of residence. This is particularly true in a country like Canada, where Ukrainian-Canadians make up an estimated 3.95% of the state’s overall population. While a group that comprises approximately 4% of the populace might initially not seem incredibly large, this means that nearly one in every twenty-five Canadians has some Ukrainian origin;

106 Ultimately, from a diplomatic perspective, representatives from the governments of Poland, Germany, and France played a key role in negotiating a peace deal between Yanukovych and the opposition; the deal was never implemented because Yanukovych fled to Russia before its terms took place, but the presence of foreign powers here was still clear. As evidence, see: Easton, Adam. “Poland’s Crucial Role as Yanukovych’s Rule Crumbled.” British Broadcasting Company. Published February 24, 2014. Available online at https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-26342883.

this is not far from the percentage of Americans who identify as Asian-American, at 5.2%\textsuperscript{108}. This is clearly a significant percentage of the population, and represents a group that can have serious sway over the Canadian government’s policies and priorities. Ukrainians were aware that this potentially influential force existed, and many protesters were intent on utilizing this resource in any way possible.

Indeed, particularly with the Canadian case, there is ample journalistic evidence that members of the Ukrainian diaspora there regularly hold dialogues with various elected officials to advance their cause. A 2016 British Broadcasting Company report details how Ukrainian-Canadian civil society organizations such as the International Council in Support of Ukraine meet with Canadian parliamentarians to inform them about Ukraine’s war with Russia and to facilitate legislators’ travel to the country\textsuperscript{109}. Interestingly, the same article also notes how Canadian-Ukrainian groups have been instrumental in sending supplies and funding to help the Ukrainian army in its battle against Russia-backed separatists; this is not related to Euromaidan specifically, but it is still evidence of transatlantic assistance. Similarly, a Reuters article written in February 2014 (days before snipers started to shoot protesters en masse) detailed the many ways in which Ukrainians in Canada were assisting the protests, with many sending resources and financial aid and others actually traveling to Kyiv to participate themselves\textsuperscript{110}. Taken together with my interviewees’ on-the-ground observations, this clearly shows that the diaspora mattered deeply in many ways.


The preceding section has shown the four key ways in which external democratic support affected the calculations, perceptions, and beliefs of participants in the Euromaidan movement. External democratic promotion and assistance played a role by 1) lending an air of purposive solidarity in which Euromaidan movements held around the world and statements from politicians showed protesters that they were not alone; 2) providing strategic and tactical assistance from external forces including health care to increase the probability that the movement would continue; 3) enhancing the presence of international media that maintained the ability to transmit depictions of repression and violence to the outside world, reducing the chance that the regime would brutally attack people; and 4) utilizing the existence of a large diaspora that sent material and financial resources to sustain the campaign and pressured their leaders for support, increasing participants’ certainty that they could succeed. Throughout this chapter, it is essential to reiterate again that I am not claiming that protesters behaved a certain way because Western actors were instructing them to do so. Instead, I show that in addition to important domestic factors, these international variables factored into their consideration on the viability of protest as well.

It can be valuable to conclude this section within the context of Ukraine by graphically presenting the results of another closed-ended survey question which asked interviewees to rate the importance (in their opinion) of Western actors supporting pro-democratic protests in Ukraine. As displayed clearly in Figure 3.7 below, the vast majority of my respondents indicated that they found support extremely vital and necessary – 60.17% view support as “very” important and 33.05% view it as “somewhat” important. In fact, only 5.08% believe such support to be “not very” important or “not at
all” important, indicating that nearly everyone with whom I spoke perceives democratic assistance as a valuable policy tool for Western governments working with Ukraine. This is likely due to the fact that many Ukrainian politicians are still seen as highly corrupt and as members of the old “system,” meaning that they have few incentives to bring about real reform through the enactment and implementation of new legislation. Western states have the power to pressure them in a way that local forces simply cannot, meaning that this support could be extremely important for promoting further democratization in Ukraine. This reveals that many Ukrainians do believe that foreign aid and assistance can make a difference – if they felt instead that their own leaders were unsusceptible to influence from the outside, their responses to this question would be quite different.

I turn now to the second substantive area of study in this chapter – an examination of protesters’ perceptions of autocratic intervention from the Russian government designed to diminish the Euromaidan movement’s chance at success.
Effects of Autocratic Intervention on Protesters’ Beliefs and Perceptions

In the following section, I detail four main contextual factors and mechanisms that, according to my interviews, drove protesters’ calculations about participating in the movement: 1) the widespread (and resentful) sense that the Russian government had a long history of meddling in Ukraine’s political affairs; 2) resentment over Russian coverage of the protests’ origins and evolution; 3) suspicions about Russian forces aiding Ukrainian riot police to undermine protesters’ ability to successfully challenge the regime; and 4) concerns about Ukraine becoming too much like Russia if a drastic course of action did not prevent such an outcome;

Following my approach in the preceding section, before I delve into the qualitative mechanisms that my conversations identified and highlighted, I begin my analysis by presenting the simple statistical findings of a question on my closed-ended survey in order to quantitatively assess opinions about the Russian government’s role in the Euromaidan movement. The question read, “Based on your observations, did protesters’ calculations about the Russian government’s reaction to Euromaidan have any effect on peoples’ perceptions, strategies, or goals?” I provide a graphical overview of respondents’ opinions in Figure 3.8 below.

According to my findings, while my interviewees were not as widely convinced that actions by the Russian government affected protesters’ calculations as they were that Western forces mattered in this way, a majority still felt that the reaction of the Russian government had some effect on protesters’ behavior. 33.89% of respondents felt that it was “somewhat likely” that protesters considered the actions of the Russian government while another 26.27% felt that it was “very likely,” for a combined total of 60.16%. In contrast, 24.58% of interviewees felt that it was “somewhat unlikely” that
protesters gave much thought to Russian involvement at the time, 13.56% felt that it was “very unlikely,” and another 1.69% could not determine a final opinion on the matter\(^{111}\).

In order to illustrate respondents’ own personal beliefs about Russian intervention at the time, I present the results of another closed-ended survey question in Figure 3.9 below. This question read, “If you feel that Russia was intervening to undermine Euromaidan’s success, what are some ways in which the Russian regime might have been acting?” Respondents had the chance to select as many of the optional choices as they wished – if they did not feel that the Russian government was playing a

\(^{111}\) It is important to briefly qualify these survey results by noting that this particular question was not worded as clearly as it could have been. My intention in asking the question was to see whether protesters felt that the Russian government was intervening to affect the Euromaidan movement’s success and whether this consequently affected their decision to participate in the movement, and the question as written does not reflect this sentiment as neatly as it could. However, I can ameliorate this by noting that virtually every single respondent completed the closed-ended survey after we had already had extensive open-ended conversations about these topics, and so the general sentiment of what I was truly hoping to capture was understood by all participants.
part at the time, they would not have selected any response, while if they felt that interference was multi-pronged, they could choose numerous factors.

Figure 3.9 provides the percentage of respondents who felt that each of the four possible options were in play during Euromaidan. It is interesting to note that virtually every interviewee selected at least one response for this question, indicating that everyone with whom I spoke felt that the Putin regime was intervening in at least one way. Narrowing the focus specifically to focus on each action individually, vast majorities felt that the Russian government provided financial aid to Yanukovych (88.46%) and that Putin was waging a propaganda campaign through the media and Internet to undermine the movement’s success (84.62%). Given the numerous revelations in recent years about armies of online Russian “trolls” and their efforts to weaken democratic elections in Western states, this should come as no surprise\(^\text{112}\).

A majority of respondents (51.92%) felt that the Putin regime supplied some type of military aid to Viktor Yanukovych, primarily understood as tactical weapons and other resources rather than physical manpower, while a significantly smaller share (38.46%) felt that the Russian government actually sent some troops to suppress the protests. In the aggregate, therefore, these results indicate that most interviewees with whom I spoke for this dissertation felt that the Putin regime played some role in supporting Yanukovych, intervening to protect its ally against protesters. I turn now to a discussion of the first primary authoritarian mechanism highlighted in the following section – a widespread and resentful sense that the Russian government was constantly affecting Ukrainian affairs.

\(^{112}\) Indeed, McFaul (2018) provides ample evidence of these efforts to disrupt the operations of Western democracy in his account of his experience serving as the United States of America’s Ambassador to Russia from 2012 to 2014.
Mechanism 2.1: Unwanted Russian Intrusion in Ukraine’s Political Affairs

This first causal mechanism concerns the fact that for years, many pro-Western Ukrainians were intensely aware that there were close connections between the regimes of Yanukovych and Putin. Indeed, as one respondent noted, “Well, in Ukraine, we knew that Yanukovych was mostly pro-Russian president. Even as early as 2004, when there was a presidential election in Ukraine and two candidates were running against each other. It was Yanukovych and the guy who became the president eventually, Viktor Yushchenko. But before that, we also had a revolution with people protesting against the falsification of the election. But before the results were even officially declared by the Ukrainian election commission, what Putin did, he called his friend Yanukovych to congratulate him on his victory in this election. So it was sort of a symbolic thing to see that a president of a bordering country congratulates a candidate who is not yet sure to have won. And so from this time, it was obvious their connection with Putin” (Interview 0102030405060708090100 Military aid to the Yanukovych regime Sending troops Providing financial aid Online and media propaganda campaign)
with analyst at the Institute for Economic Research and Policy Counseling, conducted in Kyiv, November 15, 2017). For numerous Ukrainians such as this individual, the clear and observable ties between Yanukovych and Putin ran long and deep.

Other respondents pointed to efforts by the Russian government to undermine Ukrainian identity and history in order to make the country more hospitable (or subservient) towards Russia, as well as the perception that Yanukovych and his allies willingly joined in this campaign as well. One individual recounted, “Again, it was understandable for each of us that Russia was trying in some way to support the Ukrainian government, because in that time, Yanukovych and his party were more pro-Russian, they were trying to play very sensitive topics, history, second World War, culture, language, even the creation of Ukraine” (Interview with former student activist and civil society organizer, conducted in Kyiv, December 8, 2017). Another interviewee used a more colorful analogy to describe many Ukrainians’ underlying desire to firmly break away from domineering Russian influence, noting, “You know, we are used to saying...in the Soviet Union, we were taught to say that all of the countries in Soviet Union are sister countries. And they used to say that ‘Moscow is the elder sister of Kyiv,’ or something like that. And everyone was still kind of afraid of talking bad about the elder sister. It’s like having an elder sister who is sort of weird and violent, and you don’t really want to have anything to do with her, but you’re afraid because she can like go and slap your ass” (Interview with activist, conducted in Kyiv, December 6, 2017).

Serhiy Leshchenko, a former investigative reporter and then-current Member of the Verkhovna Rada with whom I spoke, specifically mentioned a widespread sense that the Putin regime was supporting Viktor Yanukovych financially. As he recounted to me, “At that time, Yanukovych was recognized as pro-Russian President, so it was clear for
everybody that the President received support from Russia. It was media coverage, it was financial support, it was consultants, assistants, Yanukovych with Russian roots, and so on” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, May 25, 2017). Similarly, others noted that many in society resented both the Yanukovych regime’s outward support for and reliance on the Russian government as well as the internal composition of its Cabinet members. A policy analyst mentioned that “the nationalist movement was most importantly not willing to see Ukraine to Russia, but that was the main motivation. And also ideologically strongly opposing Yanukovych because in foreign policy, they were not so like pro-Russian as most people think, but internally, they had strongly pro-Russian education minister” (Interview with political analyst from the Institute for Euro-Atlantic Cooperation, conducted in Kyiv, November 21, 2017). For these people, therefore, the perception that the Russian government was playing too large a role in influencing Ukrainian political affairs provided adequate motivation to join the Euromaidan protest.

As noted in other parts of this dissertation, a significant number of protesters came from Lviv and other cities in Western Ukraine. This intense dislike of Russian influence on Ukraine appears to be stronger among citizens in this region than it is for individuals in other parts of the country. As an active leader of Lviv’s Euromaidan protest mentioned, “That is the main characteristic of Western Ukraine. We always perceive Russia as the main enemy. Always...Yanukovych was always called pro-Russian politician, and we totally understood that he is rebroadcasting Putin’s message. He was not acting on his own; he was too stupid to do that...There was no doubt that everything, like the beginning of Russian aggression, and actually, what had happened then on the Euromaidan, when students were beaten, when the demonstrators were beaten on the 10th, 11th December and so on...we see that the straight orders of Putin, who was not
able to see that Ukraine is not the country when you can threaten people like he does in Russia” (Interview with singer and activist, conducted in Lviv, May 2, 2017). This quote is particularly interesting, as it suggests that many protesters actively perceived the presence of direct Russian intervention guiding Yanukovych’s response at the time. This spurred feelings of resentment and anger, making protest participation more likely. Indeed, as this same individual mentioned, “The more that Russia disagreed with what we were doing, we just did it harder!”

The preceding section shows that for many activists, the fact that the Russian government was seen as directly supported Yanukovych politically and financially was the final straw, driven by years of frustration over Putin’s efforts to undermine Ukraine’s Western path and democratic development. Many activists viewed Yanukovych as weak and unintelligent, surmising that he was incapable of remaining in power without guidance from the Russian government. I turn now to the second mechanism presented in this section – resentment and anger at the way that Russian propaganda was working to undermine the protests by framing the movement as fascist and violent.

**Mechanism 2.2: Resentment over Russian Coverage of the Euromaidan Protests**

An important theme that emerged in several of my interviews was a notable irritation over the way that Russian media depicted the protests at the time that they were taking place. This coverage adopted many disingenuous strategies in order to make the protesters seem both smaller in number and more vicious than they actually were. On the matter of Russian media presenting a biased image of the protest, one former Ukrainian reporter recalled of the time, “And at the same moment when I was making my report [on the Maidan], I saw the news crew of NTV, or the First Channel, I don’t
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113 Lucas (2014) notes that these efforts to manipulate Ukraine are likely continuing in the present day.
remember, but it was definitely a Russian channel. And they were saying they found a little piece of square, a technical square, where nobody was standing. Because it was not possible to stand there, because fences were blocking it. And they were standing there live, and saying, you see, we are in the square of independence, and nothing is going on. Impossible!” (Interview with former television reporter, conducted in Kyiv, March 17, 2017). During this same conversation, the former reporter also discussed ways in which Russian state media would use footage that was nearly ten years old to convince viewers that the Euromaidan movement was much smaller than it actually was – “In terms of editing, they just took the video for instance from Euromaidan, but not from this time. From 2005. And they told that you see, there is nobody on that street.” These efforts were clearly done to show viewers that the movement was weak and would not succeed, both to reduce the chance that a similar movement would emerge in Russia and to send a signal to Ukrainians sympathetic to the Yanukovych regime that the protests were not to be taken seriously.

Another common strategy in the Russian media was to depict protesters as paid lackeys of Western governments, with a particular amount of attention being paid to the role of the United States of America and the Central Intelligence Agency. One activist at the Reanimation Package for Reforms told me, “Victoria Nuland, when she came to Kyiv, she took a pack of biscuits and other foods to Maidan. And obviously all the reporters fixed on that moment. And I remember that pro-Yanukovych media, and also in Russia, it was described as, you see this foreign government feeding their proxies. And it was so nasty, because it was just an act of good will to support protesters, but it
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114 Many people in Eastern Ukraine traditionally view and listen to media from the Russian Federation, rather than Ukrainian state television channels. This means that these types of reports were being processed and absorbed not only by individuals in Russia, but by many individuals in Ukraine as well.
was depicted as people eating from the hands of USA. But higher officials came to
Maidan as ordinary citizens, just to speak with citizens and to offer their help”
(Interview with activist, conducted in Kyiv, March 23, 2017). This concept came up
several times throughout my conversations, with numerous participants actively
disavowing its accuracy. One respondent indicated that it was foolish to think that
anyone would risk their lives for ten dollars a day\textsuperscript{115}, while another joked that if
participants were indeed paid for their time, she was still waiting for her check from the
American government\textsuperscript{116}.

Kasparov (2015) discusses this in his analysis of Russia under Vladimir Putin,
noting that Russian media played up American influence as much as it could, even going
so far as to claim (with no evidence) that protesters were being armed and trained by
American troops\textsuperscript{117}. Further underscoring this belief among consumers of Russian
media at the time, one ethnically mixed Ukrainian-Russian activist explained to me
about her relatives,

“Many European and American officials came to visit [the Maidan]. There was
this famous joke, cookies from the Department of State. So Victoria Nuland, an
official from the Department of State, she was responsible for European and
Eurasian Affairs. So she was a frequent guest in the region, and in Ukraine in
particular. So once she came to Maidan and she had some cookies with her, and
she started distributing cookies. She’s a high-ranking official, and she brought the
media with her. And then the Russian media picked it up, like, look, Maidan is
supported by the Americans, it’s all FBI or it’s CIA, who staged all this
performance, and so now the protesters are getting their salary in cookies. And
I’m half-Russian and the majority of my relatives are in Russia. And up until this
day, they do think that I got paid for protesting. By the U.S. No matter what I try,
it’s still there. I was paid by the U.S. This is how big support U.S. gave to
Euromaidan (laughs)” (Interview with reporter from the Ukraine Crisis Media
Centre, conducted in Kyiv, March 29, 2017).

\textsuperscript{115} Interview with Professor of Political Science at the National University of Kyiv – Mohyla Academy,
\textsuperscript{116} Interview with civil society activist and prominent Twitter user, conducted in Kyiv, April 19, 2017.
\textsuperscript{117} Kasparov, Garry. 2015. Winter is Coming: Why Vladimir Putin and the Enemies of the Free World
Others took umbrage at the fact that Russian media depicted all Euromaidan participants as vicious far-right, nationalist extremists, using the actions of a few to tar the legitimacy and reputation of the entire group. One political analyst noted, “During the Euromaidan events, Russia several times spoke out for Yanukovych and against the protesters, and then the Russian official media – state media – released lots of lies and lots of confrontational argumentations about how Maidan is so fascist, and how the people are some guys from out of nowhere who were just paid to participate, and how they are being treated with drugs on Maidan. And other bullshit” (Interview with political analyst from the Institute for Euro-Atlantic Cooperation, conducted in Kyiv, November 21, 2017). These types of misleading claims frustrated protesters, and made it more likely that they would remain on the streets.

Similarly, a political theorist recounted to me the ways in which media coverage of protesters as fascists fed into a pre-existing framework that Yanukovych himself had previously helped develop in conjunction with Putin to criticize anyone who was opposed to his regime. As he recalled, “The narrative of fascists was developed long enough before. Yanukovych and Russia developed it together. Deploying Russian “political technologists.” In 2004, despite Kuchma’s problems, he never used the fascist card. Yanukovych did it during his campaign, when he tried to call Yushchenko a fascist. He can say a lot of bad things about Yushchenko, but he has nothing to do with fascists. So the seed was planted at that time” (Interview with Ukrainian philosopher and theorist, conducted in Kyiv, April 25, 2017). Unsurprisingly, this depiction of pro-Western actors as “fascists” is a relatively common strategy employed by the Russian government. In recent years, the Putin regime has repeatedly branded the leaders of
countries such as Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as fascists, attempting to use the Soviet Union’s pride in defeating Nazi Germany in World War II as a way to frame Russia as a credible character witness on identifying fascism today.

Many participants at Euromaidan understandably resented this depiction, particularly as this portrayal became increasingly widespread among their family members or contacts in Russia. As one student noted, “And two other people that I had conversations with from Russia, they had quite another point of view. They thought that NATO gave weapons to the Maidan protesters, and these weapons – policemen were killed and so forth, and also there are a lot of CIA spies there, and maybe there are even some NATO agents, and when it really started to killing people like with snipers, they also said that maybe it’s not SBU, our national security agency, they thought that it’s not them who are doing it, but there may be some unknown killers who were hired by NATO or the United States. That most of the people that participated were nationalists, and evil Ukrainian fascists, Nazis, who were against Russians, who wanted to kill Russian population in Ukraine, to make it genocide, and other irrelevant


120 Interview with former television reporter, conducted in Kyiv, March 17, 2017.

121 Interview with reporter and activist from Euromaidan Press, conducted in Kyiv, April 26, 2017.

122 Interview with activist, conducted in Kyiv, December 9, 2017.

123 One respondent also noted that this coverage was certainly inspired by the Russian government’s efforts to fracture Ukrainian society. As he mentioned, “So it was important for Russia to have events unfold in this direction, so there’s a civic war in Ukraine, and people in the East who are Russian-speaking are endangered by the fascist Ukrainian government who wants to make them all Ukrainian” (Interview with former Euromaidan activist and current project manager for the Lviv Education Foundation, conducted in Lviv, December 5, 2017). Several other respondents echoed similar claims, suggesting that Ukrainians and ethnic Russians in Ukraine’s East were more likely to consume media from Russia than media from Ukraine, and were therefore persuaded that all Euromaidan participants were violent thugs who would attack all Russian-speakers. This was ironic, as I observed during my time in Ukraine that Russian was actually much more widely spoken in Kyiv than Ukrainian.
stuff” (Interview with student, conducted in Kyiv, November 22, 2017). Still others noted that the coverage was likely designed to make the protests look bad in the eyes of Western governments, a tactic that was perceived as attempting to undermine the West’s burgeoning support for protesters’ demands.

One American reporter made the compelling argument that Russian coverage of the protests was likely shaped not only by a desire to shape Ukraine’s politics, but Russia’s as well. As he mentioned, “The way that Russia reacted to the Maidan was obviously a reaction to the protests that happened in Russia a few years prior to that. And I think Russia didn’t want the revolution here to work, because they knew it would inspire another one in Russia. So I think Russia did everything it could to discredit the revolution here, at least in least in the eyes of the Russian people. A CIA-sponsored coup, put in place by the fascist government” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, November 16, 2017).

This section has shown that the Russian government’s depiction of the Euromaidan protests as 1) smaller and weaker than they truly were, 2) directed and paid by the Central Intelligence Agency, and 3) more violent, less tolerant, and intensely “fascist” was adopted by the Putin regime to discredit the movement and weaken its
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124 Interestingly, much tangible evidence has since emerged about the extent to which Russian “trolls” were propagating this narrative. According to a 2017 *Washington Post* article, members of the Russian GRU (a military spy agency) created fake social media profiles with false names, claiming to be ethnic Ukrainians living in Ukraine at the time. They then posted comments designed to inflame the situation and turn Russia-friendly residents of Ukraine away from the protests, including, “I live in Kiev. I was on the Maidan, but peaceful protest ended two months ago, when we were displaced by armed nationalists. It's a nightmare. Fascists came to us again 70 years after the Second World War. I do not want this future for Ukraine;” “Brigades of zapadentsy [pro-Westerners] are now on their way to rob and kill us. It is very clear that these people hold nothing sacred;” and “The rise of the opposition here will be catastrophic. These people are completely different. They have a totally different vision of Ukraine’s future.” For evidence, see: Nakashima, Ellen. “Inside a Russian disinformation campaign in Ukraine in 2014.” *The Washington Post*. Published December 25, 2017. Available online at https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/inside-a-russian-disinformation-campaign-in-ukraine-in-2014/2017/12/25/f55b0408-e71d-11e7-ab50-621fe0588340_story.html?utm_term=.fe5ef9256863.

125 Interview with Vice Rector of Ukrainian Catholic University, conducted in Lviv, May 4, 2017.
effectiveness. Protesters at the time were very aware of how they were being portrayed on Russian state media – if this were not the case, I would not have had so many respondents mention this media coverage as an issue that bothered them at the time. For many people, they therefore became more devoted to protesting than they otherwise would have been. I now turn to the third mechanism presented in this section – frustration over perceptions that the Russian government was sending military aid to keep Yanukovych in power.

Mechanism 2.3: Frustration at the Fact that Putin was Sending Forces for Help

Many protesters were therefore aware that the Russian government was monitoring the movement and that there would potentially be some type of pushback to support Yanukovych. As one interviewee mentioned, “Yanukovych and his lies have always been perceived as a pro-Russian force. So we understood that if Maidan went too far, there would be some backlash from Russia” (Interview with lawyer, conducted in Kyiv, May 19, 2017). Information about direct Russian involvement in terms of sending troops or military tools is still highly ambiguous, and much uncertainty remains about the extent to which the Russian government actually sent direct assistance. Nevertheless, a large share of my interviewees indicated some belief that this took place – more than forty percent believed that Russia sent some type of security troops, while more than fifty percent believed that Russia sent military aid without actually providing manpower.

One American reporter who spent a significant amount of time at the Maidan recounted how he interacted extensively with security forces sent by the Yanukovych regime to quell the protesters. Though he could not independently verify that several soldiers actually came from Russia, he had extremely strong suspicions, stating,
“I think that people believed, and they would tell you that they knew – and I say it that way because Russia operates in such a way that makes it very difficult to ascertain whether they're directly involved. But, people would have told you then and you could see it in some ways at the time, that Russia was aiding Yanukovych. There would be buses full of thuggish-looking titushki [unidentified and anonymous men wearing civilian clothing who would routinely beat demonstrators and kidnap them from rallies], you know, the guys that would come across the border into Novgorod into Ukraine through the Kharkiv region and come to Maidan. The Kharkiv Maidan and the Kyiv Maidan. The security forces, you know, were believed to have help, and I actually had some very interesting and strange days when I got stuff with the Berkut and other armed guys in January and February...I was speaking Russian with them, and I noticed that, like, their accents strongly resembled those of a Moscow accent or a St. Petersburg accent. Like a very thick, true Russian accent, not the kind of Russian that I was used to in Kyiv or Donetsk. And a lot of the security forces did come from Donetsk and Luhansk, and I could tell those guys right away, having been out there. That’s actually the place where I studied Russian...the accent was very different. And I asked some of the guys, and they would jokingly tell me that they were from one place or the other, and I’d try to get more specific. You know, “Oh, you’re from Donbas? I lived out there too for two years! Where are you from?” And they’d say, “Oh, a little town. You wouldn’t know it.” You know, that kind of stuff. Like, all right...and, you know, there were reports at that time of buses coming across the border with police and people with shields, and even just thugs, hired goons, the titushki characters who hang out in Marinsky Park near Parliament. So there was this type of security support coming from Russia. At the same time, there were tons and tons of rumors that Russia was also sending people to mix with the Maidan crowd in order to provoke clashes...To make it look like it was a violent crowd. That the violence was coming from inside the protesters and not from the security forces. (Interview conducted in Kyiv, November 15, 2017).

While this evidence is anecdotal, it provides a strong implication that many people at the time were perceiving that riot police did in fact come from Russia to dampen the protests’ chance at success. It seems eminently reasonable to assume that if an American reporter who had been living in Ukraine for several years was able to determine that many police had a distinctively Russian accent, it would be even more obvious to native Ukrainians.

Other respondents with whom I spoke pointed to their own beliefs that the Russian government was sending military equipment to Yanukovych to strengthen the
regime’s ability to withstand protesters’ demands. One activist who remained at Euromaidan until the movement’s last days recalled his first-hand experience: “About Russian involvement in Euromaidan – I knew some facts. First of these, Russia supported Yanukovych and supported riot police units with Russian stun grenades. It was some facts that journalists published – that two military planes from Russia, they carried these stun grenades. And these flights were in February 2014, exactly before the bloodiest clashes. And I know that they used because I heard stun grenades that were used on Hroshevskovo Street in January, and in February. They were used because they were more powerful. The explosion was louder. So some people, also journalists, they thought that this anti-terrorist operation was planned by some advisors from the Russian security services” (Interview with doctoral student and former Euromaidan protester, conducted in Lviv, December 4, 2017).

Another former protester with whom I spoke echoed these claims, stating, “So basically, there was quite a strong reason to believe that Russia would intervene, and with time, for the activization of the police beatings in January, there were reports – and later, I think they were even proven documentally true – that Yanukovych regime did receive some support in arms from Russia. Like, I think it was hand grenades and guns, stuff like that for the police” (Interview with political analyst from the Institute for Euro-Atlantic Cooperation, conducted in Kyiv, November 21, 2017). Similarly, another respondent pointed specifically to the fact that many of the tools that security forces were using at the time must have come from Russia because they simply were not available in Ukraine when the protests began – as he mentioned, “people had some not reliable myths at that time about Russian troops coming to support the President. What people really know is that during Maidan, several airplanes came to military airfield
near Kyiv and brought special equipment like grenades. Because according to Ukrainian law, cannot strike grenade closer than 6 meters from person. But government forces did this INTO your face directly” (Interview with political theorist, conducted in Kyiv, April 6, 2017). Again, the implication is that many Ukrainians believed that Putin was sending military resources in order to potentially dissuade people from protesting.

According to these individuals, many protesters felt that Putin was providing tactical training and material resources to Yanukovych to increase the chance that he could stay in office. Other respondents indicated the belief that Putin provided Yanukovych with sharpshooters and snipers to shoot protesters126, while still others pointed to the fact that Ukraine’s security institutions had been broadly infiltrated by actors from within Russia127. Many of my interviewees deeply resented the fact that Russia was intervening to directly weaken their efforts to remove Yanukovych from power. This in turn motivated them to take to the streets, deepening their resolve to protest until their movement achieved its goals. I turn now to the fourth and final mechanisms presented in this section – a growing fear that Ukraine was becoming too much like its authoritarian neighbor, Russia.

Mechanism 2.4: Fear of Ukraine Becoming Too Similar to Authoritarian Russia

The final mechanism presented here can be seen as a culmination of sorts into which the three preceding mechanisms connect and flow. In this section, I detail the ways in which protesters’ belief that Ukraine under Yanukovych was coming dangerously close to becoming a fully authoritarian state resembling its autocratic border state of Russia. Activists knew that Yanukovych was financially and politically
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126 Interview with Vice Rector of Ukrainian Catholic University, conducted in Lviv, May 4, 2017.
127 Interview with sociologist at the Center for Urban History of East Central Europe, conducted in Lviv, December 3, 2017.)
reliant upon Putin, and this made them feel that Ukraine stood at a critical juncture requiring immediate action. At the same time, their observance of Russian interference in their affairs and the disingenuous in which the movement was depicted on Russian television increased their fears of Ukraine following a similar trajectory unless immediate steps were taken to reverse this trend.

One activist whose involvement was noteworthy due to the fact that she was a leader of an all-female sotnia (a self-organized group of 100 people) recounted observations from a trip to Russia, and how this knowledge inspired her decision to join Euromaidan: “I was in Russia few years ago. St. Petersburg. And I just walked on Nevsky Prospekt and I saw that every kvartal, a lot of police. And close to metro, I saw people with this blockade. And a sign that said, “Putin to prison,” and I saw how police started to beat the people and pack them in little cars. And from that point, I thought that it’s unbelievable, it cannot be, especially in my country! But then when the police beat the students on Maidan, I understand, hmm, I saw this before in Russia. I don’t want to live in a police country. And I go to my friends and on social media, it was a very tough conversation, and next day a lot of people was on Sophia Square, near the monastery” (Interview with activist and Euromaidan protester, conducted in Kyiv, May 16, 2017). This respondent observed growing (and disturbing) parallels between Russia and Ukraine, and her tangible fear that Ukraine would become a “police state” was a key motivating factor in her decision to protest.

A reporter with whom I spoke offered similar feelings based on conversations with Ukrainians in the years since Euromaidan movement; as he noted, “But then when Yanukovych, you know, beat the crap out of those students that one night, it changed the ballgame. And for a lot of them, it became about not being like Russia. So if there is a
foreign message they’re sending, I think that message is probably more geared towards Moscow in some ways. Like, we don’t want to be a part of your world anymore” (Interview with American journalist, conducted in Kyiv, November 16, 2017). In this case, my interviewee directly suggests that for a subset of protesters, one of their main motivational factors for joining the movement was the chance to send a clear signal to Vladimir Putin that they rejected any situation in which Ukraine would come to mimic Russia in its heavily authoritarian nature.

Another reporter shared this sentiment, particularly regarding younger Ukrainians. As he recounted, “I think that the Ukrainian millennial generation has a real appreciation for how duped the Russian people are by propaganda. They interact with Russians, and one of the really common things that you hear is, I talked to my friends in Russia, or my family, and they don’t believe me when I tell them that Ukraine isn’t a fascist country. That you can walk down the streets of Kyiv and most people speak Russian, and you’re not gonna get beat up by the Banderas running around...And I feel like that awareness, that portal that Ukrainians have to life in Russia, it in some ways inspired – I believe – this very fervent desire among the young people to not end up like that. You know, they don’t want to be like that anymore” (Interview conducted in

---

128 To provide some explanatory context, the term “Banderas” or “Banderistas” refers to historical and modern-day followers of Stepan Bandera, an influential figure in the region in the early twentieth century. Born into the Eastern Galician region of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1909, Bandera became an ardent Ukrainian nationalist after Ukraine briefly experienced a period of independence before being subsumed into an independent Polish state. This nationalism eventually grew into a violent, somewhat fascist movement in which Bandera and his supporters attacked and killed members of other ethnic groups in their quest to gain independence and to establish a Ukrainian state. Much Russian media attempts to paint the majority of Euromaidan protesters as ultra-nationalist fascists in this model. Indeed, when the Russian government annexed Crimea, Vladimir Putin indicated that his country was doing so in order to save its citizens from Ukraine’s new leaders who were “ideological heirs of Bandera, Hitler’s accomplice during World War II.” For reference, see: Faiola, Anthony. “A ghost of World War II history haunts Ukraine’s standoff with Russia.” The Washington Post. Published March 25, 2014. Available online at https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/a-ghost-of-world-war-ii-history-haunts-ukraines-standoff-with-russia/2014/03/25/18d4b1e0-a503-4f73-aaa7-5dd5d6a1e665_story.html?utm_term=.6e3763f4b51d.
Kyiv, November 15, 2017). Again, protesters’ awareness of parallels between Russia and Yanukovych’s Ukraine is stark and clear.

One doctor whom I interviewed had never been politically active before Euromaidan, but he was driven to take to the streets because he viewed Ukraine under Yanukovych as becoming far too similar to Russia. In his own words, “And after this initial stage, when Yanukovych say, no to Euro integration. After this, we understand that it’s final. It’s only Russia, only the rebuilding of USSR...And Putin and government of Russia support Yanukovych to take money, and it’s not good for us. We all understand why our vector, our direction to Europe – not only to Europe, but to civilization, was in danger” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, May 24, 2017). Echoing statements that have been presented above, intervention from the Russian government sent a clear signal to protesters that if they did not act, Ukraine would cooperate more with Putin’s Russia, becoming more authoritarian in the process.

The preceding section has demonstrated the four key ways in which direct and indirect Russian efforts to dampen the Euromaidan movement spurred protesters to take action, illustrating the mechanisms presented in earlier sections of this dissertation. I now present a brief section containing findings from my interviews regarding interviewees’ beliefs about the positive effects that the protests have had on Ukrainian society, as well as areas in which the protests’ goals have not been met.

**What has changed in Ukraine since the Euromaidan Movement?**

First, I present in Figure 10 below the results of another question that I asked respondents to complete. Within the scope of evaluating Euromaidan’s success, the question read, “How would you characterize the movement’s long-term effects today?”
As the figure makes clear, a majority of respondents (60.17%) felt that Euromaidan had been “somewhat successful” in achieving its primary goals. An equal 14.41% of respondents felt that the movement was either “very successful” or “neither successful nor unsuccessful,” while only 11.02% rated the protests’ outcome as either “somewhat unsuccessful” or “very unsuccessful.” In the aggregate, therefore, my respondents clearly feel that the Euromaidan movement had at least some type of beneficial effects on Ukrainian society and politics, even if there were some goals that activists failed to completely attain.

Figure 3.10. Interviewees’ Assessments of Euromaidan’s Success

Which types of positive changes in Ukraine can be attributed to the Euromaidan movement? One of the most common themes raised in my interviews was the sense that Ukrainian citizens had come to see themselves as legitimately influential political actors since the protests took place\(^{129}\). Whereas several people indicated that the average

\(^{129}\) Interview with former Euromaidan activist and current project manager for the Lviv Education Foundation, conducted in Lviv, December 5, 2017.
Ukrainian was rather passive before Euromaidan, preferring to take a hands-off approach and to allow the government to simply provide for them, other indicted that this has changed dramatically. Indeed, the awareness that mass participation on the streets engendered real political transformation helped people realize that they could help guide their country’s political development\textsuperscript{130}, indicating that widespread civic activism was likely to become a fundamental part of Ukraine’s political culture in the future\textsuperscript{131,132}. As one former activist and current Member of the Verkhovna Rada mentioned to me, “I think that we are coming from a vertical society, in a way, where you have decision-makers that are sacred, untouchable, but now I think that society becomes much more horizontal, where decision-making is more horizontal, where social groups are much more involved, or at least have the leverage to influence – through media, through protest, through public discussion, through different kind of activities” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, November 10, 2017)

Other respondents adopted a more philosophical perspective, noting that since Euromaidan, many people came to view themselves as truly “Ukrainian” for the first time in their country’s independent history. Indeed, as the modern state of Ukraine has only existed with its current borders since 1991, many citizens never felt a deep sense of attachment to the nation – instead, people have often traditionally felt a stronger tie to their local city or region than they do to the country as a whole\textsuperscript{133,134,135}. Since

\textsuperscript{130} Interview with lawyer and former Woodrow Wilson Center fellow, conducted in Kyiv, May 19, 2017.
\textsuperscript{131} Interview with a diplomatic member of the European Union Delegation to Ukraine, conducted in Kyiv, December 7, 2017.
\textsuperscript{132} Interview with activist and assistant at the Ukrainian Embassy of Estonia, conducted in Kyiv, May 26, 2017.
\textsuperscript{133} Interview with Professor of History at Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, conducted in Lviv, December 1, 2017.
\textsuperscript{134} Interview with Project Director at American Councils for International Education, conducted in Kyiv, May 15, 2017.
Euromaidan, however, many interviewees noted a significant shift in terms of how average people identify with one another and the state, indicating a profound evolution in political identity and attachment\textsuperscript{136,137,138}.

Other positive effects from the Euromaidan movement that interviewees raised were more practical and tangible in nature. One particularly significant effect was the introduction of visa-free travel for Ukrainian citizens to the European Union\textsuperscript{139}. Prior to the revolution and the introduction of the Poroshenko government, Ukrainians could not travel to any European Union country without securing a complex and costly visa\textsuperscript{140}. Many respondents indicated that travel in the Schengen Zone had therefore been too expensive for most Ukrainians, and that the procurement of this new form of travel was deeply important to many of their countrymen\textsuperscript{141,142}. The fact that Ukrainians can now travel more freely within Europe made respondents that they had more personal and professional options than before (particularly for younger people searching for

\textsuperscript{135} Interview with internally displaced student activist from Luhansk, conducted in Kyiv, May 5, 2017.
\textsuperscript{136} Interview with political analyst and Editor-in-Chief at 112 Ukraine International, conducted in Kyiv, May 17, 2017.
\textsuperscript{137} Interview with Professor of Political Science at the National University of Kyiv – Mohyla Academy, conducted in Kyiv, May 11, 2017.
\textsuperscript{138} For a more rigorous and wide-ranging presentation of these findings, see: Pop—Eleches, Grigore and Graeme Robertson. “Revolutions in Ukraine: Shaping Civic Rather Than Ethnic Identities.” \textit{PONARS Eurasia}. Published February 2018. Available online at \url{http://www.ponarseurasia.org/memo/revolutions-ukraine-shaping-civic-rather-ethnic-identities}. The authors study public opinion polls taken before and after the Orange Revolution and Euromaidan, finding that while neither movement had much effect on respondents’ ethnic identity and affiliation, both movements spurred a significant increase in respondents’ civic attachment to Ukraine as a state and place of residence.
\textsuperscript{139} Interview with Director of European Projects at Internews Ukraine and reporter at Hromadske International, conducted in Kyiv, May 16, 2017.
\textsuperscript{140} Istomina, Toma. “In 2 years, over 2 million Ukrainians make use of visa-free travel to Europe.” \textit{The Kyiv Post}. Published May 12, 2019. Available online at \url{https://www.kyivpost.com/ukraine-politics/in-2-years-over-2-million-ukrainians-make-use-of-visa-free-travel-to-europe.html}.
\textsuperscript{141} Interview with former student protester and activist, conducted in Kyiv, December 5, 2017.
\textsuperscript{142} Interview with German political analyst, conducted in Kyiv, May 23, 2017.
economic opportunities), and the development strengthened many individuals’ ties to the broader European continent.

Another significant development to note here was the introduction of “E-reforms” for public officials in Ukraine. Following sustained pressure from activists and members of civil society, a law was passed in 2017 requiring all governmental officials and public employees to publicly make available a comprehensive list of their assets and personal properties. Designed to combat corruption and illicit profiteering, this legislation represented an important first step for many interviewees towards a more open, democratic, and fair society than had existed in Ukraine before.

What are some areas in which the Euromaidan movement unfortunately failed to create much change? Unsurprisingly for anyone familiar with Ukraine, the largest complaint that interviewees continued to express in the post-Euromaidan era concerned the country’s endemic struggle to eradicate (or even remotely manage) corruption. Many pointed to the creation of the National Anti-Corruption Bureau.

---

143 Interview with sociologist at the Center for Urban History of East Central Europe, conducted in Lviv, December 3, 2017.
144 Interview with singer and activist, conducted in Lviv, May 2, 2017.
145 Interview with Director of European Projects at Internews Ukraine, Author at Euromaidan Press, and journalist at Hromadske, conducted in Kyiv, May 16, 2017.
146 It is important to briefly note that the Verkhovna Rada pushed back against this development during the course of my time in Ukraine, prompting widespread dissatisfaction and frustration among activists by passing a law requiring that all members of civil society declare their own assets as well. This demonstrates that though actors external to the political process in Ukraine hold more sway than before, political elites still enjoy a significant amount of say in protecting their own interests.
147 Interview with political analyst from the Institute for Euro-Atlantic Cooperation, conducted in Kyiv, November 21, 2017.
148 Interview with analyst at Transparency International Ukraine, conducted in Kyiv, December 5, 2017.
149 Interview with official at the International Renaissance Foundation, conducted in Kyiv, December 6, 2017.
150 Interview with former protester and army veteran, conducted in Kyiv, December 8, 2017.
151 Interview with former student activist and current legislative assistant for the Samopovich party, conducted in Kyiv, November 3, 2017.
152 Interview with former activist and current Member of Parliament, conducted in Kyiv, November 10, 2017.
of Ukraine (NABU) as an important tool for keeping officials accountable, but several others noted that corruption still exists de facto as a central part of life in Ukraine, both in day-to-day activities and in the ways in which politics (and particularly members of the government’s legislature and judiciary) operates. As several people noted, this is because the majority of legislators who were in the Verkhovna Rada before the Euromaidan movement were still there at the time that these interviews were conducted – they simply regrouped and reformulated themselves under the labels of new political parties in order to create the appearance, rather than the reality, of political change.

---

153 According to Transparency International’s 2018 Corruption Perceptions Index, Ukraine received a score of 32 out of 100, with lower scores denoting higher levels of corruption. This ranked it at number 120 out of 180 countries in the world, with higher rankings denoting more transparency. In comparison, the 2014 Corruption Perceptions Index assigned Ukraine a score of 26 out of 100, ranking it at 142 out of 174 countries in the study. These findings are available online at [https://www.transparency.org/cpi2018](https://www.transparency.org/cpi2018).

154 Interview with policy analyst, conducted in Kyiv, December 8, 2017.

155 Interview with political analyst from the Institute for Euro-Atlantic Cooperation, conducted in Kyiv, November 21, 2017.

156 Interview with analyst at Transparency International Ukraine, conducted in Kyiv, December 5, 2017.

157 Interview with sociologist at the Center for Urban History of East Central Europe, conducted in Lviv, December 3, 2017.

158 Interview with former protester and army veteran, conducted in Kyiv, December 8, 2017.

159 As one activist mentioned to me during our conversation on the topic of reforms within the government, “I’m sorry, it’s an iceberg. Because here, you have all the same people being corrupted, who are covering all those criminals, so nothing changed really. Except society. A little, but it’s changing” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, December 8, 2017).

160 Interview with Professor of Political Science at the National University of Kyiv – Mohyla Academy, conducted in Kyiv, April 6, 2017.


162 It is very important to note that as of fall 2019, the Ukrainian government contains more new political figures than ever before, following the landslide election of political outsider Volodymyr Zelensky as President and the domination of the Verkhovna Rada by his party, Servant of the People. Many parties in
As one former investigative journalist and current Member of Parliament mentioned to me, fighting corruption in Ukraine has proven to be extremely difficult due to the fact that those within the system who benefit most are therefore the least willing to make true reforms. As he recounted, “Tradition here has not finished. So this is in some sense very dramatic dynamics because we have achievement, but next month, some sliding back decisions. So as for today, there is very unstable achievement because within the area of anti-corruption, we build some institutions, but corrupt politicians looking for different ways to demolish them, to limit their capacity, to discredit them, to fire management for these institutions. Because of the fear that the institutions go after them” (Interview conducted in the Rada, May 25, 2017). This quote shows that while civil society and even some recently elected politicians are working to change Ukraine’s culture of corruption, doing so proves to be a very arduous task.

Mustafa Nayyem, another activist-turned-Member of the Verkhovna Rada, expressed a similar sentiment when I spoke with him in his office: “We are aware and conscious about resistance, because it is aware that we cannot, you know, change country overnight. And it was obvious that they would try to save status quo. Because many people who are now in the power were in the power before that. So we feel that they are putting pressure on us, they are attacking us. Trying to scare or trying to punish, but it’s not successful yet, and I think that the more they will do, the more free will be media...Maybe in the future, we will unite many forces in one big block, and then we will go farther, because now we don’t feel that we can build up something new in this crutch, and the biggest problem is not even the organization of resources, but the

the 2019 elections aimed to capture the anti-establishment vote by offering citizens party lists that were largely absent of sitting parliamentarians. Whether these new actors are truly new and commit to disavowing any ties to existing elites and oligarchs is of course unclear, but this surprising electoral development is worth noting.
resource itself – money. Because in our country, money is very concentrated in hands of three, five, seven people. So it is very difficult to go through these obstacles” (Interview conducted in Kyiv, May 26, 2017).

The preceding section has shown that the Euromaidan movement achieved many of its goals in certain areas – Ukrainians participate in politics at higher rates now than before, citizens can travel to the European Union without a visa, and important steps have been taken towards promoting transparency among officials. At the same time, much work remains to be done in other sectors, including the continued fight to remove corruption from Ukrainian life and politics\textsuperscript{163}. I now present a brief discussion about Ukraine’s political future before concluding the chapter by reviewing my main findings and their implications.

**How likely is it that Ukrainians will participate in another mass protest?**

While much of this chapter is concerned with the motivating factors that led Ukrainians to take to the streets in 2013 and 2014, it is also helpful to consider the likelihood that such a movement might take place again in the future. In order to test interviewees’ opinions on this matter, I asked my respondents to answer a question asking, “How likely is it that a similar movement would emerge in the future?” The distribution of responses is presented graphically in Figure 3.11 below.

As the figure shows, respondents were quite split in their opinions on this topic. 41.3% felt that it was “somewhat likely,” while another 12.93% felt that it was “very likely.” Many participants pointed to the aforementioned joke about Ukrainians taking

\textsuperscript{163} Indeed, the fact that incumbent President Petro Poroshenko (elected in 2014) was overwhelmingly defeated in 2019’s President election by challenger (and political neophyte) Volodymyr Zelensky in a 73% to 24% landslide shows that many Ukrainian voters felt that changes in overcoming corruption were not happening quickly enough. For a source, see: “Ukraine election: Comedian Zelensky wins presidency by landslide.” \textit{British Broadcasting Company}. Published April 22, 2019. Available online at https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-48007487.
to the streets every ten years, suggesting that this type of behavior had become institutionalized among Ukrainian activists\textsuperscript{164-165}. Another respondent indicated that to her, it was not a matter of if Ukrainians would take to the streets again, but instead a matter of when\textsuperscript{166}. Similarly, a separate individual mentioned that another mass movement in the style of Euromaidan would be likely to happen, but only under circumstances in which human rights and civil liberties were so violated that all types of socioeconomic groups would be able to overcome their numerous differences and work together for one common cause\textsuperscript{167}.

On the other hand, numerous respondents were much less confident that Ukrainians would create such a large movement again, particularly in the near future. Among my respondents, 33.62\% felt that it was “not very likely” that another Euromaidan would occur, while 3.45\% ruled it out altogether. Among interviewees who

\textsuperscript{164} Interview with former television reporter, conducted in Kyiv, March 17, 2017.
\textsuperscript{165} Interview with medical student and Euromaidan activist, conducted in Kyiv, May 19, 2017.
\textsuperscript{166} Interview with reporter from the Ukraine Crisis Media Centre, conducted in Kyiv, March 29, 2017.
\textsuperscript{167} Interview with official at the International Renaissance Foundation, conducted in Kyiv, December 6, 2017.
felt that another Euromaidan was unlikely, by far the most common theme behind their reasoning was that this type of protest would severely destabilize and weaken Ukraine at a time when the country was challenged by Russian invasion and a struggling economy\textsuperscript{168}. As one individual noted, “You can’t have a revolution every other year. If people are becoming too reliant on revolutions as a way to create political change, you cannot build a country if you’re always having a revolution” (Interview with activist, conducted in Kyiv, December 6, 2017)\textsuperscript{169}.

Similarly, as one reporter noted, “When I go out to the war zone, I talk to the soldiers. They DO NOT like Poroshenko. An overwhelming majority of them don’t like Poroshenko very much. They don’t believe in their government...but what they tell me is that if we went back to Kyiv and protested, Russia would simply invade behind us. So there is...one influence moderating that diminishes the prospect of another Maidan, and it’s the fact that many Ukrainians understand their country is in a de facto state of war with Russia. And that government instability that would come from protests would be to Russia’s advantage” (Interview with American reporter, conducted in Kyiv, November 16, 2017). The possibility that the Russian government would use another protest to further undermine Ukraine’s democratization and international reputation was mentioned by several other people as well – one individual mentioned that another protest could turn Ukraine into a “failed state” due to the country’s fragile wartime status\textsuperscript{170}, while another noted that widespread participation in another protest would

\textsuperscript{168} Interview with historian, conducted in Kyiv, December 8, 2017.
\textsuperscript{169} This suggests that the decision-making framework facing Ukrainians now, in light of an existing invasion from a neighboring country, is quite different than it was before Euromaidan began.
\textsuperscript{170} Interview with political analyst from the Institute for Euro-Atlantic Cooperation, conducted in Kyiv, November 21, 2017.
destabilize Ukraine and make Russian aggression more effective\textsuperscript{171}. Interestingly, a separate respondent noted that a new widespread protest would further empower the Russian government’s invasion in the East by allowing Putin to frame \textit{all} of Ukraine’s conflicts as wholly domestic civil wars involving Ukrainians only, reducing any Russian responsibility for fostering the conflicts in the Donbas region\textsuperscript{172}.

Many individuals in this second camp also felt that another mass movement would be much more violent than the previous protests\textsuperscript{173}. Several individuals noted that firearms had become much more prevalent in Ukraine now than before the war with Russia began, meaning that activists (particularly far-right nationalists) would be more likely to use violence against the regime\textsuperscript{174,175}. Taken together, the wide variety of opinions expressed by interviewees in this area points to the fundamentally uncertain nature of both Ukrainian politics and the dynamics of protest movements more broadly.

Presenting one final piece of evidence regarding the chance for another Euromaidan movement in the future, I present in Figure 3.12 below the results of a survey question that asked, “If a mass protest movement such as Euromaidan arose again in the future, how likely is it that you would join the movement?” As is evident from the figure, the elite respondents whom I surveyed express a significant amount of willingness to take to the streets should a new wave of protests in the style of Euromaidan take place. From a dichotomous perspective, 78.57% of interviewees chose a response between 6 and 10, placing them on the protest-ready side of the scale.

\textsuperscript{171} Interview with legislative aide to the Verkhovna Rada, conducted in Kyiv, April 10, 2017.
\textsuperscript{172} Interview with former protester and army veteran, conducted in Kyiv, December 8, 2017.
\textsuperscript{173} In one interview conducted with an activist in Kyiv on December 8, 2017, I even heard the phrase, “Blood Maidan” to reference the potentially deadly nature of another movement.
\textsuperscript{174} Interview with think tank analyst at East Europe Foundation, conducted in Kyiv, March 29, 2017.
\textsuperscript{175} Interview with activist and assistant at the Ukrainian Embassy of Estonia, conducted in Kyiv, May 26, 2017.
Moreover, 31.25% of individuals selected a response of 10, indicating that they were “very likely” to join a future Euromaidan. Altogether, the responses to this question indicate that if another mass movement emphasizing democracy and human rights were to take place, most of the people with whom I spoke would join the cause.

**Will Ukraine go West?**

One final discussion regarding Ukraine’s future concerns interviewees’ beliefs about the geopolitical direction that the country will take in years to come. I present in Figure 3.13 responses to a survey question asking, “Do you ultimately think that Ukraine will join Western organizations like the European Union?176

The results are striking – 81.20% of respondents expressed a firm belief that Ukraine is likely to move towards integration with the West in the future. 11.11% believed that the country would remain somewhat situated between the West and

---

176 It is important to qualify these findings by noting that as written, there is a bit of a mismatch between the survey question and the response options - the survey asks about actually joining specific institutions, while the response options are more broad and general. I instructed respondents to adopt a more general perspective when answering this particular question.
Russia, while an infinitesimal 0.85% of respondents felt that Ukraine was more likely to move towards Russia. These sentiments were echoed in my qualitative interviews, with many people explicitly stating that Ukraine today has only two feasible paths. One path appeared to be integration with Western countries and institutions, and a clear and marked turn away from cooperation with Russia – one person told me that the current Ukrainian government was the most pro-Western of any in Ukraine’s history, and that Russia had become completely untenable as a partner for the country\textsuperscript{177,178}. Another individual echoed this, emphasizing that support and assistance from the United States and the European Union was important for championing this development\textsuperscript{179}.

A second path that a smaller number of respondents mentioned proposed an independent Ukraine that focused solely on developing itself as a strong, powerful, and

\begin{figure}
\centering
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\caption{Interviewees’ responses about Ukraine’s geopolitical future}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{177} Interview with analyst from Aktis Strategy, conducted in Kyiv, March 31, 2017.
\textsuperscript{178} One respondent with whom I spoke mentioned that cooperation with a democratic Russia would certainly be a viable alternative in the distant future, but that Russia’s authoritarian nature today precluded any type of meaningful relationship at present. (Interview with doctor, conducted in Kyiv, May 24, 2017).
\textsuperscript{179} Interview with civil society activist at Chesno organization, conducted in Kyiv, March 22, 2017.
autonomous nation, without any meaningful ties to either the West or Russia. One veteran of the war explicitly stressed the conflict with Russia here, noting that the country’s strategies and military campaigns were constrained by leaders’ fears about what Western forces would think\textsuperscript{180}. However, another respondent cautioned against the wisdom of thinking in this way, noting that in his opinion, Ukraine as not strong enough to chart a completely independent geopolitical path for itself\textsuperscript{181}.

I conclude by noting that due to Ukraine’s volatility and constantly shifting political dynamics, several respondents suggested that no one could truly know what the future holds. One think tank analyst noted, “Protecting the future in Ukraine is probably the last profession I would take” (Interview with think tank analyst at East Europe Foundation, conducted in Kyiv, March 29, 2017). Similarly, a former activist said with a laugh, “This is Ukraine. The ‘near future’ here is like the next two weeks” (Interview with activist and assistant at the Ukrainian Embassy of Estonia, conducted in Kyiv, May 26, 2017). Many Ukrainians do not operate with a very long time horizon in their personal lives or their expectations about the future, indicating that the country could still undergo several changes before its long-term geopolitical path has been charted.

**Conclusion & Implications**

In this chapter, I have presented a detailed case study of Ukraine’s 2013-2014 Euromaidan movement (or Revolution of Dignity), illustrating the many ways in which the qualitative and quantitative data that I gleaned from my interviews and surveys illustrate the theoretical mechanisms outlined earlier in this dissertation. As I state emphatically elsewhere, I am not claiming that protesters at Euromaidan were directly

\textsuperscript{180} Interview with former protester and army veteran, conducted in Kyiv, December 8, 2017.
\textsuperscript{181} Interview with political analyst from the Institute for Euro-Atlantic Cooperation, conducted in Kyiv, November 21, 2017.
instructed to protest by outside forces, or that such activists were compensated in any way for their participation by nefarious Western states and organizations such as the Central Intelligence Agency. Such narratives are dangerous and harmful, and merely serve the purpose of feeding into a framework of false information that has been promoted by the Russian government to discredit the movement’s legitimacy.

It is also important to briefly consider any biases (conscious or unconscious) that my respondents might have held in offering their views of what transpired during the revolution. As noted throughout this chapter, I spoke primarily with Ukrainian elites to gather the findings that I have presented here – people who are either experts in Ukrainian politics, elected officials and journalists for major media corporations, and high-level activists involved in the movement from the beginning. The years since Euromaidan have seen the protests assume a rather revered role in Ukrainian society, due to the fact that so many people lost their lives in pursuit of a better world. As a result, it is possible that a small number of people might be implicitly framing the movement in a certain manner in order to support this framework.

Despite this possibility, however, I do claim firmly here that the vast majority of my interviewees’ responses were genuine and accurate and that many of the protesters’ decision-making strategies and calculations about costs and benefits were affected by considerations regarding the actions of external actors. On the side of democracy promotion, I have illustrated four key causal mechanisms in this chapter. First, many activists recounted to me the ways in which they felt a sense of purposive solidarity with the rest of the world – this took the form of both emotional support from members of the diaspora who held their own Euromaidan movements abroad and symbolic support from foreign politicians and elected officials. Second, activists received democratic
training and tactical support from countries including the United States and Poland that alleviated some of the dangers involved in protesting, making it more likely that the movement could sustain itself. Third, many protesters knew that because the world was watching the events that were taking place, this limited the amount of violent repression that the Yanukovych regime was initially willing to use because of the threat of international checking and sanctioning. Fourth, many people that I interviewed described how the Ukrainian diaspora provided funds to sustain the movement and lobbied officials in their own countries to support Euromaidan. These factors were not solely influential in shaping protesters’ decision to take to the streets, of course; the main motivating factors were frustration with issues like corruption and police brutality. Still, I conclude that they played an important part in turning people out, making protest behavior more likely and easier to sustain.

What effects did perceptions of autocratic intervention from the Russian government have on protesters’ beliefs, according to my interviews? Based on the data that I collected, I have found evidence of four mechanisms through which beliefs about Russian intervention made citizens more likely to protest. First, many participants were driven by the notion that Yanukovych’s decision to turn away from the European Union’s Association Agreement was simply another sign of unwanted Russian interference following a long series of intrusive acts. Activists were increasingly frustrated with this intervention, and intentionally pushed back against it. Second, protesters resented the fact that Russian media depicted them as fascists and violent aggressors towards Russian-speaking individuals. Third, the perceptions of protesters that the Putin regime was providing Yanukovych with military-style weapons and training inspired them to take to the streets in anger as well. Finally, the preceding three
dynamics combined to culminate in a negative learning effect through which interviewees’ awareness of Russian politics and the government’s efforts to transform Ukraine into a Russian-style dictatorship made them challenge the Yanukovych regime out of desperation to avoid such a fate. Individuals were intent on preserving Ukraine’s democratic characteristics distinct from Russia, where dissent is silenced and repressed, and their activism at the Maidan was indicative of this fundamental goal.

While the preceding chapter has focused on the dynamics of a singular social movement that took place in one country, the findings that I present here carry a significant amount of relevance and weight for a number of reasons. There is ample evidence that mechanisms involving both democratic promotion and autocratic intervention were at play in Ukraine during the Euromaidan movement, providing an excellent testing ground for assessing the ways in which my theoretical claims operated in practice. Ukraine is a large and geopolitically important country sitting on the cusp between democratic and autocratic governance, and my findings can be extended to social movements taking place in other authoritarian and hybrid regimes.

Moreover, studying the Euromaidan movement matters precisely because so much was at stake for so many people. Many of the individuals who were open and gracious enough to speak with me recounted memories of physical abuse and potential death at the hands of security forces; witnessing people being killed directly in front of them; the threat of arrest or loss of employment as reprisal for their participation; and the fear that their country was sinking into an authoritarian abyss from which it would never return. Protesters in Ukraine were fighting for liberal and humane values that citizens in full democracies often (and woefully) take for granted, and were in many cases willing to risk their lives to do so. I suggest that both policy-makers and academics
have a normative duty to monitor and learn about these movements as they take place around the world, and to offer meaningful expressions of support when possible.

People protest in authoritarian and hybrid regimes today for many different reasons, and international considerations do not always play a role in shaping whether people decide to join a particular movement. According to the findings that I have presented here, however, considerations of external democratic support or autocratic intervention can indeed shape how people act in certain situations and contexts. This has important implications in many areas – from an academic perspective, this suggests that scholars focusing on social movements and contentious politics would be wise to avoid studying such processes in a purely domestic lens absent of any international context. From a policy perspective, this suggests that statements of support and political assistance to democratically-minded protesters in hybrid states can have real and important effects on their decision to continue fighting for democracy, reforms, and human rights. Supporting activists in their quest to improve the quality of life in their countries such as those in Ukraine’s Revolution of Dignity is a pressing task, and should remain a priority for democratic states in the years to come.
CHAPTER 4: UTILIZING A SURVEY EXPERIMENT IN UKRAINE TO UNDERSTAND THE EFFECTS OF INTERNATIONAL ACTORS ON PROTEST BEHAVIOR

The in-depth case study of Ukraine’s 2013-2014 Revolution of Dignity presented in the preceding chapter provided a qualitative illustration of the inner workings and mechanisms at play in a protest movement that has already taken place. While my analysis explored the factors that motivated protesters at that particular time, it is also important to extend my framework to other temporal periods as well. In this chapter, I therefore utilize an original survey experiment involving nearly two hundred Ukrainian undergraduates that I conducted in the field across two sessions in 2017 to understand what makes people likely to join protest movements in the future. Anti-governmental campaigns are constantly emerging around the world with little to no warning, and it is imperative to understand what might make potential participants likely to join when such movements do arise.

I present the findings of my survey experiment in the following way. I begin by discussing my experiment’s research design, describing the ways in which survey experiments can be valuable for understanding political behavior and presenting the experimental manipulations and questionnaire that comprised the survey’s core. Following this, I introduce the human subjects who completed the survey, providing information on the individuals themselves and the methods through which I recruited them. I then present a series of hypotheses about protest behavior before finally introducing and describing the key results and findings of my survey experiment. Because I am interested in testing many different trends in my data through a variety of methods, I first present the findings of t-tests comparing means between my treatment and control groups to check for significance. Following this, I then turn to statistical
models employing Ordinary Least Squares regression and logit regression to understand the individual-level beliefs that are most highly associated with protest behavior. Finally, I conclude this chapter by reviewing my main findings and interpreting their value for future work in this area.

**Research Design – what does the survey experiment entail?**

As noted in Gaines, Kuklinski, and Quirk (2007), experiments (and survey experiments in particular) have much to add to studies of political behavior provided that careful guidelines are followed, including the need to include control groups as a reference category, ensuring that multiple treatments are not affecting one another and biasing the experiment’s dependent variable of interest, and guaranteeing that assignment into treatment and control categories is fully randomized. While survey experiments have been relatively popular in American political behavior for years, they have recently become increasingly common in analyses of comparative political behavior as well. Examples include Winters and Weitz-Shapiro’s (2013) analysis of voter perceptions and assessments of corruption in Brazil; Frye’s (2015) study of voter perceptions of candidates’ ethnic identity in Ukraine; Meng, Pen, and Yang’s (2014) study of authoritarians’ response to citizen participation in China; Samuels and Zucco, Jr.’s (2013) project analyzing the effects of in-group and out-group partisan cues on individuals in Brazil; Naoe and Kumi’s (2011) study of citizen preferences about agricultural policy in Japan; Johnston’s (1992) analysis of Canadian voters’ expressed rates of party identification; Horiuchi, Imai, and Taniguchi’s (2007) analysis of voter knowledge about political parties in a Japanese election; Anduiza, Gallego, and Munoz’s (2013) study of voter attitudes towards corruption in Spain; Tilley and Hobolt’s (2011) analysis of British voters’ willingness to hold politicians accountable; and Lupu’s (2012)
project on partisanship and party brands in Argentina. These examples show that when conducted carefully, experiments (particular survey experiments) can successfully travel from a controlled laboratory setting to the field.

In designing my survey experiment, I aimed to understand the factors that make potential protest participants more (or less) likely to join anti-governmental movements that might emerge. Because of this, it was imperative to ask subjects not only about protest behavior they may have exhibited in the past, but also to express the likelihood that they might join a movement in the future. I began by recruiting a number of undergraduate and Master’s students at three different Ukrainian universities, a process that I describe in further detail later in this chapter. I focused on recruiting students specifically because as noted in preceding chapters, young people are often at the forefront of anti-governmental campaigns, particularly when the protests concern democratic governance and human rights. It therefore makes sense to survey students directly to measure their opinions, as they represent the exact type of citizen whose motivations I hope to understand.

The basic research design of my experiment consisted of a vignette, followed by a series of survey questions related to its content. I began by asking all experimental participants to read a short hypothetical vignette before then asking them to express their views on a series of topics concerning protests and political behavior. I randomly divided participants into three groups – two treatment groups and one control group. Students in all three groups read a short text asking them to imagine life in a repressive state, and were told that although the government described in the vignette had been making strides towards political liberalization and democracy, these nascent developments had recently come to a halt. Rather than continuing to implement
reformist policies, these hypothetical leaders decided instead to change course, abandoning their democratization agenda and entrenching their hold on power. This was done to simulate many situations in the real world, where progress towards democratization follows a halting path filled with many obstacles. In all three groups, subjects learned that a small student-led anti-governmental campaign had recently emerged, and participants were asked to indicate the likelihood that they would 1) sign a petition against the government, 2) contact an elected official to express their views about the situation, and 3) actually join the nascent protest movement itself.

Protest behavior is an extremely multifaceted concept that can assume a variety of forms depending on the situation at hand, and I therefore chose to test respondents’ attitudes about three increasingly active types of protest participation. Signing a petition is a fairly conventional form of protest, as it does not require a large amount of agency on behalf of the individual. However, actually committing to joining a movement requires a different and more intensive set of decision-making strategies, and I aim to study these differing types of calculations by including both in my research design¹. Once they indicated their willingness to participate in these forms of protest, subjects were asked to express their views about politics and current events, and to answer a series of control questions measuring age, gender, and other demographic traits. I designed the experiment so that students would read the vignettes first, before they

¹ I therefore echo the approach utilized by many scholars and polling companies in testing respondents’ propensity to participate in these types of political activity. In their study of the World Values Survey’s methodological approach towards measuring prior protest behavior, Dalton, Van Sickle, and Weldon (2009) note that public opinion surveys often ask respondents about their protest behaviors ranging from the more “conventional” (signing a petition and joining a boycott) to the more “unconventional” (attending lawful demonstrations, joining unofficial strikes, occupying buildings or factories) to capture differences in intensity. Due to Institutional Review Board regulations and guidance, I was unable to ask participants about potentially illegal behavior so as not to cause them to unintentionally incriminate themselves, but I was still able to capture interest in expressing one’s self through the three increasingly intensive forms of protest that I study in this analysis.
were exposed to any following questions, in order to reduce the chance that their responses would be primed by concepts I tested elsewhere in my questionnaire.

It is important to note that because my subjects generally ranged in age from 18 to 22 in 2017, all participants would have been at least 14 years old when the Euromaidan movement began in November 2013. Even if they themselves did not participate in (or even approve of) the protests, they would certainly have been aware of the extreme and brutal acts of repression carried out by governmental forces as the campaign escalated in late 2013 and early 2014. The Maidan where the protests were centered still bears countless markers of the regime’s violence today, and the movement is very much a part of the country’s cultural and political fabric. As a result, it is actually feasible for these students to accurately imagine a situation involving repressive forces and semi-autocratic leaders, because they lived under such a regime in the recent past. This lends the experiment external validity, and produces more confidence in the results than would have been attainable had I run the experiment solely with students in consolidated democracies where protest is a comparatively safe form of expression.

Two Treatment Groups and One Control Group – Experimental Manipulation

As noted above, participants across all three groups learned from their vignettes that an anti-governmental movement was beginning to grow. The experimental manipulation in my design concerned information that some groups received but others

2 In addition to bullet holes left behind as reminders of the regime’s violence, the Maidan and the surrounding area in central Kyiv have become memorialized to consciously remind people of what took place there. Spots on the ground depict outlines of bodies where protesters fell when they were shot by the regime in February 2014, and the main monument in the center of Maidan Nezalezhnosti (“Independence Square”) is regularly surrounded by posters with the faces and names of those who were killed. Furthermore, a segment of Instytutskaya Street (a road running uphill from the Maidan to the Parliamentary building) has been renamed “Heavenly Hundred Heroes Avenue” to commemorate the dead. Finally, the entire stretch of road bears photographs, artistic depictions, and the names of those who were killed, along with places where citizens can light candles or leave bundles of flowers to commemorate their memory.
did not. The first treatment group, labeled the “Liberal International Actor” group, also learned that Western states and international organizations were actively monitoring and supporting the protests. This was designed to mimic real-world situations in which Western democracies, non-governmental organizations, and diaspora communities provide on-the-ground assistance or other forms of support to a democratic movement in order to increase its chance at success. The second treatment group, labeled the “Authoritarian International Actor” group, received no information about support from democracies abroad. Instead, participants in this second group were told that autocratic leaders in other states were intervening to suppress the movement, sending forces to bolster the chance that the embattled dictator would remain in power. Finally, those in the control group did not receive any information about international actors whatsoever. Instead, they merely read the vignette’s description of domestic, localized circumstances before being asked about their willingness to protest.

In the following section, I present the actual text of the three vignettes themselves so that the dependent variables of this experiment – participants’ willingness to participate in different forms of protest against leaders – are clear. I explicitly aimed to minimize the differences between vignettes given to the three separate groups in order to keep the treatment as simple and streamlined as possible. Changing too many different parts of the experimental vignettes would introduce too many potentially influential variables and interactions, and would likely have required a larger sample of participants than was possible for me to obtain. I therefore consciously choose to vary only one sentence out of the entire paragraph between groups, and I have bolded it in the vignettes below. Furthermore, within this sentence, I only modified four words
between the two treatment groups to be as parsimonious as I could\textsuperscript{3}. I begin by presenting the vignette given to the “Liberal International Actor” group.

1. Imagine that you live in an authoritarian country in which elections are neither free nor fair. Freedom of speech and expression are limited by harsh laws and restrictions, the economy has been suffering, and corruption is pervasive. While your leaders began to liberalize recently, this progress abruptly ended a month ago when security forces aggressively clamped down on pro-democracy rallies. Increasing numbers of students have started to demonstrate against the government. These protests have been praised by democratic Western states, which are providing funding and manpower to help sustain the movement.

Participants in the “Authoritarian International Actor” learned about autocratic, rather than democratic intervention, and they therefore read the following vignette instead. Here, “praised” is replaced with “criticized,” “democratic Western” is replaced with “other authoritarian,” and “sustain” is replaced with “contain”:

1. Imagine that you live in an authoritarian country in which elections are neither free nor fair. Freedom of speech and expression are limited by harsh laws and restrictions, the economy has been suffering, and corruption is pervasive. While your leaders began to liberalize recently, this progress abruptly ended a month ago when security forces aggressively clamped down on pro-democracy rallies. Increasing numbers of students have started to demonstrate against the government. These protests have been criticized by other authoritarian states, which are providing funding and manpower to help contain the movement.

Finally, as noted above, participants in the control group received no information about outside intervention at all, and read the following vignette:

1. Imagine that you live in an authoritarian country in which elections are neither free nor fair. Freedom of speech and expression are limited by harsh laws and restrictions, the economy has been suffering, and corruption is pervasive. While your leaders began to liberalize recently, this progress abruptly ended a month ago when security forces aggressively clamped down on pro-democracy

\textsuperscript{3}In adopting this strategy, I am closely following what Findor (2017) refers to as the ceteris paribus rule, or the need to make vignettes in experiments as parsimonious as possible to avoid confounding treatment effects from other modifications or independent variables. According to Findor, keeping vignettes as equal as possible (with the exception of the central treatment) minimizes the chance that some unanticipated interaction between other manipulations might be taking place, obscuring the true effects of the experimental design. By minimizing differences between my treatment and control vignettes, I can be more confident that my results are driven by my manipulation and not by confounding factors.
rallies. Increasing numbers of students have started to demonstrate against the
government.

**Three dependent variables – willingness to protest in different ways**

As noted above, I am interested in understanding the motivations and decision-
making strategies that drive people to participate in various forms of protest behavior. Because of this, I measure respondents’ willingness to participate in three increasingly intense and contentious activities – 1) signing a petition to express their views, 2) contacting an elected official about the situation, and 3) actually joining a protest movement. I am also studying the *intensity* and extent to which participants would commit to these activities, and so for each of my three dependent variables, I provided respondents with a sliding scale to show how strongly (or weakly) they would dedicate themselves to each behavior. This adds more depth and complexity to their response, and provides more nuanced data than would have been available if the dependent variables were instead strictly binary in nature.

The three questions below portray the exact text that survey participants saw as they finished reading the vignettes above. There was no variation in these questions across treatments – members of all three groups read the same wording.

**Dependent variable #1: Willingness to sign a petition**

*Given the dangers that might be involved in the situation above, how likely is it that you would sign a petition against the government’s actions?*

- a. 10 – Very likely
- b. 9
- c. 8
- d. 7
- e. 6
- f. 5
- g. 4
- h. 3
- i. 2
- j. 1 – Not at all likely
As noted above, the intensity of the different forms of protest grew in subsequent questions to reflect the increasingly contentious means of challenging the regime.

**Dependent variable #2: Willingness to contact an elected official**

Given the dangers that might be involved in the situation above, how likely is it that you would contact an elected official to express your views on the issue?

- a. 10 – Very likely
- b. 9
- c. 8
- d. 7
- e. 6
- f. 5
- g. 4
- h. 3
- i. 2
- j. 1 – Not at all likely

**Dependent variable #3: Willingness to join a protest movement**

Given the dangers that might be involved in the situation above, how likely is it that you would join the protesters’ lawful demonstrations in their calls for democracy?

- a. 10 – Very likely
- b. 9
- c. 8
- d. 7
- e. 6
- f. 5
- g. 4
- h. 3
- i. 2
- j. 1 – Not at all likely

I also provided a blank space after each question to give participants the opportunity to explain their response, if they wished to do so. Additionally, I asked participants to share their thoughts on the likelihood that external forces could affect domestic politics to see whether students’ views on this topic were correlated with their willingness to protest. As noted in later sections, I include this response as a control in my models to quantitatively determine whether this perception shapes protest behavior.

Comparing the mean response rates of willingness to protest across the treatment and control groups can reveal a great deal of illustrative information. For example, if
respondents in either treatment group are significantly more (or less) likely to protest than those in the control, this would indicate that the one single sentence referring to international factors in the vignettes matters substantially, and that external variables have a direct effect on students’ decisions to protest should the opportunity arise. (Again, because everything else is held wholly constant across vignettes, any significant differences between groups can be attributed to the experimental sentence alone.) Conversely, if there is no difference between responses from the treatment groups and those from the control, this would indicate that the presence of international support did not play much of a role in respondents’ calculations.

Because I also ask respondents to answer a series of questions about prior protests, views about Ukraine’s geopolitical future, Western support for pro-democracy protests, and other topics, I run linear models in subsequent sections to determine whether these treatment effects still hold once other attributes are addressed. If the treatment still has an effect and does not dissipate once individual-level beliefs are accounted for, this would provide solid evidence that international factors matter. I explore these models and their implications later in this chapter.

It is also important to state that I carried out my survey experiment in two waves. For the first wave, conducted between March and May 2017, I gave participants survey questions written in the English language. As I explain in my section on participant recruitment below, this was not a problem because the institutions where I distributed

---

4 I note here that in designing and implementing this project, I complied fully with all human subject requirements given by the University of Illinois Institutional Review Board. I recognize that asking Ukrainian students about their willingness to engage in anti-governmental protests mere years after their country actually was racked by an extremely contentious movement could, if handled improperly, spur painful memories in students who might have participated or been directly affected. I therefore secured complete Institutional Review Board approval of all my questions well in advance of carrying out the experiment, and I made it clear to all participants that completing the survey was voluntary and anonymous. By being explicit, I was able to assuage any concerns that participants may have had.
my survey heavily promoted English language knowledge and instruction, and students were entirely capable of processing the survey’s questions without the aid of a translator. During my second wave of fieldwork, conducted between October and December 2017, I recruited a native Ukrainian speaker in Kyiv to translate my questions into Ukrainian and sent a certified translation to the Institutional Review Board at the University of Illinois to ensure full transparency before then distributing the Ukrainian-language survey to students instead.

**Recruiting subjects – who participated in the survey experiment?**

I am principally interested in understanding the beliefs, perceptions, and attitudes of individuals who are likely to join a nascent protest movement at its beginning. These citizens are not necessarily those who *start* the protest, but they are individuals whose support at an early stage is an essential signal for recruiting others and helping the campaign grow to a point at which it can attain critical mass for success. As noted throughout many examples in preceding sections of this dissertation, university students and other young people are often at the forefront of a variety of emergent rallies and movements around the world.

This was particularly true in the case of Ukraine’s Euromaidan revolution. According to a number of different interviews that I conducted in the field, many of the first individuals at the Maidan were Western-oriented university students who were protesting the Yanukovych regime’s decision to abandon an agreement with the European Union in favor of renewed ties with the Russian government. Wilson (2014) and Diuk (2014) both show how in addition to several Western-oriented journalists and members of the country’s intelligentsia, these students were determined to pursue a path of European cultural, political, and economic integration, and as Reid (2015)
makes clear in her comprehensive study of Ukraine’s historical and political development, it was not until security forces brutally beat students on the ground that ordinary Ukrainians began to protest and the broader revolution began. Students and young activists would certainly be at the forefront of a similar protest in the future, and it is for these reasons that Ukrainian university students are an excellent population from which to draw a sample for my analysis.

To be sure, this method of recruitment does produce a type of convenience sample in that I am running an experiment on a group largely consisting of one type of person. Students are certainly younger than the average Ukrainian, and are likely better-educated and more tuned into political developments, meaning that they differ from their fellow countrymen on several dimensions. However, my goal is to make inferences about this exact population of individuals – university students and other young people in authoritarian and semi-authoritarian countries who are willing to challenge leaders on the streets. I am not claiming to make inferences about very different types of groups in Ukrainian society – elderly retirees, middle-aged laborers, or high-ranking government officials, for example. Instead, I recruited precisely the type of individual whose behavior I am most interested in understanding, procuring a population that is wholly appropriate for testing my theoretical claims.

Of course, it is also true that even within the population of Ukrainian university students, some will be much more inclined to join a protest than others. Attitudes about protests and Ukrainian politics vary quite widely across the country, with respondents in the Western and Central parts of Ukraine holding views that are often diametrically opposed to those in the East. Furthermore, according to a number of interviews that I conducted with Ukrainian academics and students, some universities actively
encouraged students to participate in the Euromaidan movement, cancelling lectures and permitting professors to lead groups of students to the Maidan to join the campaign. In stark contrast, other universities (often those with political or economic ties to the state) adopted a harsher stance; at those institutions, professors and other instructors were ordered to monitor student attendance during Euromaidan and to punish those who were clearly skipping class to protest.

It stands to reason that students who are prone to protest, particularly in a post-Euromaidan era in Ukraine, might be more likely to self-select into attending certain institutions based on their political or ideological reputations. Ukrainian society is also often characterized to some extent by a division between those seeking closer ties with “the West” and those seeking to maintain a historically entwined relationship with Russia. Before beginning my fieldwork, I therefore asked several contacts in Washington, D.C. including former American Ambassadors to Ukraine and numerous policy experts about the universities that would be more Western-oriented and that would be amenable to working with a graduate student from the United States.

Taking all of this into consideration, I ultimately recruited participants from three universities. During my six months of fieldwork in Ukraine, I was able to secure an affiliation as an International Research Student with the National University of Kyiv – Mohyla Academy (NaUKMA). Originally founded in 1615 and based in Kyiv, NaUKMA re-opened in the early 1990s following years of closure during the Soviet era, and it has rapidly re-established itself as one of the preeminent and most influential institutions of higher learning in Ukraine. Notably, the university also has a strong reputation for academic honesty and transparency in a country where corruption still pervades many aspects of life, including university education. NaUKMA has consistently promoted itself
as politically liberal, transparent, and oriented towards the West. Many scholars have noted the strong role that it played in fostering both the Euromaidan movement and Ukraine’s 2004 Orange Revolution, a stance that the university has clearly endorsed as well. As evidence of this, Reid (2015) reports that during the early stages of Euromaidan, many lecturers from NaUKMA (referred to in her text as “the most progressive of Kyiv’s universities” (262)) opened an “Open University” in the city’s Trades Union Building to provide media training and to hold seminars on constitutional and economic reforms. Additionally, a 2010 article from the Kyiv Post (Ukraine’s leading English-language newspaper) refers to NaUKMA as a “pro-Ukrainian revolutionary hub of knowledge” that served as a headquarters for many Orange Revolution activists. Once I began working at NaUKMA, I established professional connections with several professors who allowed me to visit their seminars, introduce myself, and recruit survey participants for my project.

In addition to NaUKMA, I was also able to survey several groups of students at Taras Shevchenko National University, located in Kyiv. Taras Shevchenko National University is one of the largest universities in Ukraine at approximately 30,000 students, and is also well-regarded for the quality of its education. Finally, I recognized the need to survey students elsewhere in Ukraine as well, in order to give voice to the valuable perspective of individuals outside of Kyiv. (This is particularly true given that Ukraine is quite large, and is in fact the largest country located entirely in Europe by

---

5 During my fieldwork, I observed that NaUKMA maintains an “American library” on its main campus. The library contains only English-language books, and often promotes English-language lessons, discussions, and cultural opportunities.
geographical area.) As a result, I traveled to the Western Ukrainian city of Lviv several times to survey students at the Ukrainian Catholic University, another institution of higher learning with a strong reputation for transparency and pro-Western values. Working with students there was highly valuable for me because as Shore (2017) makes clear, Western Ukraine is a region that has historically had a strong political and cultural affinity for Europe rather than Russia. Because of this, many Euromaidan participants regularly traveled back and forth to Kyiv from Western Ukraine, giving up their jobs in order to devote themselves to the movement. Between these three institutions, I recruited 62 students for each group, for an overall sample size of 186 individuals. All participants were randomized into the group to which they were assigned – it is important in experimental research to ensure that samples are randomly drawn to avoid bias, and I was sure to follow that procedure carefully in my own work.

**Primary theoretical hypotheses – what do I expect to find?**

Gathering 186 student responses to my survey experiment provided me with a large amount of original data on which I can conduct statistical analysis, searching for

---

8 A 2014 article in the *New Yorker* magazine, “The Radical Skepticism of Ukraine’s Students” by Peter Pomerantsev, specifically pointed to Ukrainian Catholic University as a “bastion of liberalism” and notes that everyone interviewed by the author supported the Euromaidan movement. It is accessible online at https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/the-radical-skepticism-of-ukraines-students.

9 I must briefly address the fact that all three of the Ukrainian universities from which I recruited participants from my survey experiment were largely pro-Western in nature, and were located in the Central and Western parts of Ukraine. As noted above, this was in large part an intentional decision, as those universities are the exact types of institutions at which I expect to find students who would be more prone to joining large-scale movements championing human rights and democracy. From a geographical perspective, this conclusion is also supported by studies including Onuch’s (2014) on-the-ground survey of participants during Euromaidan itself. After surveying more than 1,000 protesters, Onuch and her team conclude that roughly eighty percent of the respondents were from the Central or Western regions of Ukraine, with only one in five coming from the East or the South. I therefore would not expect students at universities in the traditionally Russia-friendly East or South to respond to my vignette in the same way because those are not the types of students about whom I am claiming to make inferences. Furthermore, there were simply too many logistical boundaries that prevented me as an independent researcher with a graduate student’s budget from adding more institutions to my list of sites to visit. Nevertheless, testing the opinions of students at less Western-friendly institutions is an interesting notion, as determining the ways in which their attitudes might (or might not) vary from the students that I surveyed in this experiment is an important task for future research projects.
trends and making meaningful comparisons across models. I now present a series of hypotheses concerning the results of my experiment, linking each to the theoretical framework outlined earlier. I begin by discussing three primary hypotheses explicitly related to the treatment effects of my experimental design, before then turning to a set of supplementary hypotheses that test correlations between individual-level attitudes and willingness to protest.

First, I expect research subjects who were assigned into the “Liberal International Actor” group to express significantly higher rates of protest willingness than those in the control group. Echoing the claims made in my theoretical chapter, I hypothesize that individuals who believe that democratic states and organizations elsewhere are supporting them in their mission should be more likely to protest than those who are unaware of such factors. Awareness of external support can strengthen participants’ moral and psychological resolve, assuring them that their campaign has not been forgotten and bolstering their belief that the movement can succeed. This produces my first hypothesis, H6-1:

\[ H6-1: \text{Subjects in the “Liberal International Actor” treatment group will be significantly more likely to protest than will subjects in the control group.} \]

Second, I also believe that it is likely that individuals in the “Authoritarian International Actor” treatment group should be more likely to protest than those in the control group. I predict the presence of autocratic intervention to spur a backlash in which protest becomes more likely, prompting people to take to the streets against a weak and unpopular ruler. This leads to hypothesis H6-2:

\[ H6-2: \text{Subjects in the “Authoritarian International Actor” treatment group will be significantly more likely to protest than will subjects in the control group.} \]
In terms of comparing my two treatment groups, I believe that interest in protesting will be larger among individuals in the “Liberal International Actor” group than among individuals in the “Authoritarian International Actor” group. While I still predict that individuals in both groups will be more likely to protest than those in the control overall, it seems plausible that the positive effects of democratic support will be more uniformly powerful than the potentially intimidating effects of authoritarian intervention across respondents.

_H6-3: Subjects in the “Liberal International Actor” treatment group will be significantly more likely to protest than will subjects in the “Authoritarian International Actor” treatment group._

**Supplementary hypotheses to test the effects of individual-level attitudes through linear models – what do I expect to find?**

I now introduce a series of supplementary hypotheses related to six linear models that analyze my data to determine the beliefs and attitudes that are most predictive of protest behavior. I begin by discussing the survey questions that I included in my questionnaire in order to capture different aspects of political beliefs, before then presenting hypotheses about attitudinal correlations that I expect to find. The primary theoretical foundations and analysis of this empirical chapter concern hypotheses H6-1, H6-2, and H6-3 above, as they directly test the claims that I have made elsewhere in this dissertation. The hypotheses described and tested in this following section are instead supplements to the more central questions tested above.

Because I designed and distributed my own original survey to Ukrainian university students in the field, I was somewhat constrained in the number of questions I could ask and the amount of concepts that I could test, particularly when compared to
much larger-scale undertakings such as the World Values Survey, the Eurobarometer, and so on. Those mass-scale surveys often contain more than one hundred questions to ascertain respondents’ thoughts on a wide-ranging battery of topics, and involve dispersing numerous teams of researchers throughout an entire country to distribute their questionnaires. Despite this structural limitation, however, I was still able to obtain respondents’ thoughts on a wide variety of topics that can help explain their thoughts on protest behavior today.

First, I believe that individuals who have been politically aware and active in the past should be concurrently more likely to protest in the future. Several studies, including the works of Kricheli, Livne, and Magaloni (2011) and O’Brien and Li (2005) suggest that activists with prior participation in successful social movements are subsequently more likely to join similar movements in the future. For these authors, this demonstrates a benevolent learning effect in which positive participation engendered feelings of efficacy and political power, encouraging repeated participation in later movements. If university students have already joined some type of anti-governmental movement in recent years, this points to a high level of political engagement, and an expectation that these individuals would be more politically active in the present as well. I capture this dimension in my survey through four questions measuring political awareness and prior political behavior. Question 2 asks respondents to indicate their interest in politics (on a five-point scale ranging from “very interested” to “not at all interested”), producing a wholly subjective measure about political interest that relies solely on respondents’ opinions about themselves.

Additionally, I included three questions in my survey that objectively ask about prior participation in different forms of protest. Question 3 asks respondents if they
have ever (or would ever) sign a political petition, while question 4 asks participants if they have ever (or would ever) join a lawful protest movement. (I chose to emphasize the term “lawful” in my question to keep participants from potentially incriminating themselves by admitting to non-lawful behavior.) Finally, question 5 asks whether participants have ever (or would ever) contact an elected official to express their views. Because it is possible that many of these behaviors might be correlated within individuals (for example, those who have protested are perhaps also more likely to have signed a petition), it will be important to check for multicollinearity to ensure that my models’ results are unbiased. These expectations produce my next hypotheses below:

\( H6-4: \) Subjects who are highly interested in politics will be more likely to protest than those who are not interested in politics.

\( H6-5: \) Subjects who have signed a petition in the past will be more likely to protest than those who have not signed a petition.

\( H6-6: \) Subjects who have joined a protest movement in the past will be more likely to join a protest movement than those who have not protested in the past.

I also include questions measuring attitudes about international variables in my models, as I believe that an individual’s thoughts about their state’s geopolitical orientation shape their behavior as well. To this end, I asked respondents questions about Ukraine’s future as a democracy and about the potential role played by Western forces in supporting the country’s democratic development. Question 14 asks subjects whether they believe Ukraine will eventually move towards the (democratic) global

\[\text{\footnotesize{10}}\] While I did include this question in my survey and I initially intended to use it as an independent variable in my models, I ultimately was forced to drop it from my analysis. This is because a surprisingly large number of participants indicated “don’t know” in their responses to this particular question, forcing me to drop all of these observations from my analysis as missing data. This could be because Ukrainian students are unaware of what “contacting an elected official” might involve. In any case, I chose to retain as many survey responses as I could, and ultimately decided to drop this question from my study.
West, whether it will move closer towards Russia, or whether it will remain situated in the middle between the two. In the same line of reasoning, question 15 asks subjects how important it is in their opinion that Western states and organizations support pro-democratic protests in Ukraine. For both questions, I expect that those who place a greater emphasis on integration with and support from the West will be more likely to protest:

*H6–7: Subjects who predict that Ukraine will integrate with the West and who believe that Western support for democracy matters will be more likely to protest than those who are unsure that Western integration will take place.*

Finally, I include three domestic politics questions and one question related to personality. First, question 11 asks respondents to report their ideological orientation on a scale ranging from 10 (very liberal) to 1 (very conservative). I expect that respondents who are more liberal will be more prone to challenge autocratic rule in pursuit of democracy and human rights. Second, question 16 asks respondents how satisfied they are with the way that democracy is working in their country (ranging from “very satisfied” to “not at all satisfied”). I predict that those who are highly dissatisfied with their government’s performance will be more likely to protest than those who are not, as individuals who are content with the status quo would see less reason to challenge leaders. Finally, question 7 measures respondents’ levels of trust in others. While not expressly political, trust has been shown by several studies including Benson and Rochon (2004) to be an important predictor of protest behavior, and I therefore include this variable here to test its influence. Theoretically, those who are willing to risk their well-being to join a collective movement should be more trusting than those who are not, leading to my final set of hypotheses below:
H6-8: Subjects who are more politically liberal will be more likely to protest than those who are more politically conservative.

H6-9: Subjects who are dissatisfied with their government’s democratic performance will be more likely to protest than those who are satisfied.

H6-10: Subjects who express higher levels of trust in other individuals will be more likely to protest than those who are less trusting.

Results – Comparing means through t-tests

I begin the results section of this chapter by presenting and interpreting the core findings of my survey experiment – a test to determine whether there is a significant difference in willingness to protest between respondents in my two treatment groups and respondents in my control group. I begin by presenting simple descriptive statistics for all groups on my dependent variables of interest (signing a petition, contacting an elected official, and joining a protest movement) before conducting a series of paired t-tests to show whether these differences are significant.

Table 4.1 below presents the mean willingness to participate in three forms of protest behavior, self-expressed on a scale ranging from 10 (very likely) to 1 (not at all likely) for participants in the “Liberal International Actor” treatment group, the “Authoritarian International Actor” treatment group, and the control group.

Several interesting facts about the group averages are immediately apparent. First, before any sorts of significance tests are conducted, one can clearly see that participants in all three groups were notably less likely to contact an elected official than they were to sign a petition or participate in a protest. Across all three groups, the highest average willingness to contact an elected official was 5.53 out of 10, as compared with means of 7.97 (signing a petition) and 7.92 (joining a protest movement). On a
TABLE 4.1. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR EACH TREATMENT/CONTROL GROUP, BY DEPENDENT VARIABLE

Question: On a scale from 1 (not at all likely) to 10 (very likely), how likely is it that you would......?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>Sign a Petition to Express Your Views</th>
<th>Contact an Elected Official</th>
<th>Participate in a Lawful Protest Movement</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Treatment Group</td>
<td>Mean Reported Value</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian Treatment Group</td>
<td>Mean Reported Value</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>Mean Reported Value</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

scale that only ranges from 1 to 10, a difference of more than two points is quite unusual and indicates a widespread reluctance towards contacting elected officials among participants in my study.

What might explain this? While it is impossible to prove through statistical analysis, it seems likely that respondents would be unenthusiastic about contacting officials for two reasons. First, in Ukraine, half of the parliamentarians in the Verkhovna Rada are elected on closed-list party lists through proportional representation. The other half are elected to represent constituents through first-past-the-post voting, but this second form of elections has only been in place since 2012, meaning that it is not yet fully institutionalized. Because of this, Ukraine lacks the deep-seated and direct linkage between elected officials and voters that one sees in the United States. Whereas
American citizens commonly call Congressional offices and demand that they vote a certain way in order to stay in office, such situations are rare in Ukraine. Instead, parliamentarians in Ukraine are not directly accountable to voters, and citizens might not think to contact an individual legislator about an issue because of this reason. Secondly, and more cynically, it is possible that Ukrainians (particularly young people pursuing higher education) simply might not trust members of government to take any meaningful action on the public’s behalf.

Public support for and trust in the Verkhovna Rada is largely quite dismal – as evidence of this, an October 2017 study by the Ilko Kucheriv Democratic Initiatives Foundation found that an overwhelming eighty-two percent of Ukrainians viewed the Verkhovna Rada as corrupt. Furthermore, the 2011 World Values Survey reports that 79.3% of Ukrainians expressed “not very much” confidence in their parliament or “none at all.” Finally, a June 2016 report from the Kyiv International Institute of Sociology notes that only 4.1% of adults evaluate the Verkhovna Rada “positively,” as opposed to a striking 86.9% who view the institution “negatively” and another 9.1% who offered no opinion. Overall, Ukrainian citizens’ orientations towards the Verkhovna Rada are markedly negative and pessimistic. If voters view officials as unreliable and unresponsive, this could explain why contacting an official is not seen as an effective form of behavior in Ukraine today.

---

I now present a 3 X 3 t-test comparison of means between my treatment and control groups on the three dependent variables identified above. I first present comparisons between the three groups on my first protest behavior in Tables 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4 below – signing a petition. It is immediately apparent that for this form of protest, there is no statistically significant difference between my three groups. Instead, comparing the mean responses from individuals in the “Liberal International Actor” treatment and respondents in the “Authoritarian International Actor” treatment produces a p-value of 0.505; comparing the means of respondents in the “Liberal International Actor” treatment and respondents in the control group produces a p-value

| TABLE 4.2. COMPARING LIBERAL TREATMENT GROUP AND AUTHORITARIAN TREATMENT GROUP – SIGNING A PETITION |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| Difference                      | -0.29           |
| Standard Error                  | 0.43            |
| 95% Confidence Interval         | -1.15 to 0.57   |
| t-statistic                     | -0.67           |
| Degrees of Freedom              | 122             |
| Significance Level              | P = 0.505       |

| TABLE 4.3. COMPARING LIBERAL TREATMENT GROUP AND CONTROL GROUP – SIGNING A PETITION |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|
| Difference                      | -0.31           |
| Standard Error                  | 0.44            |
| 95% Confidence Interval         | -1.18 to 0.57   |
| t-statistic                     | -0.69           |
| Degrees of Freedom              | 122             |
| Significance Level              | P = 0.490       |
of 0.490; and comparing the means from participants in the “Authoritarian International Actor” treatment and those in the control group produces a p-value of 0.972. As far as willingness to sign a petition, knowledge of international factors did not alter participants’ calculations – instead, the two treatments have very little effect when compared with the control vignette.

How do the other forms of protest participation that I am studying fare when the group means are compared here? Below, Tables 4.5, 4.6, and 4.7, display the results of a t-test comparing group means on my second dependent variable of note – willingness to contact an elected official. Again, the results do not indicate any real statistical differences between groups. Comparing the mean rates of respondents in the “Liberal International Actor” treatment and respondents in the “Authoritarian International Actor” treatment produces a p-value of 0.516; comparing the mean answers of respondents in the “Liberal International Actor” treatment and respondents in the control group produces a p-value of 0.497; and comparing the mean responses from participants in the “Authoritarian International Actor” treatment and the control group produces a p-value of 0.971. For each of these, there is generally no statistical evidence
### TABLE 4.5. COMPARING LIBERAL TREATMENT GROUP AND AUTHORITARIAN TREATMENT GROUP – CONTACT ELECTED OFFICIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>-0.31</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval</td>
<td>-1.24 to 0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-statistic</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance Level</td>
<td>P = 0.516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4.6. COMPARING LIBERAL TREATMENT GROUP AND CONTROL GROUP – CONTACT ELECTED OFFICIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>-0.32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval</td>
<td>-1.26 to 0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-statistic</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance Level</td>
<td>P = 0.497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4.7. COMPARING AUTHORITARIAN TREATMENT GROUP AND CONTROL GROUP – CONTACT ELECTED OFFICIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>-0.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Error</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% Confidence Interval</td>
<td>-0.89 to 0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-statistic</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degrees of Freedom</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance Level</td>
<td>P = 0.971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that the treatments affected respondents’ calculations and decision-making strategies.

In interpreting these results, it is possible that there is no large difference between the groups simply because participants were not very eager to engage in this form of behavior at a basic level and that no international variable would ever matter that much. If individuals are never likely to contact elected officials in the first place, perhaps this fact would ameliorate any potentially influential effects of international intervention or support because the hypothetical ceiling has already been reached. It is also possible that respondents would view elected officials as relatively powerless actors in the rather dramatic scenario described in the vignette, and perhaps participants made the judgment that reaching out to a parliamentarian with concerns about governmental crackdowns in such a dangerous and repressive context would be a general waste of one’s time.

To conclude my comparisons of means, I finally turn to the results of t-tests analyzing my third and most powerful form of protest behavior – joining a protest itself. Here, the results of my statistical analysis in Tables 4.8, 4.9, and 4.10 are remarkably different from the conclusions reviewed above. Rather than producing null results, these tables show that knowledge of international support in fact has a very strong statistical effect on respondents’ decision to protest. This is evident when one compares the mean protest rate in the “Liberal International Actor” treatment with the mean protest rate in the control group – as illustrated in Table 4.9, the P-value for that comparison is 0.0006. This is extremely significant (p<0.001), indicating that the means are much more different than they would be if no treatment effect existed. This finding can also be seen simply by looking at the data – the “Liberal International Actor” group’s mean was 7.92 while the control group’s mean was 6.32, a difference of 1.6 on a scale that only
TABLE 4.8. COMPARING LIBERAL TREATMENT GROUP AND AUTHORITARIAN TREATMENT GROUP – JOINING A PROTEST

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>-0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Error</strong></td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>95% Confidence Interval</strong></td>
<td>-1.84 to -0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>t-statistic</strong></td>
<td>-2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degrees of Freedom</strong></td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance Level</strong></td>
<td>P = 0.031</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4.9. COMPARING LIBERAL TREATMENT GROUP AND CONTROL GROUP – JOINING A PROTEST

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>-1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Error</strong></td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>95% Confidence Interval</strong></td>
<td>-2.49 to -0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>t-statistic</strong></td>
<td>-3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degrees of Freedom</strong></td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance Level</strong></td>
<td>P = 0.0006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4.10. COMPARING AUTHORITARIAN TREATMENT GROUP AND CONTROL GROUP – JOINING A PROTEST

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>-0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standard Error</strong></td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>95% Confidence Interval</strong></td>
<td>-1.66 to 0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>t-statistic</strong></td>
<td>-1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degrees of Freedom</strong></td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Significance Level</strong></td>
<td>P = 0.228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ranges from 1 to 10. Though this experiment is a simulation asking participants to imagine a hypothetical scenario, it is evident that participants who learn that democratic forces elsewhere support them are much more likely to protest than those who are unaware of international aid. This provides conclusive support for one of the main theoretical expectations of this project.

What can be learned from the two other comparisons here? While it is not quite as large as the observed difference in mean responses between the “Liberal International Actor” group and the control group, there is indeed still a very notable difference between the “Liberal International Actor” group and the “Authoritarian International Actor” group. Comparing the mean responses of these two groups provides a highly significant $P$-value of 0.031. This shows that providing people with positive information about support from abroad is more likely to drive them to the streets than giving them negative information about autocratic intervention that might instead dampen their enthusiasm and keep them from protesting.

Finally, comparing the “Authoritarian International Actor” treatment group and the control group finds no statistical difference between them, with a $P$-value of 0.228. Though interpreting these results is not entirely straightforward, it seems plausible that the two competing effects of autocratic intervention outlined in my theory could both conceivably be operating here in tandem, effectively cancelling each other out. Perhaps this intervention is spurring a backlash in some respondents, making them more likely to protest, while at the same time it simultaneously intimidates others, deterring them from taking to the streets. If both effects are taking place at once, this would mean that the two mechanisms are producing a null result overall.
It is interesting that the international treatments are clearly most effective for only specific type of behavior – the act of actually joining a protest, a process that requires much more time commitment and dedication than signing a petition or contacting an elected official. Why might this be? Why are international variables less influential in low-risk, low-cost situations but more influential in high-risk, high-cost situations? Perhaps this stems from the fact that choosing to participate in low-risk activities does not really involve that much of a commitment. It is certainly possible that one might face some recrimination for adding their name to a petition, of course, but actually taking to the streets carries much higher levels of personal danger and asks much more of an individual in terms of lost time, missing work, withheld wages, and so on. When an individual is willing to commit to an intensive and involved type of political participation, they have more to lose, and it seems that they are more likely to be influenced by external support than when their participation is much more fleeting or short-term.

The preceding section has shown that for signing a petition or contacting an official, my two treatments had no statistical effect on willingness to protest. However, there was a strong and statistically significant effect of the “Liberal International Actor” treatment on a person’s decision to join a movement – those in the liberal treatment group were much more likely to protest than those in the authoritarian treatment or the control. What other factors matter in explaining an individual’s decision to protest? The following section uses two linear models to answer this question.

**Linear models – checking for balance**

Before presenting the results of my Ordinary Least Squares and logit regression models, it is essential that I test for balance across my groups on certain demographic
variables. Scholars including Hansen and Bowers (2008) show that balance is essential in experiments to insure that the results are not biased, and that subjects in one group are not fundamentally different from those in another group. If participants in the “Liberal International Actor” treatment group are all older than participants in the control group, for example, this could mean that it is their ages (and not the treatment itself) that explains their divergent opinions. It is possible to check for balance by comparing mean characteristics across groups on certain variables – if this shows that subjects in all three groups are similar, this would point to balanced random assignment, increasing the certainty of the models’ statistical findings.

I test for balance on respondents’ age, gender, and ethnicity, as these could be relevant for shaping political behavior. I expect these groups to be balanced because all subjects were randomly assigned, meaning that there should be no bias. Furthermore, the sample consists almost entirely of Ukrainian undergraduates, meaning that age and ethnicity should be fairly homogenous. (I did survey one Master’s level graduate class, but those participants were distributed randomly and equally across groups.) Table 4.11 below presents the average responses for age, gender, and ethnicity. Here, age was recorded numerically, and gender is represented by “1” for male and “2” for female. For ethnicity, respondents were able to choose “1” for Ukrainian, “2” for Russian, “3” for equally Ukrainian and Russian, and “4” for other.

The results are clear – the three groups are balanced on all three traits. This is particularly true for age – the mean age of respondents does not differ by more than three months across groups. Gender is similarly balanced; each group skews a bit towards a female majority, but not to the point of biasing results. Finally, while there is a bit more variance with ethnicity, the results are still similar enough to illustrate balance
overall. I am confident that the three groups do not differ dramatically from one another on any of these dimensions, and that I can be certain in interpreting my results.

**Linear model #1 – Ordinary Least Squares Regression**

The following models test the effects of individual-level beliefs on willingness to protest in order to identify the variables most strongly correlated with protest behavior. In interpreting the model, a positive coefficient indicates that an attribute is positively associated with protest, while statistical significance demonstrates that that variable has truly meaningful power in explaining the dependent variable. Additionally, these models produce R-squared values that indicate the aggregate amount of variation in the dependent variable that is explained by the independent variables in the model.

I first provide a methodological note regarding my survey questions and ways to interpret their effects on protest. When students completed the questionnaire, the response options that they read trended from a more “positive” option to a more “negative” option. As an example of this, when asked to express their level of interest in politics, students were able to select from the following choices: “very interested,” “somewhat interested,” “neither interested nor uninterested” “not very interested,” or “not at all interested.” When quantifying these responses, I re-coded them such that “very interested” is a “5,” “somewhat interested” is a “4,” and so on until “not at all interested” is a “1.”
interested” is coded as a “1.” Similarly, I coded responses to questions like “Have you ever signed a petition?” so that “yes” is coded as a “3,” “have not, but might” is coded as a “2,” and “would never do” is coded as a “1.” This makes it easier to interpret the results of my models – a positive coefficient indicates that the more likely someone is to express a particular type of belief or attitude, the more willing they are to protest as well.

I also check the independent variables in my model for multicollinearity. This is necessary because if two or more independent variables have a strong and statistically significant relationship with one another, this could bias the results of the model and obscure the true nature of their effect on the dependent variable. I conducted a series of tests to address this. First, I determined the variance inflation factor (VIF) for each variable in my model. Doing so produces a numerical value for each, with values of 4 or above regarded as problematic. This test did not produce any troubling results – all variables produced VIF scores of 2.42 or below. Following this, I conducted a series of paired Pearson correlation tests to produce correlation coefficients for different pairs of independent variables. In general, the vast majority of paired correlation coefficients were 0.25 or below. The main exception was a correlation between respondents’ interest in domestic news and their interest in international news – the correlation coefficient here was 0.658, demonstrating that individuals who partake in one activity are very likely to partake in the other as well. Because of this, I dropped individuals’ interest in international news from my models to ensure that the results were unbiased.

I also included a series of controls in my models – first and foremost, I obviously must account for the treatments that each respondent did (or did not) receive, as I expect their knowledge about international actors to have a powerful effect on their decision to protest. To account for this, I include a dichotomous dummy variable for
both the “Liberal International Actor” treatment and the “Authoritarian International Actor” treatment. Additionally, I include dichotomous dummy controls for ethnicity (Ukrainians are coded as 1 and all other ethnicities are coded as 0) and gender. This is to determine whether these factors have an effect on my dependent variable, though they do not factor prominently into my theoretical framework.

Finally, I have included a control to account for respondents’ views on the ability of external actors to assess a state’s domestic politics. As noted earlier, at the very end of the vignette that respondents read before expressing their willingness to protest, I asked them to share their opinion as to how much external actors could shape a country’s domestic politics, with options ranging from 10 (very much) to 1 (not at all). As it is possible that subjects’ opinions here might interact with the treatment vignettes, I include this as a control to address variance that might be introduced by this variable.

The results of my primary Ordinary Least Squares model are presented in Table 4.12 below. The dependent variable in this first model is the central concept with which I am concerned – an individual’s willingness to join a protest movement. I begin by identifying significant individual-level attributes before then assessing the effects that my experimental vignettes had on respondents, accounting for other factors. First, the most significant predictor of future protest behavior by far is prior protest behavior. Indeed, respondents who indicated that they had already joined some type of protest movement in the past were markedly more willing to protest again than were individuals who never joined any movement – this is clear by the coefficient’s positive sign and the high level of significance this variable attains. Evidently, students who took to the streets before saw some real value in doing so, making them easier to mobilize in the future should another protest campaign arise.
TABLE 4.12. OLS MODEL ON DECISION TO JOIN A PROTEST MOVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Coefficient (Standard Error)</th>
<th>t-value (P-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effects of international actors</td>
<td>-0.022 (0.104)</td>
<td>-0.215 (0.831)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in politics</td>
<td>0.394 (0.245)</td>
<td>1.606 (0.110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior protest participation</td>
<td>1.429 (0.291)</td>
<td>4.916 (2.41e-06)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior singing of a petition</td>
<td>0.829 (0.334)</td>
<td>2.482 (0.014)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in other individuals</td>
<td>0.444 (0.208)</td>
<td>2.132 (0.035)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>0.214 (0.093)</td>
<td>2.300 (0.023)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in the news</td>
<td>0.024 (0.317)</td>
<td>0.077 (0.939)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that Ukraine will move to the West</td>
<td>-0.105 (0.433)</td>
<td>-0.242 (0.809)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important for the West to support protests</td>
<td>0.294 (0.261)</td>
<td>1.130 (0.260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with democracy</td>
<td>0.265 (0.249)</td>
<td>1.068 (0.288)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal International Actor control</td>
<td>1.113 (0.422)</td>
<td>2.640 (0.009)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian International Actor control</td>
<td>0.601 (0.432)</td>
<td>1.391 (0.166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.057 (0.361)</td>
<td>0.159 (0.874)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>0.082 (0.130)</td>
<td>0.627 (0.532)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-4.793 (1.837)</td>
<td>-2.609 (0.010)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residual standard error: 2.114 on 142 degrees of freedom
N = 186
Multiple R-squared value: 0.4285
Adjusted R-squared value: 0.3722

* p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

Other significant variables include measures testing whether an individual has signed a petition in the past, a respondent’s level of trust in others, and a respondent’s ideological views. Prior expression of activism is particularly strong, as students who
signed a petition in the past were more likely to protest in the future. Similarly, students who felt that most other people could be trusted were also more likely to protest. This shows that people who are less suspicious than others are willing to believe that fellow citizens will stand by them in the face of repression. Finally, individuals with liberal beliefs were also more prone to join an anti-governmental movement. It is important to briefly qualify this finding on ideology, because several students responded during the survey that Ukrainians do not view the term “liberal” in the same way as do scholars in the United States or Canada – instead, Ukrainians tend to think of classical, “small-L” liberalism. This was remedied by instructing participants to think of the 10-1 ideological scale as one ranging from the left to the right, using terminology that was more familiar and understandable for a European context.

This section has shown that certain attributes clearly make some people more likely to protest than others. However, what effects did the two international treatment vignettes have? If either treatment produces a significant result despite the fact that individual-level attitudes are being accounted for, this would demonstrate that they possess an influence above and beyond the effects of ideology and interest in politics. Table 4.12 shows that the “Liberal International Actor” treatment is still highly significant (p < 0.001), despite the presence of many other explanatory variables in the model. This shows that even when one takes into consideration respondents’ political ideologies, prior protest participation, interest in politics, and so on, the liberal treatment still possesses a great deal of influential power.

I conclude my discussion of this model by noting the independent variables that did not attain significance. Individuals’ beliefs about other countries’ effect on domestic politics did not shape their responses, nor (surprisingly) did their level of interest in
politics. Also interestingly, respondents’ opinions about Ukraine’s geopolitical future and Western support for democratic protests in Ukraine did not factor into considerations either. Perhaps this is because the response options for these questions were truncated in comparison with the dependent variable’s scale – it seems likely that including a wider range of options would have better captured the intensity with which respondents felt that Ukraine should orient itself towards the West. Finally, neither satisfaction with democracy nor gender were significant predictors of protest behavior.

I now turn to a presentation of two Ordinary Least Squares Linear models that test the same framework on the two remaining dependent variables. Table 4.13 below presents the results of a regression analysis on respondents’ willingness to sign a petition, and the results are quite different from Table 4.12. First, and most noticeably, prior real-world protest participation has no predictive power here – whether someone joined an anti-governmental campaign in the past has no bearing on their willingness to sign a petition in the future. Similarly, trust loses its power in this second model as well.

Despite this, two predictive variables from Table 4.12 manage to maintain their significance in Table 4.13. First, respondents who have signed petitions in the past are more likely to undertake that action again than are respondents with no such experience. This likely indicates both a strong interest in expressing one’s self and engaging in politics in this way, and also a belief that the earlier experience was valuable and worth repeating. Second, ideology matters, with those who are more liberal being significantly more likely to sign a petition. Additionally, gender plays a role, with women (the reference category) being statistically less likely to sign a petition than men. Finally, the two international experimental treatment variables fail to produce any statistical significance. This should not be overly surprising given the fact that neither treatment
### TABLE 4.13. OLS MODEL ON DECISION TO SIGN A PETITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Coefficient (Standard Error)</th>
<th>t-value (P-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effects of international actors</td>
<td>0.114 (0.111)</td>
<td>1.026 (0.307)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in politics</td>
<td>0.066 (0.265)</td>
<td>0.254 (0.799)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior protest participation</td>
<td>0.078 (0.310)</td>
<td>0.252 (0.802)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior singing of a petition</td>
<td>1.034 (0.356) **</td>
<td>2.901 (0.004)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in other individuals</td>
<td>0.301 (0.222)</td>
<td>1.358 (0.177)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>0.206 (0.100) **</td>
<td>2.075 (0.040)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in the news</td>
<td>-0.196 (0.338) **</td>
<td>-0.581 (0.562)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that Ukraine will move to the West</td>
<td>0.760 (0.462)</td>
<td>1.646 (0.102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important for the West to support protests</td>
<td>0.167 (0.278)</td>
<td>0.599 (0.550)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with democracy</td>
<td>-0.294 (0.265) **</td>
<td>-1.111 (0.268)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal International Actor control</td>
<td>0.193 (0.450) **</td>
<td>0.428 (0.669)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian International Actor control</td>
<td>-0.051 (0.461) **</td>
<td>-0.109 (0.914)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.955 (0.385) **</td>
<td>-2.478 (0.014)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>0.123 (0.139)</td>
<td>0.882 (0.380)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.620 (1.960)</td>
<td>0.827 (0.410)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residual standard error: 2.255 on 142 degrees of freedom  
N = 186  
Multiple R-squared value: 0.1834  
Adjusted R-squared value: 0.1028

* p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

The group was statistically distinct from the control group in the earlier comparison-of-means analysis on signing a petition – instead this form of protest behavior is largely unaffected by international considerations.
What variables determine individuals’ willingness to contact elected officials?

Table 4.14 below shows that the set of attitudes tested in this survey experiment are largely inconsequential in explaining this behavior. (Indeed, the model’s dismal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 4.14. OLS MODEL ON DECISION TO CONTACT ELECTED OFFICIAL</th>
<th>Coefficient (Standard Error)</th>
<th>t-value (P-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effects of international actors</td>
<td>0.078 (0.125)</td>
<td>0.628 (0.531)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in politics</td>
<td>0.723 (0.294)</td>
<td>2.456 (0.015)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior protest participation</td>
<td>-0.239 (0.349)</td>
<td>-0.685 (0.495)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior singing of a petition</td>
<td>-0.734 (0.401)</td>
<td>-1.830 (0.069)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in other individuals</td>
<td>-0.127 (0.250)</td>
<td>-0.508 (0.613)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>0.254 (0.112)</td>
<td>2.106 (0.037)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in the news</td>
<td>-0.056 (0.380)</td>
<td>-0.147 (0.887)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that Ukraine will move to the West</td>
<td>0.517 (0.520)</td>
<td>0.996 (0.321)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important for the West to support protests</td>
<td>0.253 (0.313)</td>
<td>0.808 (0.420)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with democracy</td>
<td>-0.129 (0.298)</td>
<td>-0.431 (0.667)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal International Actor control</td>
<td>0.185 (0.506)</td>
<td>0.364 (0.716)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian International Actor control</td>
<td>-0.133 (0.519)</td>
<td>-0.257 (0.798)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.057 (0.434)</td>
<td>-0.131 (0.896)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>0.084 (0.157)</td>
<td>0.537 (0.592)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.522 (2.206)</td>
<td>0.690 (0.491)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residual standard error: 2.538 on 142 degrees of freedom
N = 186
Multiple R-squared value: 0.1173
Adjusted R-squared value: 0.030

* p < 0.1, ** p <0.05, *** p < 0.01
R-squared value of 0.030 makes this clear, particularly when compared with the higher adjusted R-squared value of 0.3722 in Table 4.12.) Only three independent variables have any predictive power in this model – interest in politics, ideology, and prior willingness to sign a petition. Those who report themselves as paying more attention to politics are more likely to contact an official, as are those who are more politically liberal. However, and a bit surprisingly, individuals who signed a petition in the past were concurrently less likely to contact an elected official in the future. As with the second Ordinary Least Squares model above, the two international treatment variables here have no predictive power. Taken together, this decisively illustrates that the treatment variables were most effective for one specific kind of protest behavior alone – actually joining a movement.

**Linear models #2 – Logit Regression**

Having presented the main findings of my Ordinary Least Squares regressions, I now turn to the final method employed in this chapter – logit regression. Whereas Ordinary Least Squares regressions employ a dependent variable with a range of possible values, logit regressions are appropriate when the dependent variable is dichotomous and consists of only two possible values. Because of this, I collapsed my 10-1 range for the three forms of protest into two discrete categories to see if my findings hold when analyzed in this way. I chose the halfway point of the scale to be the point at which I distinguish between “likely” and “not likely” to protest, and responses with values from 10 to 6 are therefore categorized as “likely” while all responses with values from 5 to 1 are categorized as “not likely.” This is somewhat arbitrary, as the cut-off point could hypothetically be 4 or 6 instead. Nevertheless, I believe that dividing responses cleanly in the middle makes sense, as my goal is to determine whether these
findings hold even when willingness to protest is operationalized in a more simplified way\textsuperscript{14}.

I now present the results of the first logit model in Table 4.15 below. Here, the dependent variable is willingness to join a protest movement. In general, the results are consistent with the findings from the Ordinary Least Squares model above. Again, prior protest participation is the strongest predictor of willingness to protest in the future, in line with my earlier expectations. Similarly, prior willingness to sign a petition and higher levels of trust in other individuals are statistically significant as well. Interestingly, ideology loses its predictive power in this logit model, indicating that one’s orientation on the left-right scale might be more influential in determining the \textit{intensity} to which one is committed to protesting (measured on a relatively fluid and wide-ranging scale from 10 to 1) than in determining whether one is fundamentally willing to protest at all (measured on a more simplified and restricted binary scale from 1 to 0).

The “Liberal International Actor” treatment variable is again positive and significant, indicating that its power is not diluted by the dichotomous reconceptualization of the model’s dependent variable. From a broader perspective across regressions and cross-group treatments, it is quite encouraging to see that this effect proves to be positive and significant across every test included in this chapter –

\textsuperscript{14} In doing both Ordinary Least Squares regression models and logit regression models, I am therefore able to study two different aspects of protest behavior here. First, with my logit models, I am able to test whether respondents \textit{are} or \textit{are not} willing to protest. This is a rather simple dependent variable, as it only possesses one of two potential values, but it provides a useful benchmark for measuring overall protest willingness in my sample. Beyond this my Ordinary Least Squares models add a much deeper dimension of detail to my analysis because protesters are able to express not only whether or not they choose to protest, but also \textit{to what extent} they would be willing to do so. If certain respondents indicate a “10” on the willingness scale while others indicate a “6,” for example, this captures a difference in intensity that is missed when both are collapsed into one category in my logit models. Testing the same set of variables through both Ordinary Least Squares and logit can also indicate whether the treatments or other individual-level variables are useful for predicting whether people will protest and also how intensely this dedication is under the hypothetical situations described in the vignettes.
TABLE 4.15. LOGIT MODEL ON JOINING A PROTEST MOVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Coefficient (Standard Error)</th>
<th>t-value (P-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effects of international actors</td>
<td>-0.041 (0.149)</td>
<td>-0.277 (0.782)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in politics</td>
<td>0.540 (0.359)</td>
<td>1.503 (0.133)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior protest participation</td>
<td>1.190 (0.393)</td>
<td>3.028 (0.002)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior singing of a petition</td>
<td>0.938 (0.473)</td>
<td>1.986 (0.047)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in other individuals</td>
<td>0.603 (0.314)</td>
<td>1.922 (0.055)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>0.206 (0.132)</td>
<td>1.562 (0.118)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in the news</td>
<td>-0.500 (0.489)</td>
<td>-1.023 (0.306)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that Ukraine will move to the West</td>
<td>0.015 (0.570)</td>
<td>0.026 (0.979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important for the West to support protests</td>
<td>0.353 (0.347)</td>
<td>1.017 (0.309)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with democracy</td>
<td>-0.006 (0.381)</td>
<td>-0.016 (0.987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal International Actor control</td>
<td>1.385 (0.669)</td>
<td>2.069 (0.038)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian International Actor control</td>
<td>0.469 (0.597)</td>
<td>0.785 (0.432)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.099 (0.560)</td>
<td>-0.177 (0.860)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>0.971 (0.665)</td>
<td>1.459 (0.144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-9.491 (2.706)</td>
<td>-3.507 (0.000)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 186

* p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

inserting one single sentence about democratic support from abroad into my vignettes produces a durable effect that holds across t-test mean comparisons, Ordinary Least Squares regression, and logit regression.

I turn now to my second logit model to test the model’s effects on willingness to sign a petition. These findings are displayed in Table 4.16 below. Similarly to Table 4.13
above, the logit model in Table 16 shows that an individual’s prior experience signing a petition is again significant and positive. This indicates a benevolent learning effect, demonstrating that those who partook in that form of political participation in the past saw some utility in doing so again. Ideology and gender both matter, with those to the left of the spectrum being more likely to sign a petition and men being more interested

**TABLE 4.16. LOGIT MODEL ON SIGNING A PETITION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Coefficient (Standard Error)</th>
<th>t-value (P-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effects of international actors</td>
<td>0.036 (0.141)</td>
<td>0.259 (0.796)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in politics</td>
<td>0.100 (0.334)</td>
<td>0.296 (0.767)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior protest participation</td>
<td>0.140 (0.364)</td>
<td>0.384 (0.701)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior singing of a petition</td>
<td>0.830 (0.399)</td>
<td>2.079 (0.037)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in other individuals</td>
<td>0.191 (0.281)</td>
<td>0.679 (0.497)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>0.213 (0.129)</td>
<td>1.651 (0.098)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in the news</td>
<td>0.035 (0.445)</td>
<td>0.078 (0.938)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that Ukraine will move to the West</td>
<td>0.330 (0.513)</td>
<td>0.645 (0.519)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important for the West to support protests</td>
<td>0.087 (0.332)</td>
<td>0.260 (0.795)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with democracy</td>
<td>-0.196 (0.335)</td>
<td>-0.586 (0.558)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal International Actor control</td>
<td>-0.190 (0.621)</td>
<td>-0.307 (0.759)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian International Actor control</td>
<td>-0.644 (0.589)</td>
<td>-1.094 (0.274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-1.075 (0.518)</td>
<td>-2.076 (0.038)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>0.129 (0.667)</td>
<td>0.193 (0.847)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-2.384 (2.318)</td>
<td>-1.029 (0.304)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 186

* p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01
in doing so than women. Also similar to Table 4.13, neither international treatment had any effect on the dependent variable here – both the “Liberal International Actor” and the “Authoritarian International Actor” variables produced null results. This suggests that while knowledge of assistance from external actors might be instrumental in guiding someone to undertake the high-risk activity of joining a movement, this might not affect the decision to undertake a low-impact action like signing a petition.

What findings are produced by the final regression analysis in this chapter? I present the results of a logit regression measuring willingness to contact an elected official in Table 4.17 below. As was the case with the final Ordinary Least Squares model in Table 4.14, this third logit contains the least predictive power of the three logit models in this chapter. Only two variables obtain any level of statistical significance at all, and one of those is orientated in the opposite direction from what was expected. Ideology again has a positive effect on willingness to contact an elected official with all other individual-level beliefs accounted for. Surprisingly, however, prior willingness to sign a petition actually has a significant and negative relationship with contacting an official in the future. Stated differently, individuals who signed a petition at some point in the past are markedly less likely to contact an official than citizens who never signed a petition.

Why might this be? Perhaps the results stem from Ukraine’s semi-authoritarian and highly corrupt political system – it seems plausible that concerned citizens who were willing to monitor a political development to the point where they signed a petition might be more cynical about the chance that an elected official will create any meaningful change. If this is true, then taking prior willingness to sign a petition as a proxy for political activity suggests that people who are more involved in Ukrainian politics might simultaneously be less likely to view politicians as vehicles for reform. In
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Coefficient (Standard Error)</th>
<th>t-value (P-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effects of international actors</td>
<td>0.007 (0.105)</td>
<td>0.066 (0.947)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in politics</td>
<td>0.347 (0.253)</td>
<td>1.370 (0.171)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior protest participation</td>
<td>-0.120 (0.300)</td>
<td>-0.404 (0.686)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior singing of a petition</td>
<td>-0.662 (0.347)</td>
<td>-1.909 (0.056)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in other individuals</td>
<td>-0.033 (0.202)</td>
<td>-0.157 (0.875)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>0.198 (0.098)</td>
<td>2.025 (0.043)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in the news</td>
<td>0.058 (0.320)</td>
<td>0.181 (0.856)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief that Ukraine will move to the West</td>
<td>0.437 (0.437)</td>
<td>1.001 (0.347)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important for the West to support protests</td>
<td>0.238 (0.268)</td>
<td>0.889 (0.374)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with democracy</td>
<td>-0.293 (0.256)</td>
<td>-1.142 (0.253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal International Actor control</td>
<td>0.233 (0.425)</td>
<td>0.547 (0.584)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian International Actor control</td>
<td>-0.127 (0.438)</td>
<td>-0.291 (0.771)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.502 (0.370)</td>
<td>-1.357 (0.175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>0.711 (0.520)</td>
<td>1.368 (0.171)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-2.320 (1.854)</td>
<td>-1.251 (0.211)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 186

* p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01

any case, the results are interesting, presenting unexpected findings that must be explored in future research. Finally, neither international treatments had much effect here – out of the three forms of protest studied in this experiment, their influence was seen most clearly on actually joining a protest movement.
Discussion – what do the results show about my primary hypotheses?

This chapter has tested a number of different hypotheses through a variety of methodological approaches, meaning that identifying a few key findings is essential. First, what effects did the two international treatments have across experiments and regressions? Participants in the “Liberal International Actor” treatment were significantly more likely to join a hypothetical protest movement than were participants in the “Authoritarian International Actor” treatment and the control group. This was first seen through a t-test comparison of group means on that variable – the “Liberal International Actor” group mean was more than 1.5 points higher than the control on a scale that only ranged from 1 to 10. Furthermore, this remained consistent across both Ordinary Least Squares and logit regression models, demonstrating that the treatment’s effect remained durable and could still be seen even the dependent variable was measured in different ways and when other important individual-level beliefs were accounted for. This shows that my hypothesis 1, predicting that the liberal treatment’s outcome would be significantly more positive than the control, is strongly supported.

The effects of the “Authoritarian International Actor” treatment were unfortunately not significant in the mean comparisons or linear models on any of the forms of protest tested here. While it is difficult to determine why this might be the case without in-depth qualitative analysis, it seems plausible that if the two posited mechanisms of autocratic intervention (unwanted backlash and intentional deterrence) are operating simultaneously for different subsets of the sample, perhaps they are balancing out when assessed across the group and nullifying the aggregate effect. This means that the chapter’s hypothesis 2 is not supported – there is no difference between the authoritarian treatment group and the control. Still, it is clear that the liberal
treatment is significantly higher than the authoritarian treatment, meaning that the chapter’s hypothesis 3 is supported – positive news about democratic support from abroad is more influential than negative news about autocratic intervention.

**Further results – what do the findings show about my supplementary hypotheses?**

The preceding section has established that at least in terms of liberal democratic support, assistance from abroad matters in shaping protesters’ decision to join a movement. It is important to qualify this by noting that these findings apply strictly to actually protesting itself, and not to lower-risk activities such as signing a petition or contacting an official. Given these findings, how do the supplementary hypotheses that I proposed earlier in this text bear out in light of the analysis? What do the six linear models in the latter part of this chapter reveal about other behaviors that make protest likely? First, *experience matters*. Respondents who protested in the past were more likely to protest in the future, while respondents who signed a petition in the past were also more likely to do so again. This suggests that anyone hoping to identify segments of the population to mobilize should look first at those who have been active in the past, as they should be easiest to energize.

More broadly, this also presents a positive situation in which participating in these activities in the past did not have a deterrent effect on individuals. One can easily imagine a situation, for example, in which people who were politically active before (particularly in a semi-autocratic state such as Ukraine) would become disillusioned, viewing their activities as having little effect and becoming apathetic towards politics. The fact that prior participation *encourages* future activity is a very good sign, and suggests that these actors could be key figures in pro-democracy movements yet to
come. Moreover, it also shows that hypothesis 5 and hypothesis 6 are supported – prior protest participation and signing of petitions indicates an orientation to do so again\textsuperscript{15}.

Finally, I consider the other individual-level attributes that I predicted would matter in explaining protest behavior. I proposed in hypothesis 4 that individuals who were more interested in politics would be more likely to protest, but this was not supported. While surprising, it seems possible that this is the result of a large number of political science students being included in my sample. The students I surveyed were not all in political science, of course, as I also visited history and computer science courses depending on availability at each university. There were still more political science students than other disciplines, though, so perhaps the average effect of interest in politics is simply so high overall that it obscures variations in this area. I predicted in hypothesis 7 that students who were more oriented towards the West would be more likely to protest, but this was also not supported. Perhaps other questions on a longer and more detailed survey could have better captured this particular set of attitudes – asking about favorability towards certain Western organizations, for example – and can be tested in future research.

Turning to my final three hypotheses, I predicted first in hypothesis 8 that politically liberal participants would be more likely to protest. In general, this hypothesis was supported – more politically liberal respondents were consistently more likely to protest than were conservative participants. Second, I predicted in hypothesis 9 that those who are dissatisfied with democracy would be more likely to protest. However, this was not supported – this attitude never attained significance in any

\textsuperscript{15} As mentioned in earlier parts of this chapter, I was unable to test any linkages between respondents’ willingness to contact an elected official in the past and their willingness to do so again in the future due to the large number of respondents who indicated a “don’t know” response to that particular question.
model, indicating its lack of relative importance here. Finally, I predicted in hypothesis 10 that trusting individuals would be more likely to protest because of the communal nature the activity inspires. This was generally supported across models, as trust repeatedly proved to have a significant and positive relationship with protest behavior.

**Conclusions & Implications**

Taken together, what do these findings show us? First, at least within the context of Ukraine today, political protest and participation remain extremely viable and attractive forms of political behavior for students and other activists. The average rates of willingness to protest and to sign petitions were high across all three groups, and indicate that there is a notable pool of individuals who might be mobilized to take to the streets in the face of future autocratic reversals, scandals with corruption, or pervasive human rights abuses. This is perhaps a bit surprising given that the country is still recovering in many senses from the instability of the Euromaidan movement, but it certainly demonstrates some evidence that another movement might be more likely than some anticipate – the readiness among students is evident.

Second, certain types of individuals are more likely to join protest movements than others. According to the findings of the linear models, participants who were politically active in the past were more likely to be politically active in the future – rather than becoming jaded or weary, these people can instead be more easily mobilized should future social movements arise. Furthermore, activists attempting to recruit protesters would be well-advised to focus on politically liberal (or left) individuals who might be willing to challenge the government, as well as those who place high levels of trust in other people and who are willing to work together to achieve a common objective.
Third, and most pressingly for the purposes of this dissertation project, international factors matter, but their influence (at least in this survey experiment) is slightly tempered in two ways. Liberal assistance from democracies abroad was consistently more influential in shaping protest behavior than was authoritarian intervention, suggesting that while the effects of the authoritarian treatment were somewhat muted, the effects of the liberal treatment were unequivocally strong and clear – participants who believe that democratic forces elsewhere support them are much more likely to take to the street than are those who otherwise lack this type of knowledge.

Furthermore, this effect was strongest not on relatively commonplace forms of political behavior such as contacting officials and signing petitions, but instead on the most involved and intense form of behavior tested here – actually joining a movement. Heading to the streets and protesting against a government is a much more involved, costly, and dangerous activity than other forms of protest activity, and individuals’ decision-making strategies in this final sphere (a sphere with perhaps the most potential for real political change) are ultimately the most influenced by international factors.

Protests have become a viable tool for creating change in authoritarian and semi-authoritarian regimes today. At the same time, states have come to intervene in each other’s affairs at greater and greater rates, supporting or challenging segments of the population to make certain types of political outcomes more likely. This chapter has shown that according to the results of a six-month field survey experiment conducted in two waves at three Ukrainian universities, potential protesters are far more likely to take to the streets when they believe that liberal forces elsewhere are aware of their cause and are supportive of the movement. This holds even when other important
beliefs and values are accounted for in a series of linear models. These findings demonstrate that democracy promotion still has a valuable and very real role to play in the world today, and that the current worldwide trend towards “strongman rule” and illiberalism might mask the potential for a significant resurgence of liberal democratic growth in the future.
CHAPTER 5: COMPARATIVE CASE STUDIES: EXPANDING CONTEXTS

The two preceding chapters demonstrate the ways in which my project’s assertions apply to Ukraine’s 2013-2014 Euromaidan revolution and to studies of protest behavior in the country since that time. While Chapter 3’s emphasis on process-tracing and in-depth interviews showed how international factors influenced protesters’ decision-making strategies during the Revolution of Dignity, Chapter 4 utilized an experimental approach to illustrate the ways in which such variables might affect Ukrainian activists in the future. It is also essential to present cases in which my theory operates in different spatial and temporal dimensions, of course – for a proposition to “travel,” it is important to show how its mechanisms are not limited to one case alone.

In order to demonstrate my theory’s relevance for other contexts, I turn in the following chapter to a series of comparative analyses that show how different components of my framework operate in a variety of settings. By demonstrating that my theory applies to a number of divergent cases, I show that my ideas are generalizable, extending the range of situations to which my propositions apply. Political protests and external influences matter in all corners of the globe, and my approach in this chapter is to turn my focus outwards to capture this important dimension.

This chapter proceeds in the following way. I begin by introducing and previewing the comparative case studies that I include here, showing why each is an important context for testing my theory. It is critical to select cases that differ from one another on important dimensions to ensure that I am not simply analyzing similar situations, and I justify this process in greater detail below. Following this, I present the methodological approach that I adopt in this chapter, demonstrating the ways in which my analysis is held consistent across cases to be as logical and rigorous as possible. I
then turn to the core of the chapter – a close examination of my five cases, highlighting the relevance of each for illustrating my theoretical mechanisms in action. Finally, I conclude by synthesizing my main conclusions and their implications. It is to the first task above that I now turn.

**Justifying my case selections – which contexts am I comparing and why?**

In any comparative study, it is of utmost importance to select cases that are fundamentally logical to compare. If I test my theoretical framework in contexts where my expectations would not reasonably apply, this would undermine the usefulness of my analysis. Similarly, if I compare cases that are either too similar or too divergent, this would also weaken my ability to test whether my mechanisms are operating as I expect. For this reason, I present five cases that exhibit both important contextual similarities and also critical variations for testing competing aspects of my theory. These cases – Ukraine in 2004, Bahrain in 2011, Uzbekistan in 2005, Lebanon in 2005, and Venezuela in 2019 – are listed in Table 5.1 below.

As outlined in previous sections of this dissertation, I am primarily interested in understanding the influences of two external forces on the calculations of protesters in autocracies today – external democratic support aimed to bolster the protests’ strength and external authoritarian intervention designed to keep the protests from succeeding. Because of this, I have selected one case that largely exemplifies each of four different situations in the two-by-two matrix below – 1) a protest movement in a hybrid regime where democratic support outweighed the role of autocratic intervention (Ukraine’s 2004 Orange Revolution); 2) a movement in which democratic support was relatively weak and domestic state capacity was too strong for it to have much effect (Uzbekistan in 2005); 3) a revolution in which autocratic intervention failed to undermine
4) an uprising in an autocratic state that was crushed by intervention from outside authoritarian forces (Bahrain in 2011).

It is important to note, of course, that none of these cases are true “ideal types” in the sense that one type of intervention was wholly present while the other was wholly absent. It would be preferable from a scholarly perspective if one truly could study a case with full democratic support but absolutely no external autocratic presence, for example, but such a case is unrealistic – disentangling the competing effects of countless international variables is impossible, particularly given the relatively truncated length of each case study. Nevertheless, as I show in subsequent sections, empirical evidence demonstrates that one type of support was more predominant and influential at the time than the other, creating a series of cases that differ on both the important factor of domestic regime capacity and the nature of external signals sent to protesters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role played by international actors in a given protest movement</th>
<th>Regime Type</th>
<th>Semi-authoritarian or hybrid regimes</th>
<th>Fully authoritarian or heavily autocratic regimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External democratic promotion designed to support the protests</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ukraine 2004</td>
<td>Uzbekistan 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Venezuela 2019?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External autocratic intervention designed to suppress the protests</td>
<td>Lebanon 2005</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bahrain 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Venezuela 2019?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to these cases, I present an analysis of the protests that have been taking place in Venezuela since the mid-2010s. This event differs from the others on two important dimensions. First, and most obviously, its outcome has not yet been determined – whereas each of the other cases was decisively successful or unsuccessful, it is still unclear whether embattled President Nicolás Maduro will be forced from office. Second, it is a case in which both external democratic support and autocratic intervention have been clear and present throughout the duration of the event. This therefore represents a test of competing mechanisms within one context. By selecting these cases, all of which fall within my emphasis on non-violent campaigns pursuing democratic reform and combatting corruption, I study a wider range of movements that show how my theory travels beyond Ukraine in the early twenty-first century.

Utilizing a comparative approach and maintaining a consistent method

In this section, I briefly describe the comparative approach that I adopt in this chapter. This demonstrates how my approach is consistent from context to context, and will make it easier to compare the cases on the important dimensions explored here.

I begin each case study by presenting the movement’s triggers and goals as well as the most common tactics that were utilized by participants. While this part of my discussion might not focus on the international variables that are central to my broader analysis, it is important to focus on these topics to demonstrate that each anti-governmental campaign falls within the pro-democratic and peaceful realm that comprises my framework. It does not make sense to apply my theory to cases of violent ethnic conflict or brutal religious extremism, and the information detailed here will show that this step is met. In doing so, I rely upon qualitative scholarly and journalistic sources that attest to the factors that spurred participants in each movement to join.
Following this, I analyze the ways in which either external democratic promotion designed to bolster the protests or external authoritarian intervention designed to suppress the protests was present. As noted above, there are few cases in which one type of external intervention was present while the other was absent – states do not exist entirely in isolation of one another, and larger countries often try to influence their neighbors. Further, it is important to recognize that a significant amount of assistance (both democratic and anti-democratic) takes place “behind the scenes,” and cannot be easily traced by average citizens or analysts studying this subject. Nevertheless, I will rely upon research and news reports to present evidence that in the cases I have selected, strong signals of either type of support were made and protesters would have known of their existence. These are objective indicators of the types of support that were being signaled at the international level – expressions of aid that did in fact exist in a highly visible manner. Additionally, I use these sources to assess a state’s domestic capacity and regime strength. Much of my argument rests on the importance of an autocracy’s repressive capacity, and it will be essential to show how this factors into the analysis as well.

Critically, I then highlight the mechanisms of my theory that were operating in each case. Certain mechanisms were much more present in some states than others, and I show how different components of my claims did or did not operate in each context to either spur or deflate protest participation. This section of each case study is most concerned with what protesters thought and felt – individual-level evidence that people on the ground were aware of and acting upon democratic support or autocratic intervention. In addition to qualitative evidence, I also present empirical data regarding protest size when available. Reliable quantitative data on protest participation
and size is unfortunately difficult to obtain and study within the parameters of this dissertation, as many data sets in this field are too static (meaning that they do not trace changes in size from one period of time to another and focus instead on estimating crowd mass at one point only); too limited in their temporal or geographical scope (meaning that they do not provide variation in their coverage); or do not contain information on the actions of external actors towards a protest’s development. Further, depending on the source at hand, estimates of crowd size themselves can be unreliably inflated or deflated for political purposes – a 2012 Radio Free Europe-Radio Liberty piece shows how the Russian government constantly and intentionally under-estimates crowd size at opposition rallies¹, while a 2018 Washington Post article reports that over-inflating crowd size of administration supporters has been a staple of the Trump regime since the President’s inaugural address². Despite these inherent drawbacks, data sources on crowd size are still valuable when available and will be used as supplementary content within my broader analysis.

For three of the five cases included here, I report data on external actions and changes in crowd size drawn from the Nonviolent and Violent Campaigns and Outcomes (NAVCO) 3.0 dataset, one of the most comprehensive within this area of research³. NAVCO 3.0 scholars selected twenty-six countries around the world and coded data regarding social movement goals, changes in crowd size from day to day, and statements

³ These data are available on the website of the University of Denver’s Sié Chéou-Kang Center for International Security & Diplomacy, found online at https://www.du.edu/korbel/sie/research/chenow_navco_data.html.
and other actions taken by actors within and outside of the country at hand. This includes condemnations or commemorations made by Presidents and Prime Ministers around the world, calls for sanctions, and statements issued by representatives from international organizations like the United Nations or the European Union. It is important to remember that changes in crowd size cannot be directly attributed to statements or actions from external actors, of course, as many other factors are simultaneously taking place. Nevertheless, by demonstrating that protests either grew or shrank dramatically in the days following an external action, I show that there is an apparent link and that these factors affected peoples’ willingness to take to the streets.

Finally, I conclude with a brief overview of the outcome of each movement—were the protesters successful in achieving their goals? Was policy or regime change attained, or did politics remain the same as before? Concluding each case study in this way will provide a helpful overview of each movement’s overall effectiveness. I now turn to the first point of analysis in this chapter—Ukraine’s 2004 Orange Revolution.

**Case study #1: Ukraine’s 2004 Orange Revolution**

While preceding chapters have focused extensively on Ukraine’s 2013-2014 Euromaidan movement and trends in political behavior throughout the country since that time, it is also valuable to test the mechanisms of my theory within the context of the country’s 2004 Orange Revolution. This campaign was sufficiently distinct and temporally separate from Euromaidan to be assessed as its own unique event, particularly as the Orange Revolution provides another important example of the ways in which external democracy promotion can drive people to the streets against leaders.

---

4 For more information on the dataset, see Chenoweth, Pinckney, and Lewis (2018).
5 These statements have also been coded to reflect the specific calendar dates on which they were proclaimed, making it easier to situate their proper temporal location within the framework of the broader social movement.
In terms of its origins, the Orange Revolution certainly did not appear out of nowhere – as White and McAllister (2009) make clear, public discontent with authorities in Ukraine had been growing for years, precipitated by events including the murder and subsequent cover-up of investigate journalist Heorhiy Gongadze, evidence of illegal weapons sales to foreign governments, and potential proof of fraud in the Presidential election of Leonid Kuchma in 2000. Much as Euromaidan saw years of discontent mobilize into concrete action following the focal point of students being beaten by regime forces, the trigger for the Orange Revolution was one singular event – the fraudulent election of Viktor Yanukovych as President in November 2004.

Yanukovych’s campaign against former Prime Minister Viktor Yushchenko for the office was marked by controversy, even nearly resulting in the death of one of the candidates. As Plokhy (2015) notes, Yushchenko was poisoned in September 2014 by an unknown assailant; after he was safely hospitalized abroad and began to recover, doctors determined that he had been nearly killed by a dioxin of a strain of a poison produced in Russia but not in Ukraine. Karatnycky (2005) and Reid (2015) emphasize that this was hardly the first evidence of covert Russian interference in the 2004 election – Vladimir Putin had already sent a team of Kremlin “political technologists” to advise Yanukovych in his electoral strategy and in fact visited Ukraine several times to appear as a visible supporter for the Yanukovych campaign. Further, Fraser (2008) suggests

---

6 Interestingly, Wilson (2014) suggests that these technologists – actors who work as strategic advisers to candidates and campaigns, often in a way that lacks any kind of transparency or openness – were also effective in mobilizing some radical nationalists that rallied behind the Yushchenko campaign at the time. Their goal was evidently to tar Yushchenko supporters as national fascists; if they were able to work this particular demographic of supporter into enough of a frenzy, this would make it appears as though all Yushchenko supporters were similarly aggressive. This in turn would feed into the Putin regime’s common tactic of using fascism as a label to discredit and delegitimize a given political opposition.

7 In addition to these transparent expressions of support issued by the Russian President, Yekelchyk (2015) notes that Yanukovych was also receiving the support and endorsement of essentially every state-owned Russian television channel at the time. While such channels originate in Russia, many have
that Putin provided roughly half of the campaign expenses for Yanukovych in his quest for the Presidency, covering campaign materials, advertisements, and investments.

While these developments set the stage for widespread anger at corruption and Russian interference in Ukraine’s electoral process, the true spark of the Revolution itself came in late November 2004 following the initial results of the election. Both Yushchenko and Yanukovych advanced to a second round of voting as the top two candidates from the first round on roughly equal footing. Upon the conclusion of the second round on November 21, independent exit polls showed Yushchenko receiving approximately 53% of the vote and Yanukovych receiving approximately 44%. However, when official governmental agencies revealed their formal tallies, Yanukovych was declared the winner with 49.5% of the vote to Yushchenko’s 46.9%.

In addition to this suspicious reversal from the outcome expected based on exit polling, Myagkov, Ordeshook, and Shakin (2009) point to the fact that supposed turnout in regions of Ukraine supporting Yanukovych increased at much higher rates in the second round than would be reasonably expected. Widespread discontent was further exacerbated by telephone interceptions from Yanukovych’s campaign staff indicating that they had falsified local election results later submitted to Kyiv, demonstrating incontrovertible proof of electoral fraud. Karatnycky (2005) suggests that the blatant disregard for democracy in this situation was drastic enough to unite disparate groups in Ukrainian society, including civic reformists, politicians, and members of the educated middle class. Fournier (2010) agrees, reporting that the results of interviews she conducted on-the-ground with Yushchenko supporters showed historically had widespread reach and sizeable audiences in Eastern Ukraine, and they are often more influential on voters there than is Ukrainian state media.
that for many, the election was the “last drop” that they were willing to tolerate. Further, Hatton (2010) suggests that the Revolution’s emphasis on democracy had a pro-Western character, as Yushchenko repeatedly evinced the notion of moving Ukraine towards the European Union or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in the future.

As more and more people took to the streets, the movement grew to be massive in scope. While no exact figures on crowd size exist, Beissinger (2011) points to the results of the 2004 wave of the European Social Survey (ESS), which asked Ukrainians whether they had participated in a demonstration in the past twelve months. According to the survey, 22% of Ukrainians answered in the affirmative, a number that was dramatically higher than the 6% who reported similar protest behavior in the 2002 ESS. Relying upon survey data issued by the Institute of Sociology at the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Beissinger further notes that respondents who self-reported as having been participants on Maidan during the Orange Revolution were asked to identify the main causes prompting people to join at that time. 44.8% felt that protesters were there to reject one of the election’s candidates, 39.1% reported activists’ hope for attaining better living standards, 36.8% noted individuals’ fear for their children’s future, and 34.5% felt that people were inspired by an emotional protest against injustice. Interestingly, despite the Russian media’s efforts to paint protesters as paid shills carrying out the covert plans of the West, only 1.1% of people felt that the cause of the Orange Revolution was “a choice of geopolitical orientation between the West and Russia.” Instead, the motivation was to restructure political life in their country.

As Yekelchyk (2015) notes, the Orange Revolution was not as organic or “grassroots” in its origins as was the Euromaidan movement. Instead, politicians played a large role in mobilizing people to take to the streets – Reid (2015) and Menon and
Rumer (2015) stress that the movement’s name was derived from Yushchenko’s “Our Ukraine” party and its orange coloring and emphasize that many people were inspired by his candidacy\(^8\). While the opposition was therefore influenced by politicians, some of whom might have possessed their own ulterior motives\(^9\), participants’ tactics remained calm and civil. Indeed, as Wilson (2006) notes, protesters adopted a framework of strategic non-violence, or one that was “neither passive nor a means of avoiding conflict, but a means of identifying and engaging the weak points that any regime will have, and of avoiding giving semiauthoritarian regimes an excuse to crack down” (30). In doing so, protesters hoped to discredit any type of repression that security forces might employ. In stark contrast to bloody revolutions that overthrew dictators in places such as Qaddafi’s Libya, the Orange Revolution was notable for the overall lack of violence utilized by either protesters or the government – no single individual died directly as a result of the conflict. Karatynycky (2005) reports that though Yanukovych initially demanded that force be used to remove the protesters, the Ukrainian security apparatus took no action due to divisions between the military and the Ukrainian security services (or SBU) as to whether or not this was necessary.

Reid (2015) notes that participants did often conduct activities that were deemed illegal, occupying large public structures such as the Trade Union Building, but that protesters were also wholly peaceful in doing so and used the buildings as centers for distributing donated mattresses, clothing and food. Further, she points to the overall celebratory nature of the Revolution, stressing that participants were forbidden from

\(^8\) Beissinger (2013) adopts a more cynical perspective on the Orange Revolution’s mobilization, as he suggests that oppositional elites amplified and exacerbated cultural cleavage to drive people to the streets, relying on negative mobilization rather than positive enthusiasm about democratization and reform.

\(^9\) Katchanovski (2008) supports this perspective, pointing to the fact that many Yushchenko advisers and strategists were hardly true revolutionaries themselves – while many were indeed committed to liberalization and democracy, many were also former members of other, corrupt prior administrations.
drinking alcohol on the square to prevent rowdiness and that organizers recruited musicians to perform for crowds nightly. Taken together, these findings indicate that the movement fits within the non-violent scope of cases to which my theory applies.

Scholars have shown that there was a significant amount of objective external democratic support towards the Orange Revolution. According to Wilson (2006), significant Western funds aimed at promoting democratic development had been actively involved in Ukraine for years – hundreds of millions of dollars entered the country through organizations including United States Agency for International Development; George Soros’s International Renaissance Foundation; Freedom House; and the National Endowment for Democracy. Similarly, McFaul (2007) finds that the United States government spent eighteen million dollars specifically on election funding and training in the two years before the 2004 Presidential election, and Kuzio (2006) reports that training from Western civil society groups intensified in the early 2000s, indicating that activists were quite aware that external forces supported their mission.

What have scholars found about Western support during the Orange Revolution itself? Wilson (2006) argues that external organizations’ financial support for protesters played an important role, but that from a purely monetary perspective, their power was overshadowed by domestic and Russian forces supporting Yanukovych – his backers spent more than four hundred million dollars to help him win office. For liberal outside

---

10 Chaulia (2005) echoes these claims, suggesting that international non-governmental organizations (most with ties to Western states or groups) played a significant role in founding and shaping the activities of Ukrainian activist and civil society groups in the years following the country’s independence.
11 According to Emeran and Polyakova (forthcoming), this degree of support from the West was particularly evident to Ukrainian civil society reformers and activists because the vast majority of workers employed on-the-ground at these democracy promotion organizations in Ukraine were Ukrainians themselves. Rather than import American or Western European workers to carry out their mission, most organizations relied upon a few Western-born individuals to lead the group who would then transfer their skills and mission to Ukrainians working to implement the group’s goals in practice.
actors, therefore, their influence flowed more through a combination of civil society training and symbolic support made by politicians' statements and gestures.

As an example of this, McFaul (2007) shows that the United States Department of State invited the Speaker of the Verkhovna Rada (Ukraine’s legislature) to visit Washington, D.C. five days before the election. This was heavily political in nature, as State Department officials informed Speaker Volodymyr Lytvyn that the United States intended to “to underscore [its] support for a legislative body committed to ensuring an outcome that reflected the will of the people” (68). McFaul argues that this allowed Western forces to position certain members of the Rada as oppositional actors who would later challenge Yanukovych, strengthening the chances of a divided government while sending a signal to Ukrainians that the West was watching the election closely.

The most prominent form of support offered by democratic governments towards the protesters during the Revolution came in the form of official statements challenging the election’s results and proclamations demanding a free and fair vote. These actions included the United States immediately threatening sanctions should the fraudulent vote stand; the parliamentary deputy head of the European parliament claiming that the vote was rigged; and the chief of NATO calling for a rigorous investigation into the election’s outcome. Pifer (2007) mentions that Secretary of State Colin Powell refused to accept the outcome as “legitimate,” and sitting President Leonid Kuchma quickly sought the advice of outside forces in generating a dialogue between Yanukovych and Yushchenko to address this international criticism.

Moreover, similar statements by other, varied political figures were equally scathing in their criticism of the election’s conduct and outcome. Quinn-Judge and Zakharovich (2005) note that United States Senator Richard Lugar called the results “a concerted and forceful program of...fraud and abuse enacted with either the leadership or cooperation of governmental authorities,” while Secretary of State Colin Powell noted that the United States was deeply disturbed by the extent to which fraud had taken place.
Additionally, several foreign officials traveled to Kyiv to negotiate and offer tacit support to the opposition’s calls for a re-vote, including Polish President Aleksander Kwasniewski, former Polish President Lech Walesa, Lithuanian President Valdas Adamkus, and High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Javier Solana. At the same time, leaders across Europe were in constant communication about the crisis, leading Kwasniewski to believe that he had a critical amount of backing from European Union leaders to step in as a mediator.

Several scholars point to this international mediation as critical in guiding the movement to a resolution. Pifer (2007) posits that while Ukrainians themselves were ultimately responsible for helping the Revolution come to a peaceful end, outside actors – particularly Kwasniewski and Adamkus – were highly influential in resolving the crisis due to several reasons: 1) their presence and engagement dis-incentivized the use of force against protesters, making it easier for people to remain on the streets; 2) the threat of their return in the future should a stable compromise not be reached forced Ukrainians to come to a workable compromise; and 3) their engagement in the proceedings kept the negotiations from being mired down in disagreements. From a broader perspective, according to Kosc-Harmatiy (2011), while Solana was not as actively involved as his Polish and Lithuanian counterparts due to his diplomatic role as a representative of the entire European Union, his presence was still significant as it demonstrated that the crisis had captured Europe’s attention.

This attention from Western forces continued throughout the duration of the movement, culminating in a visit from Secretary of State Colin Powell to commemorate

---

Yushchenko’s inauguration as President of Ukraine in January 2005. It is evident from the preceding analysis that in addition to laying the groundwork for a democratic revolution through years of training and millions of dollars invested in civil society, democratic states helped sustain the protests by showing that they were standing with the participants and promoting a sense of purposive solidarity with activists.

Another important component of Western support that must be discussed here is the role of international media. Earlier sections of this dissertation point to the fact that dictatorial leaders – particularly those whose states that are more hybrid than fully authoritarian – are often constrained in the violence they can use against protesters because the eyes of the world are upon them. According to several scholars, this was true in 2004 Ukraine as well – Wilson (2005) points to reports that while Kuchma was considering using force against protesters near the start of the Revolution, officials decided quickly against such a plan due to the fact that images being transmitted around the world would undermine the regime’s international standing. Moreover, United States Ambassador John Herbst and Secretary of State Colin Powell both warned Kuchma against the usage of force after hearing that the regime was considering a crackdown on activists, again reminding leaders that they were being watched closely.

It is interesting to note that as was the case with Euromaidan, certain segments of the Ukrainian population came to believe a narrative that the West orchestrated the entire revolution. White and McAllister (2009) report that according to an original

---

14 CNN. “Powell in Ukraine for inauguration: Plans to meet with Kuchma, Yushchenko.” CNN. Published January 23, 2005. Available online at http://www.cnn.com/2005/ALLPOLITICS/01/23/powell.ukraine/. 15 Interestingly, Ambassador Herbst appears to have been quite a notable figure in linking Ukrainian activists up both with one another and with Western organizations and embassies. According to Emeran and Polyakova (forthcoming), Herbst regularly held monthly meetings between Ukrainian non-governmental organizations and Western activists and ambassadors to reassure members of civil society that they were being supported by liberal democratic forces elsewhere.
survey that they conducted in Ukraine from November to December 2017, forty-seven percent of respondents in Eastern Ukraine and fifty-three percent of ethnic Russians throughout the country characterized the Revolution as a Western-designed and backed coup.1617 Unsurprisingly, perhaps, these are also the geographical and demographic groups that are most likely to consume media from Russia – in contrast, among respondents living in Kyiv, only thirteen percent felt the same way.

What role did external authoritarian forces objectively play in attempting to help Yanukovych win the election and then weather the ensuring protests against him? Much of the autocratic influence on Ukraine had been building and developing before the Revolution took place. According to McFaul (2007), the Putin administration had been selling Russian gas to the Kuchma regime at reduced rates for many years in an effort to keep Ukraine tied closely to Russia and its undemocratic form of government.

Perhaps the most influential action taken by Putin during the protests themselves was the Russian government’s continued recognition of Yanukovych as the rightful victor and its demands that the results of the first election hold18. Putin’s stance was enthusiastically supported by the Russian public, as Yanukovych was seen as friendlier towards Russian interests among a population who desired close ties between the two nations – Fraser (2008) finds that three-quarters of Russians at the time felt that Russia

16 A December 2004 Guardian article provides qualitative evidence of this, noting that for one skeptical respondent, he “refused to accept that any of the protesters on Independence Square was there because of a concern for honesty and fairness. They were all there because they had been paid. And the ultimate paymaster was Washington. ”It used to be Yugoslavia. Then Iraq. Now it’s Ukraine.”” See Meek, James. “Divided they stand.” The Guardian. Published December 9, 2004. Available online at https://www.theguardian.com/world/2004/dec/10/ukraine.jamesmeek.

17 This was likely aided significantly by statements made by Vladimir Putin at the time – a 2004 Atlantic article notes that he referred to Western democracy promotion as “a ”dictatorial” foreign policy...packaged...in beautiful, pseudo-democratic phraseology.” See: Schneider, William. ”Ukraine’s Orange Revolution.” The Atlantic. Published December 2004. Available online at https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2004/12/ukraines-orange-revolution/305157/.

18 Holley (2004) notes that Putin’s support for Yanukovych was clear and apparent to all observers since the beginning of his electoral campaign.
and Ukraine should merge into a single country. Additionally, in an interview with *Ukrainska Prawda*, the Ambassador of Russia to Ukraine Viktor Chernomyrdin stated, “Ukraine and Russia have never lived as two sovereign states. Ukraine has never been a sovereign government. Now we have to learn how to perceive her as such” (9). Reid (2015) notes that Putin personally called Yanukovych to recognize him as the new President before the votes were verified. Unlike in Euromaidan, however, there was little evidence that Putin sent any tactical materials to Yanukovych.

Instead, the Russian reaction at the time focused on discrediting the movement to reduce the chance that democratic forces in Russia and Belarus would be inspired to undertake similar campaigns. Indeed, Herd (2005) finds that one Russian analyst specifically said shortly after Yanukovych was ousted from power, “Russia cannot allow defeat in the battle for Ukraine. Besides everything else, defeat would mean velvet revolutions in the next two years, now following the Kiev variant, in Belarus, Moldova, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and possibly Armenia” (17). This is clear evidence of a fear of regional diffusion, in which one autocratic ally after another could fall from power.

Interestingly, authors including Delcour and Wolczuk (2015) argue that while the Russian government worked to combat the spread of democracy in hybrid states since the Orange and other “Color” Revolutions, this has caused a backlash in which hybrid regimes become more intent on liberalizing and moving West than they otherwise would have been. Herd (2005) suggests that “Putin became the factor that helped to unite Ukrainian nationalists, liberals, and socialists against the authorities and against Moscow. Having taken part in the Ukraine struggle, Moscow has...narrowed the field for

---

19 Sushko (2004) notes that Yanukovych was also congratulated by a host of other autocratic leaders in addition to Vladimir Putin. These included Belarus’s Alexander Lukashenko, the breakaway republic of Transnistria’s Igor Smirnov, Kyrgyzstan’s Askar Akayev, Uzbekistan’s Islam Karimov, and Yugoslavia’s former President Slobodan Milosevic.
domination in the post-Soviet space” (24). On the whole, democratic support appears to have outweighed autocratic intervention in the Orange Revolution, making participation by protesters more likely than would have otherwise been the case.

What evidence exists that my causal mechanisms were operating during the Orange Revolution? First, ample content shows that protesters were highly cognizant of and solicitous towards external democratic forces in hopes that their assistance would strengthen the movement. According to a 2004 New York Times article written during the height of the protests, the author finds that many people were hoping for – at the most basic level – a significant amount of symbolic recognition from the West.

The article notes, “Here’s a suggestion for President Bush from the protesters behind the democratic “orange revolution” here: Wear an orange tie. “If he wore an orange tie, people here would be crying,” said Yuri Maluta, a protester from Lviv. “It would show that the American president supports democracy here.” This is a highly relevant example of the power of purposive solidarity – for this activist, Bush’s possible decision to publicly declare his support for the movement would have sent a clear signal to protesters that they were being seen, recognized, and validated by a powerful democratic leader. Another strong example of purposive solidarity can be seen by the prominent public appearances of former Polish President Lech Walesa, who regularly supported the protests during his visits to the country and made statements including, “I opposed the Soviet Union, and I opposed communism, and I came out victorious.

21 The same author notes that Orange Revolution participants were enthusiastic and energetic when they discovered that an American reporter was in Kyiv documenting their campaign, and that many activists asked him to sign their orange memorabilia with the letters “USA.”
Ukraine has a chance! In this case, Walesa was providing a clear signal to protesters that *they stood a chance at succeeding*, strengthening their belief that creating political change was possible. Finally, statements made by protest leaders themselves reflect the fact that the campaign was seeking attention from the outside world. At a rally celebrating the Orange Revolution’s victorious outcome, Yushchenko proclaimed, “The heart of Ukraine was on Independence Square...Good people from all over the world, from far away countries, were looking at Independence Square, at us.” Taken together, these quotes indicate clear evidence that purposive solidarity played a large role in shaping the perceptions of participants in the Orange Revolution.

Similarly, other sources provide information indicating that participants were aware of the fact that their campaign stood a better chance at success should they attain the attention of actors elsewhere. As one respondent noted in a December 2004 *Los Angeles Times* article, “The last campaign rally we had -- we were trying to show the

---


23 A *National Public Radio* article from August 2005 indicates that protesters were cognizant of Western support for the movement both before and after the fraudulent electoral results were reversed, noting that “ordinary people [are]...glad when people like Viktor Yushchenko can go to America and to have a hero's welcome.” See: *National Public Radio*. “The Orange Revolution, Six Months Later.” *National Public Radio*. Published August 23, 2005. Available online at [https://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=4811330](https://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=4811330).

24 Furthermore, according to Kuzio (2005), this strong signaling of support sent a clear message to protesters that the Euro-Atlantic alliance was unwilling to cede the fraudulent election to Yanukovych, and that it would instead stand firm behind protesters in their calls for democracy.


26 The same CBS News report indicates that Yushchenko publicly attributed a great deal of the Orange Revolutions' success to the role played by support from outside forces. Yushchenko reportedly spoke with Secretary of State Colin Powell following the movement’s conclusion and told him, “I'm sure that on Independence Square you will see hundreds of thousands of people with very bright eyes...none of that would have been possible without our partners who share the same democratic values as we do, in which I include President Bush and you.”

27 Interestingly, Emeran and Polyakova (forthcoming) also suggest that Yushchenko and other leaders of the “Our Ukraine” party attributed a fair amount of influence in their success towards foreign governments and non-governmental groups, praising the fact that Western embassies were able to connect Ukrainian activists with activists and civil society organizations located in their own home countries of origin.
world that Yushchenko supporters are also human beings, and we have the right to gather, to express our opinion under orange banners. Moreover, a number of other reporters covering the events described the Orange Revolution as “a media-savvy revolution, almost like a democracy festival, aimed at winning the sympathy of Europeans and Americans” and a campaign that forcefully demanded some type of significant response from Western countries and political actors. Further, this sense of solidarity extended in some cases even to non-democratic contexts – a November 2004 *Los Angeles Times* article presents the views of one respondent who managed to convince her friends in Russia that the movement was worthy of support. As she recounted, “When they heard that we’re here all night in the snow and rain, they wrote us and said, ‘We understand you’...They feel they are in warm flats and we are in cold tents, and now they understand and want to help us. We feel like winners.”

In addition to purposive solidarity, there is significant on-the-ground evidence that the presence of Western support for the protesters helped their cause by sending a

---

31 Other sources report interviews and conversations with activists demonstrating that while participants were indeed cognizant of the support that did exist from several liberal international actors, many individuals indeed wished to solicit even more outside attention towards their cause. As evidence of this, the previously mentioned 2004 *New York Times* also includes quotations from an activist who intentionally desired more outside support. The article notes, “‘Bush has to push more strongly and decisively on Ukraine to be democratic,’” said Bogdan Prysyazhnyuk, a young lawyer who is backing the orange revolution. This particular activist was clearly turning his attention beyond Ukraine’s borders in recognition of the effective role that outside actors could play in shaping the movement’s outcome.
credible threat of sanctioning should the Kuchma regime crack down too forcefully. Several pieces including Dell’Arciprete (2005), Kemp and Solonenko (2007), and Haran (2012) note that linkages between Ukrainian civil society groups and international organizations increased the ability of activists to bring outside forces to Kyiv. According to authors such as Emeran and Polyakova (forthcoming), individual actors including Western diplomats played an effective role in deterring the usage of force by appearing regularly and publicly in Kyiv, indicating both to activists and to the regime that any serious repression against the movement would be noted and reported quickly.33

This section has shown that democratic support from outside forces shaped protesters’ beliefs by signaling to them that people elsewhere championed their cause, granting them feelings of emotional solidarity and decreasing the chances that the regime would repress their movement. It is also important to consider the role played by perceptions of autocratic intervention from the Russian regime to support Yanukovych. According to several reports issued by journalists in Kyiv at that time, a significant number of activists made clear their frustration and anger at unwanted intervention on Yanukovych’s behalf. The primary determinants driving people to the streets were domestic in nature, but I now show that beliefs about Russia played a role as well.

As evidence of this, reports reference everything from activists brandishing English-language signs reading “Putin: Hands Off Ukraine!” to respondents stating

33 According to the same authors and to Bassuener (2003), Western embassies and officials also played an important role in connecting Ukrainian activists with civil society organizations in other countries both in advance of and during the 2004 Presidential election and subsequent Orange Revolution. This included democratic trainers from Slovakia, Serbia, and Georgia, many of which had experienced their own electoral revolutions in recent years.

that the movement was partially about moving beyond Russia’s sphere of influence to crowds in the Maidan loudly booing whenever images of Vladimir Putin were projected onto the square’s many screens. Two other pieces of evidence are relevant for this discussion. First, a *Time* report from November 2004 presents the viewpoint of one respondent who sarcastically thanked both Putin and Yanukovych for uniting Ukrainian protesters against both domestic corruption and unwanted intervention. For physician Taras Kuchma, “they [Putin and Yanukovych] finally forced the Ukrainians to unite to become a nation.” Here, his perception is clearly that the two figures were working together to suppress the movement. Finally, a CBS News article reports the viewpoint of an activist who viewed the Orange Revolution within a broader geopolitical framework aimed at ending Russian influence in Ukraine. The report notes, “This is the end of the big game. After this, with Yushchenko Ukraine has the opportunity to become a real state, a real nation — not Russia’s back yard," said 35-year-old Bohdan Mysorsky, one of the throng waiting in subfreezing temperatures for the speech.” For these people, their actions were driven by a desire to combat visible efforts from the Russian government to sway the election in a way that would benefit Russia.

The preceding discussion has drawn from scholarly work and news sources to explain the origins of the Orange Revolution and to provide evidence that activists were aware of outside forces working to influence dynamics on the ground. What can


empirical data illustrate regarding actions taken by external actors and resultant changes in crowd size? I now present and interpret data from the NAVCO 3.0 database. As mentioned earlier, analysts involved in constructing this dataset tracked day-by-day news reports and event information to code and list important developments. I report and illustrate the most relevant findings from their data in Figure 5.1 below.

What information is being presented here? First, the plotted data depict events that took place from November 21, 2004 to January 23, 2005 – these are the beginning and end dates of the Orange Revolution. Bar graphs in blue are the most easily interpreted in the figure – these indicate the number of protesters (in the thousands) who were estimated to have joined the mass movement in central Kyiv on any given day. One can see that estimates hold that nearly 100,000 people took to the streets at several points, with activity particularly concentrated near the beginning of the campaign in late November and early December. Participation rates decreased following that time before flaring up again in late January, when Yushchenko was inaugurated as President.

The red lines indicate actions that were taken or statements that were made by officials, politicians, or international organizations elsewhere in favor of the protesters; these therefore represent external democratic support. It is not possible to explicitly quantify these statements in a way that is directly comparable with numerical estimates of crowd size, of course. However, as the timing of these statements is important, I have plotted them together on one graph to provide a sense of the temporal points at which international support was most prominent and the times at which crowd sizes were largest. I have coded the figure so that days with the most significant amounts of activity display higher bar graphs than days where no statements were made.

As a way to interpret this, one can take November 23 as an example – this is the
Figure 5.1. NAVCO 3.0 Data on Crowd Size in Orange Revolution
day with the single highest bar graph in Figure 5.1. According to NAVCO 3.0, on this day alone, several external actions were taken in support of the protests including France expressing “serious doubts” about the election’s legitimacy; a European Union monitor decrying the Ukrainian election as “North-Korean style;” the staff at the Kyiv embassy of the United States declaring that the peoples’ will must be respected; a series of demonstrations in Poland to support the Yushchenko campaign and to criticize the falsified results; and the Canadian Prime Minister issuing a statement questioning the vote’s legitimacy. Quite evidently, the eyes of the world were in many ways on Ukraine at this time, as leaders made statements against Yanukovych’s victory clearly and loudly.

What indicators are represented by the green bars? Days with these bars denote instances when public statements were made by an authoritarian leader elsewhere either against the protests or in support of Yanukovych as the election’s victor, despite widespread knowledge that the vote was fraudulent. It is apparent from Figure 5.1 that authoritarian support was not as large during the Orange Revolution as was democratic promotion. Notable exceptions include several of the earliest days of the Revolution, when Putin publicly congratulated Yanukovych on his victory multiple times (both before and after the formal results were announced), Russia’s parliamentary speaker adopted a similar stance in attempts to legitimize Yanukovych’s win, and Chinese officials indicated that they respected the apparent “will of the people.” While none of these statements in and of themselves were forceful condemnations against the protests, they still represented clear interjections by dictatorial leaders who were aiming to throw their support behind their corrupt ally to undermine oppositional forces.

In interpreting these data, it is imperative to offer a note of caution. As presented here, it is impossible to clearly differentiate correlation from causation. It is undeniably
clear from Figure 5.1 that high periods of international attention and large-scale turnout at rallying events tend to be correlated with one another. This is true not only at the start of the movement, but also during a brief period in central January when activity in both spheres elevated once again. It is entirely possible (and indeed likely) that international attention was being paid to Ukraine because the protests themselves were large, and not specifically that the protests themselves were large because they were receiving international attention. Instead, it is plausible that both factors were feeding into one another – more protests begat more attention, which sustained more protests, which gained more attention, and so on. It is difficult to clearly trace a causal linkage within the scope of this particular case, but taken together, these data along with the qualitative information produced in the preceding discussion suggest that my theory is supported within the context of Ukraine’s Orange Revolution.

I conclude this study by noting the outcome of the Revolution. As the protests’ goal was to challenge a fraudulent election, the campaign was successful – authorities agreed to hold a re-vote between Yanukovych and Yushchenko. Voters cast their ballots in late December 2004 amidst the presence of international observers and election monitors, and the Central Election Commission of Ukraine declared Yushchenko the winner with 51.99% to Yanukovych’s 44.20%. Yanukovych decided not to challenge the results, and Yushchenko was formally inaugurated as President on January 23, 2005.

From an immediate perspective, the Orange Revolution was triumphant. Fraser (2008) notes that the media space became notably (if also incrementally) freer – though the Verkhovna Rada passed a law preventing journalist from commenting on election campaigns, reporters were still able to criticize the regime to a greater degree than before. From a longer-term perspective, however, the movement’s effects were more
tenuous. Analysis of Freedom House in the years before the protests make this clear – Ukraine received a score of “4” (“Partly Free”) in 2003, 2004, and 2005, meaning that there was no observably meaningful improvement in political rights or civil liberties. This is likely due to the powers of history, as Fraser notes that Ukraine had no memory of democratic pluralism or national cohesion from which to draw in becoming more free. Evidently, this indicates that issues with corruption and authoritarian politics remained a problem for several years, eventually leading to Yanukovych’s election as President in 2010 and the Euromaidan movement shortly afterwards. I turn now to the second case study in this chapter – Bahrain’s 2011 uprising against authorities.

**Case study #2: Bahrain – autocratic intervention quashes a movement**

Whereas the Orange Revolution serves as an example of an anti-governmental movement that succeeded partly because of the presence of democratic support, Bahrain in 2011 provides an example of the opposite scenario. As the following study will show, protests in Bahrain were generally not supported by Western forces in any meaningful way but were directly repressed by external forces, leading the movement to collapse.

Though Bahrain is a small nation of one million people, several authors including Kinninmont and Sirri (2014) show that the country has a lengthy history of prominent oppositional movements, unusual considering its location in the Middle East – campaigns calling for more popular representation and for a powerful legislature vis-à-vis the ruling family have existed since the 1970s, with a petition in the 1990s that aimed

---

to strengthen the parliament even receiving the signatures of ten percent of the population. Part of the problem was lack of representation and opportunity for the country’s Shiite Muslim majority – Kasbarian and Mabon (2017) point to the fact that the Sunni minority have always held political and economic positions of power, leading to perceptions of inequality and lack of accountability among leaders. According to Al-Rawi (2015), protesters and their allies wanted political and economic reforms that would create a more just society, while Friedman (2012) suggests that the youngest protesters even supported the idea of converting Bahrain into a constitutional monarchy with free elections. This was compounded by the fact that the same faces had held de facto power for decades – members of the Al Khalifa transferred power from one generation to another since 1783, leading protesters to demand a fundamental reshaping of the system and its rulers.

The precise trigger that prompted dissatisfied citizens to come together was the simultaneous protests taking place in other Arab Spring countries at the time, according to Kinninmont and Sirri (2014). Nepstad (2013) finds that protesters were emulating the movements occurring elsewhere, noting that activists began to march and occupy public spaces such as the Pearl Roundabout, a common gathering place in the Bahraini capitol of Manama. Protesters believed that because anti-governmental movements in Tunisia and Egypt were able to remove leaders from power, their own campaign could likely succeed as well. Among their specific demands were “an end to torture, the

40 An ABC News report indicates that protesters similarly imitated their neighbors’ usage of social media to spur cautious onlookers to join the movement; YouTube was a particularly useful tool in the uprising’s early days. See: Raddatz, Martha. “Social Media Fuels Protests in Iran, Bahrain and Yemen.” ABC News. Published February 15, 2011. Available online at https://abcnews.go.com/International/social-media-fuels-protests-iran-bahrain-yemen/story?id=12926081. Similarly, Stepanova (2011) finds that while it does not always bring about change, social media often transmits news and information faster than any traditional news outlets and should therefore be treated as a serious form of content dispersion.
release of political prisoners, genuinely free elections, and a representative consultative council” (343). These protests were met with violence by the regime, as security forces attacked demonstrators on February 17 and killed four people. However, this caused a backlash that led even more citizens to take to the streets.

Survey data collected relatively close to the 2011 protests reinforce the notion that many activists were Shiite Muslims who were much more dissatisfied with circumstances in the country than were the comparatively privileged minority Sunni Muslims. As evidence of this, I present the results of three survey questions in the 2007 Arab Barometer in Tables 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4 below41. Responses in each table represent three sets of opinions – those of Bahrainis in the aggregate (column one), specifically Shiite Muslims (column two), and specifically Sunni Muslims (column 3).

First, Table 5.2 presents the results of a question asking respondents to express their level of satisfaction with their government. Participants were asked to choose a possible response ranging from “completely unsatisfied” (equivalent to a rating of 1) to “completely satisfied” (equivalent to a rating of 10). It is immediately apparent that there is a strong disconnect between Shiite and Sunni Muslims in their orientations towards the authorities at this time. More than a third of Shiites (34.9%) indicated complete dissatisfaction with their leaders, as compared with a miniscule 2.9% of Sunnis; moreover, a full 59.1% of Shiites selected a rating of either 1, 2, or 3 on this scale, demonstrating a clear clustering near the low end of satisfaction. In contrast, nearly half of Sunnis (49.1%) clustered themselves at the other end of the scale, selecting ratings of either 8, 9, or 10 to express a much more positive orientation towards the status quo.

41 Understandably, Bahrain was excluded from wave 2 of the Arab Barometer, which was run in 2011. These data from 2007 are available online at https://www.arabbarometer.org/survey-data/data-downloads/.
Table 5.2. “Satisfaction with the performance of the current government”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely unsatisfied</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Shiite Muslims</th>
<th>Sunni Muslims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely satisfied</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing/Don’t know N</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>235(^2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other relevant survey questions from the 2007 Arab Barometer further highlight this disconnect between Shiites and Sunnis in their beliefs, reinforcing the notion that this was a cleavage in society prompting protesters to take to the streets. Table 5.3 presents the results of a question asking, “How democratic is Bahrain?” Again, results are presented in three columns – the aggregate response rates among the entire population, the responses of Shiites, and the responses of Sunnis – to differentiate between the two groups. Individuals were asked to rate their views of Bahrain on a scale ranging from “complete dictatorship” at one end to “complete democracy” at the other.

\(^{2}\) The number of respondents in columns two and three do not sum to the number of respondents in column one. This is because three respondents in the survey merely selected “Muslim” as their religious identity, rather than differentiating between Shiite and Sunni.
Table 5.3. “How democratic is [respondent’s country]?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete dictatorship</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Shiite Muslims</th>
<th>Sunni Muslims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete democracy</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing/Don’t know</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It appears from the table that no significant number of either Shiites or Sunnis considered Bahrain to be a full democracy in 2007, as only 7.1% of all respondents selected a score of either 9 or 10 on this particular question. Nevertheless, the two groups again exhibit quite different belief patterns here – 52.4% of Shiites assign Bahrain a score of 1, 2, or 3 on this scale, while only 8.1% of Sunnis do the same. Instead, Sunnis appear to be much more likely to congregate in the middle of the scale when it comes to their beliefs on this topic, implying a more moderate stance.

Finally Table 5.4 below presents the results of a survey question asking respondents whether they agree or disagree that the government does all it can to provide citizens with basic services. Again, societal divisions are apparent – 83.6% of
Sunnis either strongly agree or agree with this sentiment, while only 32.2% of Shiites feel the same. Clearly, Shiites at the time experienced a much greater sense of disenfranchisement from the state and much more frustration with the way things were. These surveys are not equivalent to an on-the-ground survey that could have been taken during the protests themselves, of course, but they do provide evidence of the underlying beliefs that likely triggered people into taking action.

Numerous scholars point to the fact that protesters in the Bahrain movement were initially peaceful, indicating that their tactics were intentionally non-violent. Karolak (2011) notes that although the first days of the protest were termed the “Day of Rage,” the actual movement itself contained many families, several of whom brought their young children to sit in the Roundabout with them rather than angrily confront regime forces with their demands. Furthermore, Davies (2014) emphasizes that several non-governmental and civil society organizations including the Bahrain Youth Society for Human Rights actively promoted the usage of non-violence, suggesting that their movement would be more successful if it adopted this style of protest.
Al-Rawi (2015) and Katzman (2012) also note that the protesters’ initial response to the first round of violent repression from the regime was non-confrontational; instead, it was largely one-sided, as regime forces attacked protesters while they slept, rendering them defenseless. Individuals attempted to return to their places on the Roundabout, but groups were repeatedly shot upon by regime forces, leading to several deaths. The Pearl Roundabout lost its status as a nexus for protesters’ gathering in March 2011, however, as Kasbarian and Mabon (2017) and Khalaf (2013) show that regime forces bulldozed over the space and removed it as a central rallying spot.

The most striking comparison between Ukraine in 2004 and Bahrain in 2011 was the starkly differing response in terms of both objective external democratic support and autocratic intervention. Whereas support from the West for protesters in Ukraine was loud and unequivocal, with leading figures traveling directly to Kyiv to make their stances known, this assistance was significantly more muted in Bahrain. Here, Western leaders were less likely to criticize authorities, choosing instead to remain quietly and unobtrusively on the sidelines⁴³.

Why might this have been the case? Why were representatives from the European Union and the United States so unwilling to call for democratization? Several authors adopt a cynical, if likely accurate, perspective in addressing this question. According to Nuruzzaman (2013), Western forces were less willing to speak out on behalf of the protesters because they were hesitant to weaken their broader geopolitical and strategic tactics in the region. More specifically, Nepstad (2013) posits that the United States in

⁴³ According to a CBS news article from late 2011, after the protests had subsided, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton tepidly noted that, “In this context, it is essential for Bahrainis themselves to resolve the issues identified in the report and move forward in a way that promotes reform, reconciliation and stability.” See: Bentley, John. “A U.S. double-standard for Bahrain?” CBS News. Published February 21, 2012. Available online at https://www.cbsnews.com/news/a-us-double-standard-for-bahrain/.
particular recognized the fact that Bahrain hosts the American Navy’s Fifth Fleet and serves as a crucial base for American operations in the Gulf region, and that weakening the ruling regime might destabilize their future plans in the area. (Katzman does note, however, that the Obama administration eventually responded to critics from human rights groups and some Congressmen and Congresswomen by putting on hold the sale of armored vehicles and anti-tank weapons to Bahraini officials).

Other authors including Matthiesen (2013) and Hehir (2015) broaden their focus to criticize the reaction of the United Kingdom as well – the country has maintained close ties with its former colonial territory, and the fact that British forces constructed a six million dollar base in Bahrain several years after the 2011 protests were contained indicate their interest in working with Bahraini allies. In this case, geopolitical considerations and an unwillingness to alienate an important ally in the Gulf region trumped the normative goal of supporting protesters in their calls for liberalization.

While certain Western countries’ interest in procuring Bahraini support for their naval and military excursions explains part of their reticence, it is also important to consider the role played by Saudi Arabia. Though Saudi Arabia today is unquestionably a repressive dictatorship with a dire record on human rights and civil liberties, it is a close ally of Bahrain due to the religious composition of both countries’ Sunni regimes. Why would this matter for the United States and other allies? Nuruzzaman (2013) finds that Saudi authorities purchase a significant number of arms and other weapons from the United States, meaning that any significant crackdowns or sanctions on Bahrain would strain the Saudi-American relation as well. This poses a risk that many Western
leaders appeared unwilling to jeopardize due to the ramifications of doing so, leading them to remain acquiescent in the regime’s repression of protesters.\textsuperscript{44}

Gelvin (2012) echoes these claims, pointing also to the fact that the United States purchases a great deal of oil from Saudi Arabia.\textsuperscript{45} This financial relationship is an important one in many respects, and American officials prioritized its preservation. Nepstad extends this into a study of Bahraini regime strength, suggesting that security forces were unwilling to defect from leaders because they doubted that the international community would pressure Bahrain in any way – they did not believe that the movement stood a chance at success and therefore remained loyal to the government.

This lack of meaningful condemnation or sanctioning from the international community undermined protesters’ willingness to continue their campaign against the regime – if activists receive no real signals that their mission is supported by outside forces, this can lead them to feel alone with little chance of succeeding. One final topic to consider within the frame of external democratic support concerns the role of international media. Global media coverage is often crucial for supporting a movement because it both transmits the campaign’s message to other countries and allows helpful content from other states to reach protesters.

In Bahrain, there is significant evidence both that international news coverage was severely lacking on its own merits, and also that the few outlets that \textit{were} providing

\textsuperscript{44} This claim is echoed by a 2012 \textit{National Public Radio} article, which notes that considerations regarding Saudi Arabia and Bahrain’s strategic value led to a gulf in this situation between American values and American interests. See: National Public Radio. “Bahrain: The Revolution That Wasn’t.” \textit{National Public Radio}. Published January 5, 2012. Available online at https://www.npr.org/2012/01/05/144637499/bahrain-the-revolution-that-wasnt.

\textsuperscript{45} Oil plays an important role in Bahrain’s economy as well – the CIA World Factbook notes that profits from oil land natural gas development and exports account for 85% of the governments revenues. Nevertheless, Bahrain oil sales to the United States pale in comparison with Saudi sales – the United States Energy Administration indicates that Saudi Arabia is the second-largest source of American petroleum imports, at nine percent of the overall market. These figures can be found online at https://www.eia.gov/tools/faqs/faq.php?id=727&t=6.
coverage were restricted and forced out of the country altogether. Davies (2014) finds that international media conglomerates were much less likely to travel to Bahrain or to cover the events taking place there than they were for similar circumstances elsewhere. According to Kasbarian and Mabon (2017), this provided a media vacuum that the Bahraini regime was more than happy to fill – the Bahraini Foreign Minster released a statement following an violent crackdown in February claiming that such force was necessary to keep the country from collapsing into a ‘sectarian abyss.’ Because there was no external media willing or able to counter this message, this narrative quickly became dominant and provided cover for further repression towards protesters.

Finally, in addition to capitalizing on the absence of international media coverage, Bahrain sought to further control the narrative of the protests by eventually forcing out reporters that did not comply with their mission. As Karolak (2011) notes, “Moreover, after the violent clampdown on the opposition, foreign correspondents were gradually expelled from the country and Bahrain disappeared from the headlines of international newspapers. The authorities tried to preserve the image of the “island of golden smiles,” as once Bahrain was known, by cutting out the flow of unfavorable and disapproving information abroad” (173). Furthermore, according to a 2012 article from The Guardian, reporters from CNN who had been interviewing dissidents recounted

---

46 A 2011 report from the Institute for War and Peace Reporting details the ways in which domestic media coverage also made it difficult for protesters to gain much traction among large segments of their fellow Bahrainis by depicting the movement as lawless and violent. As one individual interviewed for the article put it, “When Bahrain TV was invited to the roundabout to cover the protests, they were treated very politely, even though protesters knew they work for the same oppressive regime we are trying to overthrow. But afterwards a picture was circulated of a man with a bloody head wound in front of the crowds at the roundabout and the story leaked that the reporter had been roughed up. It turned out that the photo had been from a man beaten in Egypt, and had been photoshopped onto the picture of the roundabout. But it had an effect. Even now, I talk to people via Twitter or Facebook and they say - how can we trust the protesters when they beat up journalists?” See: Institute for War and Peace Reporting. “Bahrain: Protesters Reject Sunni-Shia Split Claims,” Institute for War and Peace Reporting. Published March 23, 2011. Available online at: https://www.refworld.org/docid/4d8c60862.html.
being attacked by regime forces who forced them to the ground at gunpoint and destroyed their film and audio recordings\textsuperscript{47}. Clearly, therefore, media coverage was heavily constrained, preventing protesters from establishing any communication with the outside world. From a decision-making perspective, therefore, this closed valve of external communication dampened activists’ willingness to continue the fight.

The preceding section has shown that for protesters in Bahrain, external democratic support was severely lacking. Another striking difference between Ukraine and Bahrain is the role played by \textbf{external authoritarian actors} in working to suppress the protests. Whereas Ukraine’s neighbors largely refrained from becoming overly involved in the movement, Bahrain actively appealed to its regional allies to directly intervene and stop the uprising from growing. As protesters became more impassioned, their numbers began to overwhelm Bahrain’s domestic police force. As a result, according to a 2011 news report from \textit{Al-Jazeera}, Bahraini leaders issued a request on March 14 for manpower and assistance to other members of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), a six-member alliance consisting of Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates\textsuperscript{48}. In response to this, Saudi Arabia immediately sent one thousand troops and 150 vehicles into the country, while the United Arab Emirates contributed five hundred members of its own forces. According to Friedman (2012), this followed a March 10 proclamation by the GCC that members were committing to a ten-year, twenty-billion dollar pledge to the


governments of Bahrain and Oman to support their socioeconomic development, a move seen by many protesters as lending resources to suppress their movement.

Kasbarian and Mabon (2017) argue that for many protesters, this sent a dramatic signal that Bahrain’s neighbors were willing to directly intervene in its affairs to support an embattled leader. Taken together with a newly reenergized Bahraini regime, this was effective enough to quell the majority of the opposition, as the protest numbers never reached the peaks that they exhibited prior to the arrival of Saudi and Emirati troops. This was partially due to the fact that following the troops’ intervention, as Davies (2014) notes, the Bahraini King issued a nation-wide state of emergency and martial law that allowed even higher levels of repression. This provides strong evidence that the situation facing protesters at the time would have dramatically inhibited activists’ willingness to continue their campaign – in an environment where Western forces ignored their plight, international media coverage was non-existent, and autocratic leaders elsewhere sent troops to strengthen their leaders’ capacity, their calculations would rationally err towards heading home rather than remaining on the streets.

When considering the Bahrain’s autocratic neighbors, it is important to mention the actions of Kuwait. Though Kuwait is a member of the GCC, it did not contribute ground troops to weaken the uprising. Instead, Kuwait was briefly considered to act as a mediator in the crisis. Ultimately, this was abandoned for reasons that are still unclear, and the Kuwait government ultimately deployed its navy to Bahrain instead. A 2011 Reuters article notes that the GCC initially showed signs of welcoming the mediation move, with Secretary-General Abdulrahman al-Attiyah telling reporters that the initiative should contribute to security and stability. However, it appears that Bahraini officials had no interest in permitting this to take place, as the Minister of Foreign
Affairs Sheikh Khaled bin Ahmed bin Mohammed al-Khalifa quickly took to Twitter to dispel these rumors and to clearly state that there was no need for any type of mediation whatsoever⁴⁹.

What individual-level evidence exists to illustrate that protesters’ beliefs and decision-making processes were affected by the lack of democratic assistance and the presence of autocratic intervention? The arrival of Saudi and Emirati troops appeared to be designed from the beginning to send a signal to the population that further protests stood no chance at succeeding. Reports from the initial days of the crackdown indicate that Saudi troops openly flashed signs of victory to television cameras as they entered Bahrain, sending a clear image to protesters that the invading forces felt that the situation was already under control. Additionally, Bahraini television stations immediately began broadcasting archival footage of King Abdullah of Saudi Arabia and King Hamad of Bahrain performing a traditional Bedouin war dance together, again projecting an image of unity and strength⁵⁰ – the suggestion was clearly that Saudi forces and Bahraini forces should be viewed as one unified front in defiance against the rebellion. An interview with an activist at this time pointed to perceptions that Western support was more important at that stage than ever before – as the individual stated, “If the US walks away from us, this regime will continue to come for us...there is no option but to press ahead⁵¹⁵²⁵³.”

Ample evidence exists that the arrival of these troops changed the perceptions of the dangers involved for citizens who were considering joining the campaign. Multiple reports indicate that despite the regime’s authoritarian nature, local police had been increasingly challenged in their efforts to control the uprising at the Pearl Roundabout. The initial reaction by many protesters was to view the arriving forces as an “invasion” or an “occupation” from an unwanted neighbor intervening in Bahrain’s affairs, and several protesters initially indicated a willingness to avoid any negotiation with their leaders while foreign troops were present on Bahraini soil. This could have been the case because the incoming troops did not officially present themselves as direct threats – instead, they claimed that their main purpose was to restore order and to defend governmental buildings and infrastructure, despite unofficial indicators of a starkly different purpose.

52 Indeed, Carvalho Pinto (2014) notes that both protesters and the Bahraini regime were making appeals to international audiences – the protesters were hoping to solicit the help of liberal actors, while leaders were directly seeking the attention of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC).

53 According to Slackman (2011), protesters during the earliest part of the movement were initially sure that international attention would prevent the regime from using forceful repression against them, though they would soon become disillusioned in this belief.


55 Bronner, Ethan and Michael Slackman. “Saudi Troops Enter Bahrain to Help Put Down Unrest.” The New York Times. Published March 14, 2011. Available online at https://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/15/world/middleeast/15bahrain.html. According to this article, the term “occupation” was employed by both the oppositional protesters as well as the Iranian regime, which opposed the arrival of the troops from abroad.


57 Bronner, Ethan and Michael Slackman. “Saudi Troops Enter Bahrain to Help Put Down Unrest.” The New York Times. Published March 14, 2011. Available online at https://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/15/world/middleeast/15bahrain.html. According to this article, a Saudi official initially commented, “This is the initial phase...Bahrain will get whatever assistance it needs. It’s open-ended.” While therefore not an unequivocal expression of willingness to repress, this statement hints that combative tactics might be utilized if needed.
After the true purpose of the foreign troops became clear, however, individuals updated their beliefs about the situation on the ground, both at the Pearl Roundabout and in their own hometowns. Indeed, a March 2011 article from the *Washington Post* indicated that many protesters were forced to abandon the main uprising in Manama due to the fact that Bahrain’s police, previously concentrated in the nation’s capital, were freed up by the Saudi arrival to repress smaller uprisings throughout Bahrain’s countryside. Tactics used by the newly-energized government included blanketing Manama and the surrounding villages with tanks and other large vehicles, utilizing live bullets and other weapons to disperse small bands of protesters who were comparatively defenseless and vulnerable relative to their counterparts in the uprising’s epicenter.

Protesters at the Pearl Roundabout therefore rationally decided to defend their homes in any way that they could, reasoning that it made sense for them to abandon the main protest even though doing so would undermine the movement’s overall efficacy. Equally important is that according to several eyewitnesses, the danger threshold at the Pearl Roundabout itself rose with the arrival of new troops; these soldiers utilized a range of strategies to subdue activists including “teargas grenades fired at point-blank range into the faces of unarmed demonstrators; punishment beatings for injured

---

58 Ibid.
60 These aggressive tactics are further verified by the observations of an Australian educator who had been living in Bahrain during the beginning and growth of the uprising. For his recollections, see: Mitchell, Tony. “Witness to an Uprising: Taking Sides in a Dividing Bahrain.” *The Atlantic*. Published December 19, 2011. Available online at https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2011/12/witness-to-an-uprising-taking-sides-in-a-dividing-bahrain/250187/.
protesters in their hospital beds; [and] violence and intimidation against the wives and children of opposition activists in their village homes62.” Whereas protesting before certainly posed several dangers in and of itself, these reenergized security forces proved too intimidating for many Bahraini citizens to overcome63.

Though it is somewhat anecdotal in its scope, the example of one individual interviewed by PRI demonstrates the shifting perceptions of safety and danger that many experienced as a result of the interventions. When the woman was interviewed during the protests’ early days, she enthusiastically echoed Barack Obama’s optimistic phrase of, “Yes, we can!” When contacted for a follow-up conversation after the invasion, however, the same woman reported that three of her cousins had since been detained and she was no longer willing to continue agitating against leaders.

Psychologically, there is evidence that the arrival of Saudi and Emirate troops also began to deepen and exacerbate tensions between Sunni and Shiite Muslims in Bahrain, undermining the chance that citizens who had not yet joined the movement would ever decide to do so. According to an article from the Guardian, local Sunnis who were critical of the movement became emboldened in their attacks and increased the event’s divisiveness, while local Shiites began to protest wearing white funeral shrouds64. Taken together, the intervention therefore both increased the risks of

63 This perception is reinforced by a March 2011 Democracy Now! article, in which a reporter who had regularly been communicating with activists indicated a notable and widespread increase in the perception of threat levels among participants in the movement.
protesting and reduced the chance that protesters could attract a broader cross-section of the country that would have been necessary to sustain the movement’s existence.

While not as comprehensive as reports detailing perceptions of increasing threats following the arrival of foreign troops, there also exists much individual-level evidence that protesters were hoping for support from international actors. A Bahraini journalist detailed his efforts to inform the world about what was taking place during the early days, noting, “Since the protests started in 2010 and 2011, it has become very important for me to show the true picture of Bahrain to the world: what is actually happening between the regime and the people, without any filter. Since the revolution in 2011, the regime has been attacking anyone using social media to stop them from showing other countries what was happening here. They took us to jail just to prevent us from publishing our photographs.” This indicates that activists aimed to capture the attention of the outside world but were unable to do so due to checks on their freedom.

In a 2011 interview with the Huffington Post, Nabeel Rajab of the Bahrain Center for Human Rights noted, “The response from the West has been very timid and it shows the double standards in its foreign policy compared to Libya...Saudi influence is so huge on Bahrain now and the West has not stood up to it, which has disappointed many. They’re losing the hearts and minds of the democrats in Bahrain.” Similarly, an April 2011 Washington Post article found that pro-democracy protesters were “very, very disappointed” by the American response to the uprising, with one activist charging the

---


United States as protecting the Bahraini leaders\textsuperscript{67}; much in the same vein, a March 2011 New York Times article reported that many protesters felt that their movement was being directly impeded by the unwillingness of United States officials to criticize Bahraini leaders in fear of losing access to a naval port on Bahraini territory\textsuperscript{68}.

Several other prominent instances of Bahraini disillusionment towards the West’s pallid response further highlight the fact that activists were intentionally tracking the stances of other countries. Following a statement made by President Barack Obama’s statement that exerted a slight amount of pressure on Bahraini authorities, according to a PBS News Hour report, “Sheikh Ali Salman, leader of the largest opposition party Al Wefaq...was “delighted” to hear the criticism of the detentions of opposition leaders and the destruction of Shia mosques. But Salman remained wary. “I am pleased with the whole speech, and now looking for the speech to be carried out in practice,” he said, adding “there shouldn’t be a different standard” for how the U.S. responds to uprisings in different countries.”” Similarly, the same report details an interview with a human rights activist with several arrested family members who declared, “The U.S. is directly complicit in the violations taking place in Bahrain right now because there’s been a lot more silence about these violations than there has been


\textsuperscript{68} Al-Khawaja (2014) finds that once the United States government failed to forcefully condemn the arrival of foreign troops in Bahrain and chose instead to emphasize Bahrain’s sovereign ability to invite outside forces if it so chooses, this made it more difficult for anti-governmental activists to find much support elsewhere for their cause because the precedent of accepting the Bahraini government’s stance had already been set in place.
in other countries.”” For these activists, help from outside forces was clearly something that they desired, and a factor that could have sustained the movement69.

One final example reinforces the themes presented here about demonstrators’ desire for Western support, as well as their disappointment when this support largely failed to materialize. A March 2011 New York Times article notes, “Yet those who lead and take part in the nearly daily demonstrations here say they fear at least one key difference: The United States may not be fully on their side. “The U.S. is not acting like they did in other countries,” said Ali Najaf, who marched on Friday amid a sea of red-and-white Bahraini flags. “We thought they would support the people7071.”” Again, the disillusionment and failed hope in these types of statements is clearly apparent.

What type of picture do the concrete data from NAVCO 3.0 depict regarding the dynamics of the 2011 protest movement in Bahrain? Figure 5.2 below plots day-by-day changes in crowd size among activists, as well as statements and actions taken by external democratic and autocratic forces throughout the movement. Again, the blue bar
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69 Other reports indicate that while gaining support from the West was not activists’ singular or primary goal, the idea that the manner in which their campaign might be perceived by the West was indeed important to several protesters. As one activist recounted in an Institute for War and Peace Reporting article, “On Pearl roundabout, people were calling for a Sunni, rather than a Shia imam to lead the prayers, to show the world that to us it makes no difference, we are all one…This is really important. Even after the martyrs started to fall, and the crackdown on Shiites intensified, people still went to demonstrations with the same message - the Bahraini people are one, and our enemy is the regime.” Here, the respondent’s phrasing indicates that the activists intended to send an international – as well as a domestic – message of their intentions and goals. See: Institute for War and Peace Reporting. “Bahrain: Protesters Reject Sunni-Shia Split Claims.” Institute for War and Peace Reporting. Published March 23, 2011. Available online at: https://www.refworld.org/docid/4d8c60862.html.


71 Several articles and reports have detailed the fact that this inaction could have potential long-standing ramifications for public perception of American foreign policy in Bahrain. As evidence of this, see: Warrick, Joby and Michael Birnbbaum. “As Bahrain stifles protest movement, U.S.’s muted objections draw criticism.” The Washington Post. Published April 15, 2011. Available online at https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/as-bahrain-stifles-protest-movement-usa-muted-objections-draw-criticism/2011/04/14/AFziToFID_story.html. Also:
Figure 5.2. NAVCO 3.0 Data on Crowd Size in Bahrain Uprising
graphs represent estimated peak crowd size (in the thousands); red bar graphs represent actions taken to show democratic support, with higher graphs indicating more support on a certain day; and green bar graphs representing cases of authoritarian intervention or support for the Bahraini regime.

Figure 5.2 portrays several interesting findings. First, one can see that the movement’s highest levels of participation – estimated in the data set at approximately 200,000 people on each day – occurred after several days of statements that were made by external democratic actors. These include a statement from the United Nations criticizing disproportionate force from the regime against activists; the governments of the United States and the United Kingdom expressing “deep concern” and “calls for restraint,” respectively; a condemnation by President Obama of the use of violence in the country; and calls from Secretary of State Hillary Clinton for Bahrain to issue reforms in showing restraint. While the preceding section has shown that none of these statements truly had any real teeth due to American and British unwillingness to disrupt the strategic or financial status quo, these proclamations do demonstrate that protesters initially heard some degree of international support. As Figure 5.2 makes clear, this period of attention was immediately followed by the largest protest participation of the entire movement. While this alone cannot prove causality, it does demonstrate an interesting relationship suggesting that protesters might have been emboldened by the international attention to take to the streets in larger and larger numbers.

As one can see from the figure, however, this international attention began to deplete shortly thereafter, as did the number of people willing to challenge their leaders. The most significant effects of external autocratic actors clearly occurred on March 14, representing the day on which 1,500 troops arrived from Bahrain’s neighbor to put
down the movement. This was followed by more criticism from the West (represented by the subsequent shorter red bar graphs) and a brief resurgence in protest crowd size, but the uprising never recovered to its prior peak. Taken together with the qualitative findings presented above, this shows that in the absence of democratic support but the presence of autocratic intervention, protesters rationally decided to stand down.

Given these factors, what was the ultimate **outcome** of Bahrain’s movement? In stark contrast to the Orange Revolution, protesters failed to achieve any of their goals. The country has not made meaningful progress towards reforming its political institutions, and its freedoms actually declined in the wake of the uprising – while Bahrain’s Freedom House score was 5.5 in 2010 and 2011, it dipped to 6 in 2012. Further, the government further consolidated power after the protests were contained, with security forces arresting and detaining those who were involved in the campaign, including human rights activists and editors of the oppositional newspaper *Al Wasat*. Bahrain can therefore be viewed as a situation in which the protest movement’s collapse allowed the autocratic regime to maintain its hold on power and preserve the status quo.

**Case study #3: Uzbekistan – the importance of domestic regime capacity**

The preceding studies have demonstrated that for protesters in authoritarian regimes, support from outside forces can be a critical component in determining whether a campaign succeeds in its goals. However, many cases around the world also exemplify the fundamental importance of domestic regime capacity – when a country is simply far too repressive or powerful for outside messages to have much of an effect, this can dampen any democratic messaging that might occur. In order to illustrate the dynamics of a dominant regime overcoming any democratic signaling, I turn now to a study of the 2005 Andijan uprising and subsequent massacre in Uzbekistan.
While not as large or long-lasting as other movements profiled here, Andijan still justifies inclusion due to the motivations behind the uprising, the international response, and the regime’s reaction. The trigger for the protests in Andijan – a city of 320,000 – was frustration over the arrest and detention of twenty-three local businessmen. A 2015 *Al Jazeera* article notes that the arrests served as a focal point over years of disillusionment and frustration with the regime’s political and economic failings. According to a report issued by Human Rights Watch, thousands of protesters congregated in Andijan’s Bobur Square to challenge the businessmen’s arrests under artificial charges of “religious fundamentalism.” Protesters were initially comprised of the detainees’ families, but Nichol (2005) notes that the movement eventually grew to include other citizens and members of the business community who saw the arrests as emblematic of broader problems involving poverty and corruption. While Fumagalli and Tordjman (2010) characterize the protesters’ motivations as more economic than political, other pieces – including the *Al Jazeera* article referenced above – view the movement as being influenced by Kyrgyzstan’s Tulip Revolution and other “Color Revolutions” pushing for democracy and human rights at the time.

It is important to note that the protesters’ tactics were not entirely as peaceful as in the other situations studied here. As the *Al Jazeera* article notes, the majority of protesters were calm; many occupied public buildings in a manner reminiscent of the Orange Revolution, utilizing locations as spaces for organization and rest. On May 12,
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73 A 2005 International Crisis Group report finds that the protests were initially prompted by economic concerns over official decrees that leveled high taxes on imports and limited the activities of bazaar traders, but also that these problems were compounded by underlying frustration with corruption throughout the country.
2005, the movement acquired a revolutionary nature as protesters physically broke the businessmen out of jail. Demonstrators continued to gather on the following day, but the strategies of both the regime and opposition became more violent – the Human Rights Watch report indicates that troops surrounded the square and eventually began firing indiscriminately into the crowd, shooting and killing hundreds of unarmed citizens. In response, some protesters took governmental workers as human shields, leading many regime forces to be fatally wounded by troops in addition to the scores of activists surrounding them. The report finds that while certain protesters were armed, the provocation was begun by the authorities and the fact that so many protesters were not armed can reasonably lead the movement to be termed a “massacre.”

Though most independent sources and eye witness accounts estimate that as many as 700 individuals were killed on that day, official governmental reports put the number at a much smaller 173. Additionally, authorities claimed in the movement’s aftermath that the vast majority of protesters were violent and fundamentalist Islamic terrorists. Many scholars challenge this – Hartman (2016) is adamant that these claims were untrue; according to his analysis, there were no ties whatsoever between protesters and any outside groups, religious or otherwise. Overall, therefore, the Andijan movement can be viewed as an uprising against repressive rule and deteriorating economic conditions that was ultimately overwhelmed and suppressed by regime forces.

What was the objective response of international democratic actors at the time towards the protests? Though Uzbekistan is not a key player in global affairs, democratic organizations have still attempted to establish operations there since the fall of the Soviet Union. However, Fumagalli and Tordjman (2010) note that much of this promotion has never truly connected to the local context, meaning that there was not as
much immediate awareness and attention from Western partners as there otherwise could have been. Still, numerous governments, international organizations, and human rights groups did issue statements in the days after protests were disbanded.

A number of sanctions were put into place – Axyonova (2015) notes that these included an embargo on arms and related technical assistance, as well as travel restrictions on twelve Uzbek officials who were responsible for the crackdown; however, it appears as though these actions did not have any serious effect on Uzbek authorities. Furthermore, Paton Walsh (2005) suggests that it was Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice’s request to Kyrgyzstan that several Uzbek dissidents be safely transferred to a neutral country that prompted Uzbekistan to force American troops from its borders, indicating the reprisals that officials there took against interference in their affairs.

The fact that some Western actors did not criticize the authorities and support the protesters can be attributed in part to the regime’s ability to control the flow of media coming out of Uzbekistan at the time. In the immediate aftermath of the massacre, a Human Rights Watch report indicates that “Uzbek authorities imposed a strict clampdown on media coverage of the events, effectively banning journalists from entering the city and taking harsh measures against those who tried to report openly on the events. First, authorities made sure to deal with the journalists who happened to witness the killings in Andijan, confiscating materials they managed to gather and blatantly threatening them.” Similarly, Kendzior (2010) finds that authorities expelled all foreign media from the country shortly after the protests, preventing them from interviewing survivors or making the situation known to a broader audience. This

74 According to Daly (2016), this issue was compounded by the fact that at the start of the uprising, no major American news outlet had reporters any closer to Tashkent than Moscow. This reduced the chance of any serious international coverage or attention within the Western hemisphere.
created an environment that prevented protesters from transmitting their message and independent media sources elsewhere from knowing what was taking place\textsuperscript{75}.

Several actors including the United States and the United Nations demanded independent investigations into the protests, but as Gleason (2006) points out, Uzbek authorities pushed back against any type of intervention from liberal forces, even refusing to meet with American politicians who had traveled to Uzbekistan with the express purpose of speaking with them. These efforts from the outside were likely well-received by the population, which data indicate viewed the United States favorably at that particular time – a 2002 Pew Research survey found that a full 85% of Uzbek respondents reported an either “very favorable” or “favorable” view of the United States\textsuperscript{76}. Western organizations and states did implement a series of punishments and short-term sanctions aimed against Uzbek leaders, but several authors stress that these lacked much bite – Schmitz (2009) finds that the European Union imposed sanctions on Uzbekistan in November 2005 but that the sanctions were later abandoned due to the country’s strategic importance, while Bosse (2016) notes that the European Union’s decision to stop selling arms to the regime was somewhat meaningless as Uzbek leaders purchased most weapons at that time from Russia and Ukraine instead.

The preceding section has shown that a repressive regime capacity prevented much democratic support from penetrating into Uzbek society, as crackdowns on reporters and other media forces prevented the flow of information into and out of the country. It is also important to consider the role played by external authoritarian

\textsuperscript{75} Moreover, Schimmelfennig (2005) suggests that autocrats who enjoy a relatively high amount of domestic authority are particularly likely to resist externally-promoted reforms if doing so would weaken their national hold on power. This appears to have been the case in Uzbekistan, where Karimov and his allies were loath to display any signs of vulnerability or weakness.

\textsuperscript{76} For reference, see: https://www.pewresearch.org/global/database/indicator/1/country/UZ.
forces in supporting Karimov in the face of challenges to his regime. Whereas Uzbek authorities refused to permit Western media into the country, to meet with visiting American politicians, or to allow an independent inquiry into the protests, Gleason (2006) notes that they did allow one foreign team to visit and make an investigation into the uprising – a delegation sent from Russia. Given that the Putin regime was one of the most prominent backers of Karimov at the time, this is unsurprising as such an inquiry would likely find little about which to criticize Uzbek authorities.

Indeed, the only significant international actors who gave much genuine support to the Uzbek regime after the Andijan crisis were both powerful authoritarian neighbors – Russia and China. According to Nichol (2005), officials from both states praised the regime's response to “anti-terroristic” activities. While this represents only two countries, the fact that both are prominent politically and both play an important role in Uzbek affairs likely bolstered the confidence of regime officials and depressed oppositional actors' willingness to continue their uprising.

There is also evidence that the Uzbek regime used the support of its autocratic allies in to burnish its international image, though whether this was successfully accomplished is unclear. According to the Human Rights Watch report, “Uzbek authorities responded to growing international concern by demonstrating that they have nothing to hide, and organized a tour for diplomats and journalists to Andijan on May 18. About sixty diplomats and journalists, mostly representing official Russian media (TV Channels 1 and 2, ITAR-TASS, Rossiiskaia Gazeta, and the like) were taken to Andijan on a special plane from Tashkent and driven across Andijan in the course of
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77 As Abizaid (2011) notes, this forceful limitation on media outlets also extended to potentially influential non-Western news sources including al-Jazeera, further reducing the amount of outside interference or coverage of the events taking place.
approximately one hour, accompanied by heavily armed special forces troops. The participants were shown the major sites of "rebel" attacks [including the prison].” By coopting Russian media, Uzbek authorities attempted to discredit the protesters’ narrative, using an ally’s biased news corporations to propagate a false message about what truly took place.

What type of evidence exists that can provide insight into the perceptions of protesters at the time of the uprising? Due to the strict limitations placed on media and civil society in Uzbekistan, an unfortunately low amount of information is available regarding what people were thinking and feeling. This in itself demonstrates that many protesters faced an environment that was more repressive and dangerous than many of the others that have been profiled in this chapter. However, it is possible to use reporting gleaned after the fact to show that many activists were hoping to recruit more assistance from liberal Western forces than was actually seen or obtained.

A 2008 New York Times article quotes one activist forced into exile who notes, “To be honest, [the West] abandoned us,” while the director of Human Rights Watch recounted the results of his conversations with Uzbeks by noting, “If I were an Uzbek citizen, I would feel abandoned by the West, as if my fate didn’t matter to the West. It cannot be put better than that. And I am not in doubt – I know from thousands of conversations with Uzbeks – that they increasingly feel that way. I am sure I would. And

As evidence of this, MacLeod (2015) documents the fact that countless reporters – including several from the Institute for War and Peace Reporting – were forced to flee Uzbekistan along with their families in order to avoid governmental repression for producing their news stories. Similarly, Suleymanov (2010) also documents the dangers that reporters and other reform-minded activists faced first-hand for their activities. Taken together, this clearly demonstrates that many protesters and members of Uzbek society who might have supported them perceived a high level of danger in joining the movement.


The same article quotes Alisher Yusufjon Ugli, the son of a dissident poet who was arrested by authorities; he noted, “The silence of the West gave a good opening to Karimov to arrest my father.”
some of these people will lose all hope in this “Western” idea of democracy.”

Similarly, the preceding New York Times article makes the point that this failure to engage Uzbekistan’s protesters could have serious implications for foreign policy in the region in the future, stressing that the population is likely to become disillusioned by a non-committal response to their demands. The years since the uprising have demonstrated a similar pattern, with the continued failure of Western actors to confront the Uzbek government continuing to underwhelm activists there8283.

There also exists evidence that support from then-Uzbek President Islam Karimov’s autocratic allies might have suppressed protesters’ interest in maintaining their rebellion against leaders. Noubel (2005) suggests that Uzbekistan’s influence over its smaller neighbors Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan (one of which had just experienced its own revolution) prompted leaders of those states to support his crackdown on activists, echoing the regime’s stance that radical Islamists were to blame for the conflict.

Moreover, Ayupova (2015) proposes that the country’s autocratic neighbors promoted the narrative that Uzbekistan’s citizens simply did not hold the truly democratic and liberal values that would be needed for an uprising to succeed, further undermining citizens’ ability to recruit others to join the movement84.


82 Tisdall (2016) suggests that no meaningful Uzbek reforms will occur without the presence of any serious Western pressure on this front.

83 Interestingly, Welt (2005) notes that tacit signs of Western support are unlikely to have much effect within the broader society unless officials can provide tangible proof that they are committed to boosting anti-governmental protests in Uzbekistan today.

84 Some scholars including Makai (2012) suggest that many Central Asian cultures do not naturally gravitate towards democratic values, and may in fact prefer autocratic rule due to the relative stability it affords the population. However, others, including Roberts (2012), argue that a region’s underlying culture is not always an impediment to the effectiveness of democracy promotion.
Importantly, due to the fact that the uprising was largely not covered by either Uzbek or international media, there is little evidence that protesters in other states held any types of significant commemorations or events to show a sense of solidarity with the activists in Andijan. As a result, it is likely that people there felt that they were disconnected from the outside world, reducing their perceptions of any meaningful support coming from elsewhere. Further, Olcott (2007) finds that Chinese and Russian officials offset the financial difficulties that Uzbek officials were facing in light of Western sanctions, eliminating the chance that the government would need to offer any meaningful concessions in order to stabilize itself. In addition, Schatz (2006) suggests that for autocratic regimes such as Uzbekistan, receiving international validation from authoritarian allies deepens leaders’ support among segments of the population who already view them favorably, preventing the opposition from recruiting others in society to join them.

What information about the protests can be gleaned by analyzing event data from NAVCO 3.0? Figure 5.3 below depicts a graphical representation of important trends in Andijan, presenting crowd size, external democratic support, and international authoritarian intervention. First, it is immediately apparent in Figure 5.3 that this campaign was neither as large nor as long-lasting as other movements profiled here. Indeed, the movement reached a peak size of approximately five thousand, far below the
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85 A 2006 article from The Independent reports that British activists held a rally outside of the Prime Minister’s office encouraging action on Uzbekistan for its repression of protesters. However, the limited size of this gathering and the fact that it took place long after the uprising had been suppressed undermined any kind of meaningful effect it might have had on protesters at the time. See: Osborn, Andrew. “Uzbek leader silences critics of massacre.” The Independent. Published May 13, 2006. Available online at https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/uzbek-leader-silences-critics-of-massacre-364618.html.
Figure 5.3. NAVCO 3.0 Data on Crowd Size in Uzbekistan’s Andijan Uprising
large masses of people involved in the Orange Revolution. Similarly, this uprising – as a distinct event – lasted for only a few days.

One striking finding from this chart concerns the fact that while many liberal actors issued statements against the regime in the immediate aftermath of the shootings, these were not sufficient for driving oppositional forces back onto the streets. As an example, according to NAVCO 3.0, May 13 saw the British government urge restraint and the White House call for calm in the country; May 14 saw the European Union blame the Uzbek government for its draconian response; May 15 saw the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe call for an end to the regime’s violence; May 16 saw the French government condemn the violence; May 18 saw the United Nations call for an independent probe into the event’s origins and outcome; May 19 saw the German Foreign Minister call for a similarly independent probe; and May 29 even saw three American Senators visit Uzbekistan in a call for justice. Despite all of these statements and proclamations, however, the data reveal that no protesters ever took to the streets again in serious numbers following the initial wave of repression.

What events are captured by the authoritarian bar graphs in Figure 5.3? Echoing the findings of the reports above, these graphs indicate that on the whole, Uzbek authorities neither called for nor received significant amounts of support from autocratic allies elsewhere. Indeed, the only significant indicators of autocratic expression in the data are a May 13 statement by the Putin administration criticizing the protesters’ radical violence and offering praise and support to President Islam Karimov and a May 14 statement by Putin expressing concerns over “destabilization” in Central Asia. This points again to the importance of regime capacity – the Karimov government
was so secure and powerful that it was able to contain the movement, despite the fact that it was criticized by the West and received little assistance from allies elsewhere.

What was the ultimate outcome of Andijan? Unfortunately, very little changed following the protests’ quick end. Uzbekistan’s Freedom House scores from the years before and after the uprising provide evidence of this – while the country received scores of 6.5 in both 2004 and 2005 (denoting an extremely repressive but not totalitarian form of government), Uzbekistan’s rating in 2006 slipped to 7, the worst score that a country can receive. This is echoed by many of the authors profiled here – Schmitz (2009) expressly notes that the movement did not achieve any of its goals, while Fumagalli (2006) states that the regime went as far as to seal the Andijan area off from the rest of the country to ensure that the campaign did not spread. Uzbek leaders appear to have reflected their shift towards full authoritarianism by re-orienting Uzbekistan’s foreign policy as well – Gleason (2006) finds that in the wake of the uprising, Uzbek forces ordered American troops to leave the country and intentionally began to pursue closer ties with Russia.

Fumagalli and Tordjman (2010) and Herd (2005) posit that this reorientation in Uzbekistan was driven by leaders’ fears that the uprising was yet another “Color Revolution” backed by Western forces, making closer alignment with Putin’s Russia more attractive. The uprising therefore failed to achieve any of its economic or political missions, stressing the fundamental importance not only of international factors but also of an authoritarian state’s domestic regime capacity. I now turn to the fourth case study in this chapter – an analysis of Lebanon’s “Cedar Revolution.”
Case study #4 – Lebanon’s Cedar Revolution of 2005

This dissertation is concerned not only with protesters’ domestic frustrations in authoritarian states, but also with what these activists think about outside forces. The case of Lebanon’s 2005 “Cedar Revolution” is therefore extremely relevant in this regard – Lebanese activists took to the streets not only to challenge their national leaders’ dismal record on corruption and human rights abuses, but also specifically to protest decades of unwanted outside influence from Syria on their country’s political and socioeconomic development. As the following study will show, for protesters in the Cedar Revolution, one of their main motivating factors was precisely to challenge undesired authoritarian intervention from a neighboring country.

Before delving into the specific trigger that prompted activists to take to the streets, it is important to first explore Lebanon’s history and its complicated relationship with Syria to understand how this dynamic shaped both Lebanon’s political past as well as the foundations of the Cedar Revolution. As Safa (2006) explains, much of Lebanon’s history has been one of foreign intervention and influence – as far back as the early twentieth century, great powers including France and Great Britain intervened to partition the country and its neighbors into independent states. Lebanon was again influenced by external actors throughout the Cold War, as Egyptian forces supported local Communist actors while the United States intervened to back an anti-Communist opposition. The population was then altered by Palestinians who entered Lebanon after the creation of Israel, producing another situation in which developments elsewhere affected Lebanon’s internal dynamics. The most significant factor for understanding modern-day Lebanese politics, however, happened during the country’s civil war in the 1970s.
Syrian troops decided to enter Lebanon in 1976 to restore order and to protect Muslims from the conflict that was taking place. Following their arrival, however, these forces essentially then failed to leave for the next thirty years. Instead, they became more and more entrenched, keeping an active presence of twenty thousand troops on Lebanese soil. In addition to this physical presence, Syria’s political influence also began to grow significantly – in 1990, the Arab League brokered the Taif Accord, a provision that created a “special relationship” between Syria and Lebanon that further undermined and weakened the smaller state. Syrian officials used their money and influence to recruit the loyalty of Lebanese politicians who would support closer ties between the two countries, effectively purchasing their partnership in a mafia-like behavior allowing them to run governmental affairs and dole out the spoils of power.

In the face of Syria’s disproportionate influence on Lebanese affairs, one particular figure emerged as a prominent champion of Lebanon’s development and a fierce critic of Syrian involvement. Safa (2006) notes that politician Rafic Hariri grew to become a key proponent for the country, investing in business and political sectors to help cities such as Beirut develop independently of Syrian influence. He was eventually elected Prime Minister, and was highly critical of efforts that urged Lebanese politicians to amend their constitution to allow pro-Syrian President Emile Lahoud to extend his time in office. This made him a prominent enemy of Syrian-aligned forces in the Lebanese government and Syrian President Bashar Al Assad.

Hariri eventually resigned from his post as Prime Minister, but his role in sparking the Cedar Revolution itself was crystallized on February 14, 2005 when a car bomb exploded and killed Hariri and twenty-one members of his security team. Hariri’s family refused to allow any regime officials to attend his funeral, contributing to
suspicions that pro-Syrian forces in the government had been involved in his assassination. His death was the ignition to unite citizens frustrated with the direction that Lebanon had taken, and the revolution was underway.

Knio (2005) summarizes the fundamental goals of the Cedar Revolution neatly and succinctly, noting that “the political demands of this popular movement were very straightforward. The opposition called for a clear timetable for a complete withdrawal of Syrian armed troops and intelligence services (armed troops are estimated to be around 14,000), the removal of Lebanese intelligence chiefs, the appointment of a “neutral” government with the task of preparing parliamentary elections for May 2005, and an international investigation into Hariri’s death” (225). The movement therefore explicitly concerned itself with both domestic and international considerations. An attempted governmental cover-up of Hariri’s assassination only served to fan the flames – by producing stories about Islamic suicide bombers that turned out to be complete fabrications, regime authorities unwittingly undermined themselves and strengthened protesters’ resolve to challenge the regime in pursuit of a new path forward.

Protesters were directly influenced by anti-governmental movements that had taken place elsewhere. Safa writes that Lebanese activists were inspired by Georgia’s 2003 Rose Revolution, Ukraine’s 2004 Orange Revolution, and Iraq’s nascent 2005 “Purple Revolution,” all of which involved popular calls and proclamations in support of democratic governance. He goes on to state that this influence was widely noted in Lebanese media at the time, finding that “interviews, talk-show discussions, and commentaries buzzed with the drawing of parallels between the Beirut protests and the Ukrainian sit-ins that had filled the streets of Kiev a few months earlier after ex-
communist forces tried to steal the presidential election through means that included a possible assassination attempt on a popular opposition leader” (32).

What did the protests look like, and what were their tactics? First, the movement united a diverse set of citizens who were willing to work with a variety of religious and ethnic groups. According to Norton (2007), the anti-governmental coalition brought together Sunni Muslims, Druze, and Christians, an impressive task in a country with marked religious diversity. Sutton (2014) notes that while early protests managed to attract approximately twenty thousand protesters, later events were much larger, garnering the support of eight hundred thousand. Sutton further finds that protesters advocated the usage of non-violent techniques that would eventually be used in the Arab Spring, writing that “in the development of tented protest communities, like “Camp Freedom,” and the vast numbers of often secular middle-class protesters who occupied the streets, the protests of the Cedar Revolution mirrored and arguably inspired those seen in Tahrir Square” (99).

There is much evidence that protesters were agitating against undue Syrian influence on their country. Geukjian (2017) shows how Syrians were keeping the Lebanese parliament from operating as an independent political body, weakening its ability to represent Lebanese interests. More anecdotally, Kurtulus (2009) provides a quote from a protester who claimed, ““We don't want Syrian spies and secret police; we don't want any foreign intervention. Those Lebanese who want the Syrians to stay can go live in Syria. There are plenty of Lebanese here to fill the country”” (200).

How did the movement ultimately evolve? Tens of thousands of Lebanese gathered in Beirut’s central Martyrs’ Square on February 28 to watch Prime Minister Omar Karami resign from his post due to pressure from domestic and international
forces. Lebanese and Syrian supporters of Hezbollah held a large counter-rally on March 8 to support Syria’s presence in Lebanon, but this was dwarfed by a massive rally on March 14 that attracted nearly 1.2 million protesters – roughly a quarter of Lebanon’s population at the time – on the streets of Beirut to demand Syria’s withdrawal from the country, to push for an investigation into Hariri’s death, and to demand new legislative elections that would take place without any type of Syrian interference. Karami’s resignation was therefore a first step in achieving the protesters’ demands, but it was not the only goal that activists hoped to attain. Importantly for my theoretical framework, much evidence indicates that protesters remained calm and non-violent throughout the duration of their campaign – activists sang, danced, and offered flowers to regime security forces, meaning that the revolution did not become bloody or violent as a means of pursuing its broader mission.

According to several scholars and news reports, objective statements made and actions taken by external democratic forces were highly instrumental in motivating protesters to agitate against the regime. Kurtulus (2009) points to survey data collected at the time indicating that for many activists, the main legal reasoning demanding a Syrian withdrawal was the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1559, which was adopted on September 2, 2004 and called for a free and fair presidential election and for remaining foreign forces (understood to be Syrian troops) to withdraw. This indicates that international support for the opposition clearly existed and was being signaled to activists well before people began to take to the streets following Hariri’s assassination. Further evidence that the debate was internationalized can be found in statements from politicians at that time – Kurtulus notes that then-Prime Minister Karami “declared that he took pride in Lebanon’s alliance with Syria, compared to the opposition’s alliance
with the United States and Israel” (203). In framing the debate between regime insiders and the opposition in this manner, Karami and other officials were clearly priming citizens to think of the debate over Syria in a very interventionist, international way.

Support from outside forces was strong and visible for nearly the entire duration of the movement. Hariri was a particularly well-connected politician with ties to leaders both in Western states and in the authoritarian regime of Saudi Arabia. This created an unusual alliance in which actors from both realms were calling for an investigation into his death, meaning that the proclamations had more force than they would have had they come from the West alone – by joining together with an Arab state in Lebanon’s neighborhood, Kurtulus (2009) and Geukjian (2017) note, this transformed what had formerly been tacit disapproval into real and tangible criticism of the regime and its response to the crisis.

This criticism took very concrete forms at different points during the protest movement. Geukjian (2014) notes that the United States and France were instrumental in galvanizing the UN Security Council Resolution 1559 that demanded the withdrawal of Syrian troops from Lebanon, and that these countries were able to recruit other Arab allies such as Egypt in addition to Saudi Arabia to give the proclamation more heft. Additionally, Kulic (2016) notes that broader European Union pressure on the Lebanese authorities increased during this time as well, turning from something that was rather symbolic into something more truly effective and forceful.

Democratic support for the opposition at this time was also apparent because of the opportunities that were afforded to politicians making their case to the West. As evidence of this, Kurtulus (2009) discusses the fact that Lebanese legislator Walid Jumblatt (one of the heads of the Progressive Socialist Party) explicitly called for foreign
troops to be deployed to Lebanon to install order after Hariri’s assassination; he then gathered nine other oppositional parliamentary figures to meet with representatives from the European Union who visited Lebanon to hear their perspective. Following this, Jumblatt traveled to the United States and met with both Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan to appeal for their support.

Furthermore, this interest from Western forces in assisting the opposition continued even more intensively in the days immediately before and after the country’s first post-Revolution election. Monitored closely by international election observers from the European Union, the election’s results installed a new government dominated by oppositional forces. Secretary of State Rice visited Lebanon three days after the new government was elected. Upon arriving in Lebanon, Rice decided to meet with opposition leader Saad Hariri (son of the assassinated Prime Minister) before any other governmental official and subsequently decried President Emile Lahoud (an ally of Syrian forces) as the “old Lebanon.”

Finally, this Western influence continued on behalf of the opposition even after the election had taken place and the new government was installed. Safa (2006) notes that the last Syrian troops left Lebanon’s borders on April 26, 2005, marking the first time that Lebanon had been free of Syrian presence in nearly thirty years. Following this, the United Nations Security Council issued Resolution 1595, calling for an international investigation to determine the identities of Harari’s assassination; the study ultimately found the perpetrators to be a series of both Syrian and Lebanese operatives and conspirators, providing some justice in this particular case.
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87 Lane (2009) specifically points to this strong Western presence (particularly from the United States) in many revolutions including Lebanon’s at this time, speculating that democratic governments were interested in using the movements to extend their own influence in the region.
Also important was the role played by media in the Cedar Revolution. As previous case studies have shown, media openness often plays a critical role in determining a movement’s success. In Lebanon, the environment was sufficiently free and open to allow protesters to capture the world’s attention. Indeed, as Safa (2006) notes, “throughout the crisis and ensuring standoff with the government, sympathetic print and broadcast media – themselves basking in what they saw as the restoration of full freedoms of speech and assembly – gave the demonstrators wide and favorable coverage” (32). Furthermore, he specifically points to the fact that the campaign fostered transnational linkages through which supporters in other countries were able to express their sympathies, noting, “The March 14 rallies were beamed all over the world thanks to Arabic-language satellite-television networks, and messages of support poured in from across the globe all the next week” (33). Similar to Ukraine’s Orange Revolution, it appears that a free media apparatus was instrumental in creating a feeling of purposive solidarity through which protesters were able to form connections with people elsewhere, granting them the feeling that they were not alone and that important actors and citizens elsewhere supported their cause.

The preceding section has shown that there was extensive democratic support for anti-governmental protesters before, during, and after the growth of the Cedar Revolution. What role did external authoritarian actors objectively play in the movement? Most apparent, of course, is the presence of Syrian troops and Syrian influence on Lebanese politicians that endured for nearly three decades – this imposition from an external force played a visible role in everyday life. Norton (2007) notes that this likely persisted in some manner after the election, despite the removal of Syrian troops from the country – some segments of the population still remained
positive towards Syrian involvement, and members of the opposition continued to see Hezbollah as an internal tool of the Syrian regime due to its radical Islamic nature and its ties to Syria. Additionally, but less visibly, Nizameddin (2008) suggests that the Russian government might have played some role in supporting the Syrian presence; he notes that the Soviet Union actively aided Syria during the Cold War and that this positive relationship has continued into the present day, partially as a way for the Putin regime to extend its own influence into Middle Eastern affairs. This is therefore not as apparent as the Syrian presence, but it does point to the possibility that Russian forces were supportive of Syria’s involvement in Lebanon.

What individual-level evidence exists that Lebanese citizens were protesting against autocratic intervention from Syrian forces, or that outside liberal actors played some part in shaping the dynamics of the movement? As presented in the preceding section of this study, numerous reports indicated that protesters were virulently and visibly anti-Syrian in their campaign, stressing that activists were angered by and pushing back against unwanted external intervention from an authoritarian neighbor. Indeed, a British Broadcasting Company report indicates that prominent among the protesters were farmers, taxi drivers, and construction workers chanting both “down with the government” and “Syria out.” According to the same article, several protesters began to dress in red and white clothing, transposing the main colors of
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Lebanon’s flag onto their bodies in order to convey the nationalist, anti-occupation perspective that motivated many of them to take to the streets.

Similarly, a separate British Broadcasting Report noted that many protesters were chanting slogans explicitly blaming Syria both for Hariri’s death and for other problems facing Lebanon, as well as championing the need for increased Lebanese independence and self-governance free from Syrian intervention – one protester is quoted in the article as shouting, “It is the 21st century, and people should be able to govern themselves. We have to regain our country.” Moreover, other news reports conducted at the time depict Lebanese protesters who demanded that Syria exit Lebanon and let protesters take care of themselves, a sentiment that was strengthened by sympathetic media coverage. Echoing tactics utilized by protesters in the “color revolutions” that took place during the same period, activists in Beirut relied heavily upon cell phones and the Internet to mobilize people in support of their cause. It is worth noting that while Lebanon at the time was hardly democratic, it also was not severely authoritarian – instead, participants in the protests enjoyed a fair amount of autonomy from government repression, a factor that lowered their perceptions of the dangers that might be involved in joining the nascent revolution.

---

While there was clearly evidence gleaned from interviews and on-the-ground reports that many Lebanese were actively protesting against unwanted autocratic intervention into their affairs, what information exists to show that protesters were aided in their efforts by democratic forces? First, several sources provide strong indicators both that activists were aware of attention being paid to their cause and that they were working intentionally to deepen this attention. This is summarized in detail in a March 2005 Washington Post article, which notes, “[No] Lebanese citizen bothers to be furtive when speaking Syria’s name. Today, they hang it from the tops of buildings in Martyrs' Square. They work it into clever English-language puns on signboards: "Syria's killers get out." They chant it in slogans, on CNN and on al-Jazeera, and freely give their names to international news reporters. After the shocking assassination of former prime minister Rafiq Hariri last month, the anti-Syria movement has become big, brash and unapologetic. “Why should we be afraid of Syria now?” one protest organizer in Martyrs' Square asked me. “The world is watching us on television." Interestingly, this same article reports that many protesters were actively inspired by the success of Ukraine’s Orange Revolution, leading them to emulate the earlier movement’s direct appeals for assistance from outside forces and indicating again that activists incorporate the international context into their perceptions as well.

In terms of the active strategies that protesters employed to maximize the chance that they would secure support from external actors, one of the most important was focused on marketing and projecting a certain image of the movement. One activist reported during an interview that groups of protesters were intentionally making
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calculations about how best to signify an easily visible and unified front that would convey the message of the campaign, noting, “We were there to think: what to do? Who to support? How to make this work? How to support the youths in the tents? We needed to ensure that there were enough printed signs and slogans... We discussed how to ensure the continuity of this...to reach the objective of getting Syria out.” These slogans were clearly designed to appeal both to domestic and international audiences as evidenced by the colors that were chosen by protesters to wear and the language in which many signs were written. As noted above, many protesters intentionally wore red and white clothing to send a clear signal to local and external news cameras that their movement was fundamentally rooted in securing Lebanese independence and democratic governance. Protest leaders also worked closely with branding companies including the public relations firm Quantum Communications to design signs and posters in white and red which read, “Independence ’05.” According to Eli Khoury, President of Quantum Communications, the ’05 indicated the end date by which protesters demanded Syrian troops be withdrawn from the country.

Equally important in securing international attention was the fact that many protesters bore signs inscribed in the English language. According to a Tavaana report, “Knowing full well the role international pressure can play in civic disputes of such magnitude, the demonstrators made sure to play to both local and international...”


96 Vinciguerra (2005) notes the particularly important role that color can play in transmitting messages and sentiments about a movement in the era of digital technology and online communication, when “eye-catching colors [can]...transcend language barriers and make messages recognizable around the world.” In illustrating this, he points to the orange outfits worn by protesters in the Orange Revolution – without speaking a single word, their unity and support for Yushchenko’s party was immediately clear.

audiences by making signs in both English and Arabic, giving them a more accessible brand image.” Again, the notion of central importance here is that many protesters were attempting to capture the attention of important forces outside of Lebanon. Had this not been the case, signs would likely all have been printed in either Arabic or French, the two languages that are most predominant in the country.

Technology played a significant role in allowing these citizens to convey their messages to a broad audience. Al-Jazeera was particularly critical, as it was able to operate relatively independently of serious censorship or repression by the Lebanese government at the time. Similarly, Seib (2007) notes that many protesters strategically utilized online streaming websites, where direct video and audio feeds from Beirut’s Martyr’s Square could be transmitted instantaneously around the world, bringing protesters’ demands onto screens across the globe.

While the preceding section has focused on protesters’ ability to use signs, colors, and technology to make appeals for international support, one particularly critical external factor particularly relevant for Lebanon was the role played by the Lebanese diaspora. Indeed, the diaspora evinced two of this project’s main theoretical notions – the need to promote purposive solidarity with protesters in Beirut and the ability to affect the protests’ success by lobbying politicians in their home countries to support the revolution. Earlier sections of this dissertation have shown how external actors can promote purposive solidarity by holding rallies in their own countries to send the message that protesters are being heard. Numerous articles discuss the fact that the Lebanese diaspora held simultaneous rallies in locations including Paris, London, and
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Sydney, where over ten thousand individuals took to the streets in solidarity with the Cedar Revolution. Other sources report that in addition to holding solidarity rallies, many members of the Lebanese diaspora actually traveled to Beirut for the duration of the protests to lend their voices to the cause.

According to Fakhoury (2018), Lebanon’s diaspora population began to grow following the country’s Civil War in 1975, an event that led Lebanese to migrate across North America, South America, Western Europe, and Northern Africa. Many members of this diaspora became highly educated, and remittances sent from these emigres to Lebanon constitute approximately fifteen to twenty percent of the country’s Gross Domestic Product. Skulte-Ouaiss and Tabar (2014) note that members of this community have also sought to remain politically involved in the affairs of their former homeland, monitoring events and remaining intensively engaged. Koinova (2011) shows how these politically-inclined members of the diaspora directly involved themselves in campaigning for the success of the Cedar Revolution, as Lebanese-Americans in particular were forceful advocates lobbying for international pressure against Syria’s presence in Lebanon and subsequent support for the activists. As a result, this sent a message to participants in Beirut that their compatriots were acting on their behalf.

Additionally, evidence exists to the present day indicating that members of the Lebanese diaspora remain poised to step in should a similar movement arise in the future. In 2015, the Lebanese Information Center and other Lebanese-American organizations held a special event on Capitol Hill to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the revolution. In doing so, the organizations reaffirmed their commitment towards

lobbying leaders for their attention towards Lebanese causes. Additionally, the event organizers issued a statement reading, “The 10th anniversary of the Cedar Revolution is an important milestone for us, as Americans of Lebanese descent, as we work to keep the cause of a free Lebanon alive for decision-makers in Washington, D.C. and around the world...Every year, this commemoration sends a powerful message that the Lebanese diaspora in the United States and the US government will stand together, now more than ever, in support of the Lebanese people, the legitimate institutions of the Lebanese state, and the struggle for genuine democracy, stability, and peace in Lebanon.” This clear expression of promised aid sends a message to the Lebanese people that they will be assisted in any future causes they might undertake, granting them some comfort in the face of possible governmental repression.

Several preceding case studies have presented graphical representations of event data to depict trends in crowd size and patterns in international statements made to support or challenge the protesters. Unfortunately, the Lebanon case was not included in NAVCO 3.0, meaning that including a comparable graphical representation for this situation is not possible. However, it is possible to turn to other forms of data to indicate the beliefs that were motivating people to take to the streets at that time.

Kurtulus (2009) points in his study to survey data collected during the protests, as researchers asked respondents specifically about their views of Syrian troops and the United States of America, the leading international figureheads on the two sides of the debate. According to his findings, Lebanese citizens were roughly divided into two opposing camps when it came to both religion and their stance on the protests – one
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camp was largely against the Syrian presence and consisted of Christian Maronites, Druze (a monotheistic Abrahamic religion), and Sunni Muslims, while the other camp was largely pro-Syrian and consisted much more heavily of Shiite Muslims. Among those in the first camp, 94% of Maronites, 75% of Druze, and 53.3% of Sunnis felt that the full and immediate withdrawal of Syrian troops was essential for resolving the Lebanese crisis. In stark contrast, Kurtulus notes that only 24.6% of Shiite Muslims felt this way, indicating that this group was likely the base of the many counter-protests organized by Hezbollah to advocate for a continued Syrian presence.

These differing motivations are reinforced by other survey data as well. Kurtulus reports the findings of questions measuring respondents’ attitudes and beliefs towards both the United States and the United Nations Council Resolution 1636, which openly criticized Syria. According to the data, 65% of Druze, 58% of Maronites, and 40.5% of Sunni Muslims regarded the United States as an “ally or friend” of Lebanon. These numbers are not overwhelmingly positive, but they are markedly higher than the 3.6% of Shiite Muslims who responded to this question in the same way. This indicates that for many activists, support from the United States was welcome and desirable. Further, when asked about the UN Council Resolution, this internationally-endorsed document was viewed positively by 97.7% of Maronites, 97.1% of Druze, and 87% of Sunni Muslims. Conversely, only 9.6% of Shiite Muslims responded favorably to this question, indicating a deeply held division in views of Syrian involvement and democratic support. These data do not encapsulate all protesters, of course, but they still provide compelling evidence not only that people on the streets were aware of international forces intervening to shape their country’s dynamics, but that they also held clear views about these actors’ effects on their country.
The preceding section shows that Western support for the protesters likely played a role in galvanizing their decision to remain on the streets against leaders. What was the ultimate outcome of the Cedar Revolution? In the short term, the movement achieved its goals – several key governmental officials stepped down from power and new elections were held shortly afterwards. As Safa (2006) and Sutton (2014) note, the 2005 election created a legislature that was voted in through one of the fairest and freest processes in Lebanese history. In addition to actually forcing Syrian troops to withdraw, the movement also spurred Lebanese civil society to become more active, leading to a deeper sense of civic engagement that for a time overcame many of the country’s sectarian and religious divisions. Politically, the movement seemed to have positive effects as well – an analysis of the country’s Freedom House ratings shows that Lebanon’s rating improved from a 5.5 in 2004 and 2005 to a 4.5 in 2006.102

The decade and a half since the protests have seen a greater amount of political and societal flux, though the situation currently appears to again be rather stable. Geukjian (2014, 2017) finds that tensions between anti-Syrian and pro-Syrian forces in Lebanese society came to a head in the years immediately after the election, leading to a series of violent clashes and instability, and suggests that outside actors did not do enough to mollify a situation that they in large part helped cause. Sutton notes that Lebanon’s Freedom House score increased to a high of 4.0 in 2011, but also that the score has since reverted back to 4.5; nevertheless, this still remains a lasting improvement on the country’s pre-2005 ratings.

102 Boot (2009) also notes that many Lebanese were heartened by the international community’s support for the United Nations tribunal into investigating the causes of Hariri’s assassination, providing evidence of another short-term success.
Sutton also stresses that the Syrian Civil War has undoubtedly strained tensions, a fact that is likely given that a June 2019 Associated Press report indicates that out of Lebanon’s current population of five million, a full one million are Syrian refugees\textsuperscript{103}, or twenty percent of the state’s residents. This does not mean that the Syrian government is necessarily extending its influence in a way that is reminiscent of the past, of course, as these refugees are fleeing the very leaders that had been intervening in Lebanese affairs earlier, but it does demonstrate that the relationship will likely continue to remain tense in the future. I now turn to the fifth and final case study of this chapter – an analysis of the ongoing uprising that has continued to grip Venezuela amidst a deepening economic and humanitarian crisis.

**Case study #5 – An uprising in contemporary Venezuela**

The final case study in this chapter is different from the others explored above due to the fact that it is a dynamic protest movement that is still ongoing – the movement’s **outcome** is currently unknown, as the protesters have not decisively succeeded or fallen short in their goals of demanding regime change. Nevertheless, it is still an extremely valuable case to analyze here because it fits the parameters of my theoretical framework well, and provides evidence of both strong democratic support for the protesters’ demands and visible authoritarian aid to the embattled President Nicolás Maduro. Evidence exists that these international factors are affecting protesters’ perceptions in addition to relevant domestic variables at hand, and exploring the protests’ dynamics here is therefore an important task.

Protests have been taking place in Venezuela for more than half a decade due to the country’s urban violence, inflation, chronic shortages of basic services and goods, and slide into repressive governance. The following case study will focus specifically on protests that have taken place between 2017 and 2019, as this represents a distinct event with a more discrete beginning and cause than would be possible to identify if I attempted a broader study of the multi-year movement. For the most recent round of protests, one primary trigger that prompted Venezuelans to take to the streets was Maduro’s second inauguration as President of the country on January 10, 2019.

These protests are the culmination of years of frustration over governmental crises that have engulfed Venezuela. Puerta Riera (2018) provides a particularly illuminating perspective on the problems the country has faced—Venezuelan officials committed a number of harmful acts since 2013 that severely damaged both the country’s financial development and its (nominally) democratic institutions. Among these have been rampant corruption and economic crime that drove the inflation rate to the world’s highest at 254.9% in 2018; widespread poverty and lack of access to food that have left 33% of Venezuelans medically malnourished; actions taken by the Supreme Court (regarded in the country as a tool of the regime) to strip the legislative National Assembly of its functions and bring it under the control of a combined executive-judicial branch of government; and a military apparatus that remains committed to protecting the regime, likely because top generals and officials realize that they would be subject to international prosecution for human rights abuses should their allies in the Maduro regime fall from power104.
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104 Moreover, Winkler Osorio (2019) notes that the country is suffering from an eighty percent shortage in medical supplies, prompting further health concerns, and there has been a fifty percent drop at medicinal
Puerta Riera goes on to propose that many of the protesters are likely doing so because very few have solid memories of life under Venezuela’s prior military dictatorships; instead, many Venezuelans (particularly younger citizens) have become accustomed to living in a more democratic, open society. To provide quantitative evidence of this, she points to public opinion surveys showing that according to Latinobarometer studies, satisfaction with democracy in Venezuela fell from 24% to 13% between 2016 and 2017, a trend that is a full seventeen points below the regional average. Other authors provide similar evidence regarding the extent to which life in Venezuela has become dire and untenable under Maduro. A 2019 CBS News report indicated that nearly 94% of Venezuelans were living in poverty despite the country’s natural resource wealth from oil and other products, while Ellis (2017) notes that more than seventy percent of Venezuelan citizens reported losing weight in 2017 due to food shortages throughout the country. Ellis goes on to note that this health crisis has a political dimension as well, as the country’s politicized military has the power to distribute food rations to different neighborhoods. Given the regime’s autocratic bent, troops are often instructed to give more food to regions that are supportive of the government, punishing those who have been critical of Maduro. This problem is compounded by the fact that the military has been infiltrated by spies from Cuba, many of whom report on potential defectors in order to keep the armed forces loyal to the state.
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The crisis has continued to grow, leading more Venezuelans to head not only to the streets but also out of the country itself. As a June 2019 National Public Radio report notes, more than four million Venezuelans have left their home for other nations in recent years, leading to a massive humanitarian and migration problem. The overall sense that the current situation is not sustainable can be effectively captured by a quote in a news report from FRANCE 24 published earlier this year – the publication cites 70-year old small business owner Carlos Alberto, who notes, "We are tired of this regime, that has brutally impoverished us. My children and almost all my family have already left Venezuela...We know that if it's not today, it will be tomorrow, because this has to end." While the protesters’ tactics have not been unilaterally peaceful, the majority of activists have been much calmer and more civil than the regime’s repressive response against them would justify. As evidence of this, the same report describes the fact that following a large-scale May Day protest, regime forces injured forty-six people and killed one woman; additionally, forces fired rubber bullets at reporters who were standing nearby in an effort to disband them and keep them from transmitting the story.

What types of clear and objective actions have external democratic actors taken to support the protesters? The response has primarily been one of two strategies – 1) promoting sanctions against Maduro and other members of his regime and 2) offering symbolic statements of recognition that the protesters’ cause is just. Within the area of sanctions, the United States government under both Presidents Obama and Trump has

---


led the way in promoting economic punishments. As a Congressional Research Service report issued on July 5, 2019, notes, “Under the Obama Administration, the Treasury Department froze the assets of seven Venezuelans—six members of Venezuela’s security forces and a prosecutor who repressed protesters. Under the Trump Administration, the Treasury Department currently has sanctions on an additional 78 Venezuelan government and military officials. These officials include President Nicolás Maduro and his wife, Cecilia Flores; Executive Vice President Delcy Rodriguez; PSUV First Vice President Diosdado Cabello; eight Supreme Court members; the leaders of Venezuela’s army, national guard, and national police; four state governors; the director of the Central Bank of Venezuela; and the foreign minister. In addition to this, which clearly shows that the American government is sanctioning a number of specific (and very high-level) individuals associated with Venezuela’s authoritarian regime, the report goes on to note that the Treasury Department has currently issued sanctions against 115 different people in total, revoked visas from hundreds of others, issued sanctions against Venezuela’s state oil company, Petróleos de Venezuela, S.A. (PdVSA), sanctioned then Vice-President Tareck El Aissami for drug trafficking, and also sanctioned non-Venezuelan shipping companies that were nonetheless doing business with the regime.

Finally, the report finds that the United States Congress enacted the Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act in 2014 which, among other goals, “requires the President to impose sanctions (asset blocking and visa restrictions) against those whom the President determines are responsible for significant acts of violence or serious human rights abuses associated with protests in February 2014 or, more

---

broadly, against anyone who has directed or ordered the arrest or prosecution of a person primarily because of the person’s legitimate exercise of freedom of expression or assembly.” This Act was later extended by a Congressional vote into 2019, indicating that the provisions regarding sanctions are active. Other reports show that the American government continues to impose new sanctions on relevant individuals and entities well into 2019 – a National Public Radio report issued in June 2019 notes that the Trump administration recently imposed sanctions against Nicolás Maduro Guerra, Maduro’s son – the head of the Corps of the Special Inspectors of the Presidency and a member of the pro-government National Constituent Assembly – in an effort to further punish the regime for corruption and its role in suppressing protests.

As the preceding section shows, aggressive and targeted sanctions from the United States government have served as one of the clearest international signals of a democratic state pressuring the Maduro regime to end its repression of protesters and the Venezuelan people more broadly. Another technique that democratic forces have adopted in criticizing Maduro and offering their support to the opposition has been through the proclamation of symbolic statements and messages that endorse Juan Guaidó as Venezuela’s legitimately elected President, championing those in the country who dissent against Maduro’s rule.

As evidence of this, one can analyze the text of a prominent speech made by Donald Trump to various members of Miami’s Venezuelan and Cuban expatriate and refugee communities on February 18, 2019. It is important to note that this speech – as is the case with many speeches given by Trump throughout the duration of his Presidency – often deviates aimlessly from its intended message, wandering occasionally towards issuing statements of congratulations and praise to himself and
numerous members of his administration, as well as attacking the ideological tenets of socialism (and implicitly, communism) more broadly beyond its existence in Venezuela. Nevertheless, it is also extremely important to note that despite these reprehensible issues, the speech itself also contains many clear, overt, and unequivocal statements of support for the protesters. In this case, therefore, the leading figure of one of the most powerful nations on the planet was specifically recognizing and affirming the country’s support for members of the anti-Maduro opposition.109

As proof of this, it is possible to provide specific passages from Trump’s speech here110. Among other statements, he noted that “Today, our hearts are filled with hope because of the determination of millions of everyday Venezuelans, the patriotism of the Venezuelan National Assembly, and the incredible courage of Interim President Juan Guaidó. The people of Venezuela are standing for freedom and democracy, and the United States of America is standing right by their side.” He also went on to say, “I want to especially thank the Venezuelan exile community that has done so much to support President Guaidó to organize aid for their compatriots and to do just a lot back home. Thank you very much for being here... We’re with you. We are profoundly grateful to every dissident, every exile, every political prisoner, and everyone who bears witness to the horrors of socialism and communism, and who has bravely spoken out against them. Thank you very much... You have protested, and protested with respect, but loudly.”

109 From a diplomatic perspective, the foreign policy impact of this speech was reinforced by a statement issued by Secretary of State Mike Pompeo in 2019. In August 2019, Pompeo announced the introduction of a new Venezuela Affairs Unit, the purpose of which is to serve as “the interim diplomatic office of the U.S. Government to Venezuela, located at the U.S. Embassy in Bogota, Colombia, and has been established with bipartisan support from the U.S. Congress. The VAU is continuing the U.S. mission to the legitimate Government of Venezuela and to the Venezuelan people. The VAU will continue to work for the restoration of democracy and the constitutional order in that country, and the security and well-being of the Venezuelan people.” Here, the clear and unequivocal message being sent to protesters is clear – the current administration stands with their cause and supports their mission.

110 The entire text of the speech is available online at https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-venezuelan-american-community/.
Finally, he concluded his remarks by noting, “Peace-loving nations are ready to help Venezuela reclaim its democracy, its dignity, and its destiny...and so as the United States stands up for democracy in Venezuela, we reaffirm the solidarity with the long-suffering people of Cuba and Nicaragua and people everywhere living under socialist and communist regimes\textsuperscript{111}.”

This speech therefore contained several important proclamations of support for the Venezuelan people, despite its occasionally partisan nature. It is also worth noting that in addition to an audience that included numerous Venezuelan and Cuban refugees and dissidents, the speech was delivered in the presence of many influential Florida politicians, including Senators Marco Rubio and Rick Scott, Governor Ron DeSantis, Representative Mario Diaz-Balart, and the Ambassador of Venezuela to the United States Carlos Trujillo. This illustrates that the event was lent a legitimate amount of gravity due to the political rank of those who were in attendance, showing demonstrators both in Miami and in Venezuela that their message was recognized and respected by people in positions of power and influence.

One other important symbolic stance that numerous countries have adopted is to recognize Juan Guaidó as Venezuela’s legitimate President. Though Guaidó lost the country’s 2018 Presidential election, he has alleged that widespread fraud allowed Maduro to win another term, and he positioned himself as the figurehead of the opposition. According to a February 2019 article from \textit{Foreign Policy}, leaders from more than forty countries – the vast majority of them liberal democracies – have recognized Guaidó as President. These include states from numerous regions of the world.

\textsuperscript{111} At a different event in 2019, according to Wyss (2019), Vice President Mike Pence delivered a speech in which he declared, “We say to all the good people of Venezuela ‘estamos con ustedes,’ we are with you, we stand with you and we will stay with you until democracy is restored and you reclaim your birthright of libertad.”
globe, including North America (the United States and Canada); Latin America (Costa Rica, Brazil, Panama, Colombia, Ecuador, Chile, Peru, and Argentina); Europe (Spain, France, Germany, the United Kingdom, Sweden, Poland, and more than ten other European Union members); and the Pacific (Australia). Protesters in Caracas desire evidence that their mission actually stands a chance at succeeding, and the fact that so many powerful nations around the world have openly endorsed the leader of their campaign could make this outcome more likely.

One final point of critical importance to make here is the fact that in several cases, members of the opposition both in Venezuela and abroad have actively solicited the attention and assistance of outside actors in advancing their cause. As evidence of this, an April 2019 CBS News article describes a visit that Secretary of State Mike Pompeo took to meet with exiles and dissidents who had been displaced to Colombia. The article notes, “Venezuelan refugees demonstrated as Pompeo visited with [Colombian President Ivan] Duque over the weekend, chanting "Libertad!" and anti-Maduro slogans. When asked what they wanted from the United States, the protesters yelled back: “intervention!”” The visibility of these demands for external action is echoed in other ways, as the article goes on to note that members of the Trump

---

112 A comprehensive listing of every country that recognizes either Guaidó or Maduro as President as of February 2019 is available at: Mackinnon, Amy. “Maduro versus Guaidó: A Global Scorecard.” Foreign Policy. Published on February 6, 2019. Available online at https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/02/06/maduro-vs-guaido-a-global-scorecard-map-infographic/.


114 The aforementioned FRANCE 24 article notes that American officials announced in early May that they would consider the option of military intervention to resolve the conflict if necessary, though so far no direct steps have been taken on this front and none seem likely in the immediate future.
administration have so far made more visits to Central and South America than did representatives from the Obama administration.\footnote{Rather interestingly, the article also notes that Pompeo was asked to reconcile this fact with the administration’s critical response to immigrants and migrants from these countries; he saw no disconnect between one sphere and the other.}

For the foreseeable future, this seems likely to continue. In a testimony made to the House Foreign Relations Committee’s Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs, Professor R. Evans Ellis of the Army War College recommended that “[American] sanctions should be coupled with a strong message to Russia and China that we will actively oppose the honoring of contracts granted without the role of Venezuela’s constitutionally legitimate, elected national assembly, and that we will not lift sanctions without a clear restoration of Venezuela’s democratic order, to include active cooperation by the successor regime with efforts by the U.S. and rest of the international community to bring to justice those who are known to have committed crimes under Venezuelan, U.S. and international law” (13-14). The Trump administration has displayed a markedly (and disturbingly) inconsistent approach to foreign policy vis-à-vis dictatorial leaders around the world in general, as Trump’s embrace of strongmen including Russia’s Putin and the Philippines’ Duterte make clear, but the administration’s members seem intent on maintaining their critical stance towards Maduro and his allies.\footnote{Ellis elaborated upon these recommendations in a separate article — see Ellis (2017).}

\footnote{It is worth noting that Maduro, perhaps unsurprisingly, has chosen to frame this support from liberal outside forces as somewhat of an imperialist invasion. Indeed, Phillips and Lopez (2019) note that in a national address delivered in early 2019, Maduro vowed “to “defeat any imperialist enemy who dares to touch our soil”. He concluded his address with a swipe at the White House. “Trump, Pompeo, Bolton, Pence: how are you, my friends?” Maduro said sarcastically in English.” Similarly, Phillips (2019) finds that Maduro suggested that liberal Western states essentially fabricated Venezuela’s entire humanitarian crisis as a means to justify external intervention into his country’s affairs, dismissing the many well-documented reports of the ways in which Venezuelans have suffered under the directives of his regime.}
What objective role have international authoritarian forces played in attempting to suppress protesters’ chance at success? First, at a broad level, it can be helpful to provide an overview of the states around the world that continue to recognize Maduro as leader. Whereas Guaidó was recognized by many democratic nations, according to the aforementioned *Foreign Policy* article, the list of states supporting Maduro resembles a rogue’s gallery and includes prominent authoritarian or semi-authoritarian nations such as Russia, China, North Korea, Cambodia, Iran, Turkey, Syria, and Cuba. It is immediately apparent that the political backers of Maduro are significantly more dictatorial than those that support Guaidó; at the same time, the fact that a number of powerful autocrats have openly voiced their support for Maduro also lends resolve to remaining supporters of the regime among broader Venezuelan society.

In considering the actions that autocrats have taken to strengthen Maduro’s power beyond simply recognizing him as leader, it can be helpful to turn to the aforementioned testimony by R. Evan Ellis to the House Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere Affairs. In a presentation aiming to list the ways in which China and Russia have bolstered Maduro in office, Ellis note that China has been the most significant backer of the current regime. This assistance has been heavily economic, as the country provided a vast market for Venezuelan oil sales and financial investments and created an alternative outlet that at least partially ameliorates the sanctions enacted by the United States and others. China has also played a part in extending credits to Venezuelan officials who otherwise would be unable to access them, allowing the regime to obtain materials to domestically compensate supporters.

Beyond economics, Ellis notes, China has also played an important role in supporting and strengthening Maduro through military means. The Chinese
government has provided Venezuela with “not only conventional weapons systems and munitions, but also riot control vehicles and other equipment for helping the regime to put down protests” (5). In addition, Chinese leaders have sponsored the attendance of Venezuelan officers at technical training courses in China, enhancing their ability to act tactically against the opposition. Clearly, therefore, China plays a role in supporting Maduro –its financial assistance keeps the regime afloat, while its military training and provisions lend Maduro the physical resources to keep protests from growing too large.

While China has been instrumental in propping up the regime, the Russian government has also played a significant part in championing this effort. Putin has been among the most vocal critics of American sanctions on Venezuela, making it clear that Maduro has an ally on this front. Additionally, Russia has provided strong economic support, primarily by investing in Venezuela’s petroleum sector. Aid has been critically important as well – the Russian state-owned company Rosneft has poured seventeen billion dollars into finance and investment in Venezuela since 2018.

Furthermore, Russia has contributed to Maduro through military aid, training, and resources. A June 2019 Radio Free Europe – Radio Liberty article makes this clear, noting that Moscow deployed one hundred military experts to Venezuela in March 2019 to lend advice and recommendations to Maduro and his council; these tactical advisers remained in Venezuela for at least three months to carry out their mission118. This represents a direct form of intervention; though the Russians who visited Venezuela were not troops, they still entered the country to make one political outcome more likely than the other. The article also notes that the Russian government sold hundreds of

millions of dollars of weapons to Maduro, showing that Putin invested economic, strategic, and material resources to increase the chance that his autocratic ally would be able to stay in power. The United States has been the main force pushing back against this assistance, continuing to position itself as the champion of the opposition. Secretary of State Pompeo has openly criticized the governments of Cuba and Russia for providing military aid to Maduro and has called for a reduction in these channels\textsuperscript{119}, while White House National Security Adviser John Bolton called for Russia to refrain from intervening in Venezuela’s affairs to keep an autocratic leader in office\textsuperscript{120}.

What \textbf{individual-level evidence} exists that Venezuelan protesters are paying attention to the role of outside forces and soliciting their support? First, numerous reports gathered on the ground indicate protesters’ willingness to “show the world” that they are standing on the streets for a just cause. These include a 2019 \textit{New York Times} article in which one activist claimed, “This Saturday, I will be out there with my gas mask, my helmet and vest, to see what I can show the world\textsuperscript{121};” a 2019 \textit{ABC News} article in which a woman stated, “I’m here to show the world that we have a crisis and they are stepping over our human rights\textsuperscript{122};” a January 2019 \textit{Miami Herald} report that quotes a protester who noted, “This is a chance for the opposition to show the world

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{120}“New Caracas protests as US and Russia spar over Venezuela.” \textit{FRANCE 24}. Published May 1, 2019. Available online at \url{https://www.france24.com/en/20190501-caracas-protests-usa-russia-tension-venezuela}.
\item \textsuperscript{121}Herrero, Ana Vanessa and Megan Specia. “Venezuela Voices: We are Starving Here.” \textit{The New York Times}. Published February 1, 2019. Available online at \url{https://www.nytimes.com/2019/02/01/world/americas/venezuela-voices-protests.html}.
\item \textsuperscript{122}Aponte, Andreina. “Venezuelans take to streets on independence day with dueling rallies, military out in force.” \textit{ABC News}. Published July 5, 2019. Available online at \url{https://abcnews.go.com/International/venezuelans-streets-independence-day-dueling-rallies-military-force/story?id=64148876}.
\end{itemize}
that the immense majority of people don’t agree with the government, want a change, and want the opposition to call for new elections\textsuperscript{123};” and a May 2019 \textit{Christian Science Monitor} report in which Alejandro Velasco, a Venezuelan Professor of History at New York University, aptly commented, ““Levels of domestic support, whether expressed through being able to get people to the streets or polls – they’re important...But they’re not decisive. What’s important for momentum is showing the expat [and international] population that you can actually deliver on the promises you’ve been making\textsuperscript{124}.”” While these are all responses from individual people, the common thread underlying their reasoning is clear – the movement stands a better chance at success should the outside world pay attention to and champion it in its goals.

In some cases, this desire for outside attention and support has even involved expressed desire for external military intervention to deliver aid to protesters and to manually remove Maduro and his allies from office\textsuperscript{125}. Similarly, a May 2019 CNBC report documents the fact that “Guaidó...said he’s instructed his political envoy in Washington to immediately open relations with the U.S. military in a bid to bring more pressure on President Nicolás Maduro to resign. The leader said he’s asked Carlos Vecchio, who the U.S. recognizes as Venezuela’s ambassador, to open “direct communications” toward possible military “coordination.” The remarks, at the end of a rally Saturday, mark one of his strongest public pleas yet for greater U.S. involvement in

\begin{flushright}


\textsuperscript{125}Phillips (2019) interviews Luis Pedro España, a sociologist and member of the opposition, who notes, “We are depending on a military action – or the threat of a military action – internal or external.”
\end{flushright}
the country’s fast-escalating crisis. For some protesters, this desire for external intervention on their behalf stemmed from the fact that the Venezuelan military was standing firm with Maduro and his allies, leaving members of the civilian opposition comparatively helpless against the armed forces.

Crucially, one of the most significant examples of the opposition’s desire for external recognition is the fact that Juan Guaidó has regularly touted numerous countries’ recognition of him as Venezuela’s legitimate leader. Indeed, Phillips and Lopez (2019) note that this has been one of Guaidó’s main strategies in mobilizing crowds, writing of a rally in early 2019, “A round of applause for the EU!” Guaidó shouted, although the bloc has yet to explicitly back him as interim president. Guaidó claimed “the entire planet” was backing his movement to end Maduro’s “dictatorship.” Here, supporters of the opposition are placing a significant amount of stock in the fact that multiple forces outside of Venezuela’s borders agree with their cause. As noted above, this has been strengthened by actions taken by the current American Presidential administration, which have regularly and vocally pledged their support towards advancing protesters’ goals and missions.

For one activist quoted in a Guardian article, this international recognition sent some signal that their outcome

---

128 Furthermore, Zuniga and Eulich (2019) also report that Guaido took to YouTube to encourage Venezuelans to take to the streets and show the world that they do not support Maduro’s hold on power.
129 Zuniga and Eulich (2019) note that the most recent waves of protests in Venezuela are quite distinct from earlier movements in that they objectively enjoy significantly more support from forces elsewhere.
might actually be achieved; as she noted, “[this recognition] is “a step towards the hope that the government will change... and we can be with our families again”.”

In terms of the specific mechanisms proposed in this dissertation, two appear to be most relevant to the Venezuelan case – the influence of a powerful and influential diaspora who affect the dynamics of the protests from outside Venezuela's borders and protests held in other countries that express a series of purposive solidarity with the activists in Caracas. As the following section will show, these two mechanisms are not mutually exclusive – many of the members of the diaspora who lobby their national leaders also participate in solidarity protests. Nevertheless, they constitute two distinct actions that are taking place, and will be analyzed separately in turn.

As preceding discussion has shown, the harsh living conditions facing Venezuelans today has produced a large and influential diaspora residing in many different countries. One of the most important ways that this diaspora has affected the protests has been through providing material resources and assistance to sustain activists, making it possible for them to continue their campaign against the regime. In several cases, this has even involved instances of crowd-funding, in which Venezuelans in exile actively solicit funds and materials from people around the world to send to the country and increase the chance that the movement will endure. As evidence of this, a 2017 Washington Post article describes an operation that exists to the present day: “The growing toll — along with fears of worse violence to come — has prompted Venezuelans living outside the country to start raising money for shipments of safety equipment. “The idea is to protect as many heads as we can,” said Nelly Guinand, 25, a Venezuelan

living in New York who collected more than $22,000 and sent 128 motorcycle helmets
to Caracas, with more on the way. She calls the fund drive “Cascos contra Bombas”
(Helmets vs. Bombs)...Guinand is part of a widening international campaign to
crowdfund the protests, with some online drives raising more than
$24,000 in less than a month. As many as 17 campaigns to solicit money for food,
medicine and protest gear such as protective goggles, heavy gloves and gas masks can be
found on the website GoFundMe132.”

In addition to these communities of donors, protesters in Venezuela have
established linkages with diaspora members and their allies in other countries through
multiple channels that could also help sustain the protests. While Maduro has
attempted to block the import of foodstuffs or resources, news reports indicate the
existence of an online network of supporters in states including Colombia who form
several chains through which food and other sustenance materials can be funneled into
Venezuela despite the regime’s orders133. Other sources report the fact that Venezuelans
have been particularly successful in establishing linkages with diaspora and their allies
in Brazil, again creating networks of supporters who make it possible for humanitarian
aid to reach activists in Caracas and elsewhere134.

Assistance has also come from as far away as Canada, where members of the
Venezuelan diaspora formed the Canada Venezuela Democracy Forum to raise and send


supplies to Venezuelan hospitals. Rather than sending resources through the mail, the group is forced to send materials by boat, which are then received by a network of doctors and human rights workers who secretly store supplies in private homes until they can be smuggled into hospitals. In the United States, some reports estimate that the number of Venezuelans in exile has reached more than six hundred thousand, with many coming together to form more than one hundred non-governmental organizations to send humanitarian aid and to solicit the attention of elected officials. Relatively, members of Venezuela’s government-in-exile regularly hold events and meet with supporters in the United States; a 2019 *Houston Chronicle* article reports that Guaidó’s Ambassador Carlos Vecchio met with members of the diaspora at Rice University and urged them to keep up the pressure on the American government to oppose Maduro. Members of the diaspora and their allies have also exhibited signs of purposive solidarity by holding large, active, and visible rallies outside of Venezuela to show people in Caracas that they are being heard. Spurred by calls from Guaidó and Venezuela’s National Assembly (which opposes Maduro), Venezuelans in exile have taken to the streets in locations ranging from Canada to Mexico to Hong Kong. On-the-ground

---


138 Ibid.

accounts from these rallies provide excellent insights into the motivations of those who are participating. Phillips and Parkin Daniels (2019) interview members of the diaspora who gathered in Mexico City to protest, and spoke with one individual who expressed the following perspective: “One year ago Albert Molina and his family joined the historic exodus from Venezuela, fleeing to Mexico after his ailing father fell victim to the collapse of its health service. On Wednesday night...he stood outside the Venezuelan embassy in Mexico City with a placard reading “No more dictatorship” and suddenly rekindled dreams of a homecoming. “The thing Venezuelans most want is to go back to our homeland,” said Molina.”

Similarly, the article also recounts observations from an event in Hong Kong and Mexico: “As far away as Hong Kong demonstrators took to the streets with banners that read: “Juan Guaidó – we will stand with you until democracy is restored” and “I do not live in my country but my country will always live in me.” As the crowd outside the Mexico City embassy swelled, protesters unfurled a giant Venezuelan flag and began to chant the national anthem of their decaying nation. “Glory to the brave people, who shook off the yoke,” they sang. “Let’s cry out aloud: ‘Down with oppression!’”

While not as prominent as the two mechanisms described above, there also exists some evidence that protesters in Venezuela are calculating that international attention might reduce the chance that Maduro will crack down on them in an excessively harsh manner. For example, a January 2019 Miami Herald article interviewed one protester who stated, “[It] is full of uncertainties. There’s unrest inside the armed forces and we don’t know how they’ll respond. And we don’t know how large the march will be...In
some ways it’s not in Maduro’s best interests to squash the march because he’s trying to convince the international community that there’s no dictatorship here\textsuperscript{140}.”

How do the Venezuelan people themselves view the international actors that have been working to intervene in their affairs? While no NAVCO 3.0 data exists to measure changes in crowd size at different points in the movement, highly relevant survey data can reveal the attitudes of both regime supporters and regime opponents towards the United States, China, and Russia. The 2018 \textit{Latinobarometro} asked individuals to rate their opinions of each of these three countries as “very good,” “good,” bad,” or “very bad\textsuperscript{141}.” Following the strategy employed in the Bahrain case study above, I first present aggregate views toward each country across all members of Venezuelan society. I then specify the views of certain subsections of the survey sample, dividing respondents into those who categorize themselves as government supporters and those who categorize themselves as supporters of the opposition. Table 5.5 begins this section by presenting respondents’ views towards the United States.

Several interesting trends are evident from this table. First, roughly seven times as many people in the opposition have a “very good” view of the United States than do those who support the government, at 28.4% to 4.1%. Moreover, among supporters of the opposition, 84.7% have either a “very good” or a “good” view of the United States overall. In sharp contrast, only 27.9% of government supporters feel the same way. Instead, 67.0% of respondents in this second camp have either a “bad” or “very bad” perception of the United States as a global actor, compare with only 13.3% of the opposition’s supporters. This suggests that among those who do not support Maduro, a


\textsuperscript{141} These data are available online at \url{www.latinobarometro.org/}
Table 5.5. View of the United States – “Me gustaría conocer su opinión sobre los siguientes países u organizaciones que le voy a leer. ¿Tiene Ud. una muy buena (1), buena (2), mala (3) o muy mala (4) opinión sobre?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Government supporters</th>
<th>Opposition supporters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very bad</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid response</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

significant majority appears to be cognizant of American efforts to support Guaidó and other oppositional figures, and that these actors are positive and receptive towards such support when it emerges.

What trends can be seen in public opinion among Venezuelans towards China and Russia, the two leading autocratic forces that have been identified as affecting the country’s internal affairs? First, Table 5.6 presents respondents’ views of China. While not as stark as the divisions seen in respondents’ views of the United States, there are still significant differences between the beliefs of government supporters and members of the opposition. Nearly three times as many government supporters have a “very good” view of China than do members of the opposition (23.3% as compared with 8.3%), and the share with either a “very good” or “good” view is also significantly higher – 81.1% as compared to 55.8%. Given these statistical findings, it seems likely that regime supporters and opponents are quite aware of the various ways in which the Chinese government is supporting Maduro, and that those perceptions are reflected in
What does Table 5.7 reveal? First, both governmental supporters and opponents appear to have a more muted and moderate view of Russia than they do of China in the aggregate. Whereas 23.3% of government supporters had a “very good” view of China, only 9.7% hold the same type of feelings towards Russia, though the overall share with a “very good” or “good” view is still relatively high at 68.0%. Members of the opposition have similar feelings towards Russia as they do China, though they are also less likely to feel “very” good or “very” bad. It is possible that this is because as preceding discussion has shown, China has overall been the more significant supporter of Maduro through its financial investments and military aid, leading Venezuelans to associate the Chinese government more closely with Maduro. These data do not necessarily or directly translate into Venezuelans’ specific beliefs of opinions about intervention from the United States, China, and Russia, of course, but they can still be taken as a useful proxy...
Table 5.7. View of Russia – “Me gustaría conocer su opinión sobre los siguientes países u organizaciones que le voy a leer. ¿Tiene Ud. una muy buena (1), buena (2), mala (3) o muy mala (4) opinión sobre?:”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion Level</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Government supporters</th>
<th>Opposition supporters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very bad</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid response</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for citizens’ views on these topics because of how prominent the intervention has been.

What outcome currently seems most likely in the Venezuelan case? While it is difficult to say with any certainty, one thing is unequivocally clear – Venezuela’s Freedom House score has dropped precipitously since the protests began. An analysis of the country’s scores in the past four years shows how the state has become more increasingly authoritarian – whereas Venezuela received a Freedom House rating of 5.0 in 2016, this rating dropped to 5.5 in 2017 and 2018. Moreover, the country’s score for 2019 sits at an intimidating 6.5, showing how severely autocratic the developments there have been. Much still remains to be done in the country’s protest movement, but as of mid-2019, a Reuters article indicated that the anti-governmental campaign was beginning to resemble a stand-off where neither party was truly willing to budge. It is clear that the country’s elites have been dictatorial in their rule, but it is not yet evident

---

that protesters have lost their fight – Guaidó has not assumed the Presidency, but much 
can still happen, and supporting the opposition preserves the chance that Venezuela can 
avoid a fully dictatorial fate and return to a more democratic state of existence in the 
future.

**Synthesizing themes across cases**

The preceding discussion has presented and analyzed five distinct cases, each of 
which illustrates a different aspect of my dissertation’s theoretical framework. What 
common themes can be drawn across contexts? First, **support from external** 
democratic forces can have a real and meaningful effect on protesters’ beliefs, 
decision-making strategies, and goals. Evidence from Venezuelan dissidents both within 
Venezuela and elsewhere demonstrated that anti-regime activists intentionally wished 
to solicit the help of outside forces in their struggle against the regime, while surveys in 
Lebanon showed that significant numbers of protesters viewed external forces including 
the United States as allies and international documents condemning the Syrian 
occupation of their state as important and valid. At the same time, the fact that multiple 
foreign leaders traveled to Ukraine to support the Orange Revolution in 2004 sent clear 
signals that the outside world was with them and stood against the machinations of the 
regime. Evidently, protesters care about these actions because this shows that they are 
heard and supported, making it more likely that they will continue their fight against 
dictatorial leaders. When individuals believe that their campaign actually has a chance 
at succeeding and will not be brutally repressed, they will be more likely to remain 
steadfast in their drive against authoritarian forces.

Second, **domestic regime capacity, and – perhaps most importantly –** 
media freedom and openness matter. In Ukraine’s 2004 Orange Revolution and
Lebanon’s 2005 Cedar Revolution, protesters enjoyed a great deal of advantages that anti-regime activists elsewhere did not. Namely, oppositional forces in these countries were able to take advantage of relatively free and independent media sources to transmit their messages to a broader audience around the world, granting them the opportunity to capture the symbolic and material aid of sympathetic audiences in a variety of different countries. As earlier discussion noted, the world stood with protesters in those cases – rallies in other nations were held to illustrate this fact to the activists, while leaders intentionally made clear statements and pronouncements that were designed to undermine autocratic leaders and bolster oppositional campaigns against them.

Protesters elsewhere who faced markedly less friendly media environments experienced a starkly different situation – in Bahrain’s failed 2011 uprising and Uzbekistan’s short-lived 2005 revolution, members of the opposition were deprived of any significant assistance from media (whether within their country or beyond its borders), a fact that significantly undermined their ability to attract outside support and attention. Here, unfortunately, activists were less able to transmit their message to an external audience; instead, they perceived a signal that they were alone in their efforts, an awareness that must have decreased their willingness to continue their fight against authorities. In each case, regime capacity was of critical importance, and each movement failed to remove leaders or procure any meaningful and long-lasting changes.

Finally, **authoritarian intervention is most successful in depressing protests when it is coupled with a heavily repressive domestic regime.** In 2004 Ukraine, Russian complaints regarding American interference accomplished little, and activists were able to achieve their goals of removing corrupt leaders from power thanks in part to the Ukrainian regime’s comparatively semi-authoritarian nature.
When Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates sent troops to quash protests in Bahrain, in contrast, this represented a case in which activists were forced to contend not only with outside troops who arrived with the aim of supporting an unpopular domestic dictator, but also with a newly re-energized Bahraini regime that was able to double down on its repressive capabilities. In this case, therefore, the interaction of domestic regime strength and outside autocratic intervention clearly was enough to keep the opposition from ever gaining any serious type of power or influence.

**Conclusion**

Protests in authoritarian and semi-authoritarian regimes take place in a variety of geographical and political contexts around the world, from relatively open hybrid states in which some opposition is permitted to more repressive, dictatorial states in which leaders enjoy a wide range of tools in maintaining a hold on security forces and clamping down on challenges to their power. At the same time, states regularly monitor and intervene in one another’s affairs at greater rates than ever before, meaning that it is an increasingly pressing task to understand how the competing effects of democratic promotion and autocratic repression affect activists’ perceptions and decision-making strategies across situations.

The five case studies presented in this chapter demonstrate the ways in which liberal actors and authoritarian forces have, to varying degrees, interjected themselves into different states affairs to either support protesters or to assist embattled autocratic leaders. The triggers, tactics, and outcomes may vary from case to case, but taken together, much can be learned by analyzing Ukraine’s 2004 Orange Revolution, Bahrain’s 2011 protests, Uzbekistan’s 2005 Andijan uprising, Lebanon’s 2005 Cedar Revolution, and the protest movement taking place in Venezuela in 2019.
regime capacity matters heavily in shaping the dynamics of a protest movement’s effectiveness and impact, and external democratic promotion will not always be able to combat this fact. When protests stand a real chance at success, however, sending clear signals that their mission is worthwhile and that outside forces stand together with them in solidarity can play a key role in sustaining their motivation and drive, potentially laying the groundwork for a long-lasting and impactful push to change an authoritarian society from the bottom up. The five cases here have illustrated these conclusions in a number of ways, and my findings therefore have a number of important substantive policy implications for liberal states’ foreign policies and promotion of human rights in the twenty-first century and beyond.
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION

Joining a protest in an authoritarian or hybrid state in the modern era is not a decision that one makes lightly. Whereas protesters in consolidated and established democracies can take to the streets and criticize leaders without fear of repercussion, activists in more repressive states face the possibility of arrest, harassment, violence, or death. Nevertheless, protesters in places ranging from Ukraine to Hong Kong to Venezuela to Egypt have shown up in significant numbers to demand reforms in their countries’ political, social, and economic spheres. In doing so, they have in many cases managed to secure real and meaningful changes, utilizing both domestic and international tools of leverage to force leaders to comply with their requests.

What effects do international factors have on the decision-making strategies of protesters in these situations? I have shown in this dissertation that external actors can play a highly significant role in affecting the way that activists view themselves, their movement, and the chance that their campaign will succeed. Protesters today do not operate within a vacuum devoid of international context. Instead, individuals can harness the power of social media and online communication both to establish linkages with actors elsewhere and to make their causes known to a broader global audience. Oppositional forces can instantly transmit their message across thousands of miles without ever leaving their homes, utilizing advances in media to reach as many sympathetic ears as possible. This has numerous implications for the types of activities that protesters can undertake in soliciting this attention, as well as the kinds of methods that outside forces can employ to help activists secure their desired political outcomes.

In this dissertation, I show that international engagement can significantly shape the calculations of individuals who are deciding whether or not to join an anti-
governmental movement. In what ways can signals of support from liberal actors elsewhere alter these important beliefs and considerations? I propose four key mechanisms here. First, meaningful external support can provide activists with a sense of *purposive solidarity* – the emotional sense that the world is standing with the protesters and the notion that the movement is not alone in its efforts. This can lend activists a great amount of psychological and moral fortitude, increasing the likelihood that they will remain resolute in their demands for human rights and democratic governance. As my interviews investigating Ukraine’s 2013-2014 Euromaidan protests show, many protesters in Kyiv were heartened by both the fact that citizens in other countries were holding simultaneous “Maidans” to highlight their support and the fact that politicians from Western states visited Ukraine to visibly indicate that activists were seen, heard, and recognized.

Second, I stress the important role of *transnational learning* – the process by which strategies from civic activists and democratic forces in one country can cross national borders to be used in a new context. This can often assume the form of activist-to-activist connections, as was seen in Ukraine’s 2004 Orange Revolution. In that case, reformers from Serbia and Georgia worked closely with protesters in Kyiv to help them devise tactics that would be most effective in presenting a united front against the Kuchma regime. Moreover, international non-governmental organizations with links to the United States and Western Europe provided necessary training to Orange Revolution activists to make a victorious outcome more likely. A similar strategy can also be seen in 2019 Venezuela – there, transnational linkages take the form of technical assistance and aid, as groups in neighboring states including Colombia and Brazil work with activists in Venezuela to sustain protesters in their efforts.
Third, I point to the credible threat of checking and sanctioning that liberal forces can issue against authoritarian leaders who otherwise might be more likely to crack down on a protest. If forces elsewhere can provide convincing evidence that leaders will be held accountable for their actions, this can dissuade autocrats from employing troops and security forces against citizens in too forceful a manner. One can see evidence of this in Ukraine (both in 2004 and 2013), as democracies elsewhere made clear that the regime’s actions were being carefully monitored and that any undue actions would lead to significant reprisals. Similarly, I provide evidence from Venezuela suggesting that Maduro is constrained in his repression of protesters at least in part because of scrutiny from outside forces. Equally importantly, I point to the failings that occur when such credible threats of sanctioning do not exist. In Bahrain, democracies elsewhere never provided a serious or legitimate warning against regime elites, leaving leaders free to act with impunity and protesters forced to fend for themselves against increasingly brutal suppression and subjugation.

Finally, I propose a fourth and final mechanism spurred by external democratic support – the material and political benefits that can be gained through strong linkages with ordinary citizens and diaspora groups elsewhere. These types of actors are distinct from the transnational forces in the second mechanism above, as their connection to the protesters is often closer and more personal; in addition, they act outside of official political environments, differentiating their motivations and capabilities from human rights organizations or governmental committees. Members of a country’s diaspora in particular can be critically important in sustaining a movement by sending resources that make it easier for activists to continue their campaign and by exerting pressure on officials in their home states to support the protests.
What role might external authoritarian intervention play in shaping the perceptions of activists in these contentious situations? I predict two competing effects, dependent upon the domestic context at hand. Assistance from autocrats elsewhere to support an embattled leader can signal vulnerability by suggesting that the regime cannot stay in power without help from abroad, but external intervention can also cause fear of repercussions should the incumbent stay in office. I posit that in semi-authoritarian regimes, the first effect will dominate and cause an unexpected backlash in which protesters see their leader as increasingly fragile. In these cases, activists will resent undue external intervention in their affairs, prompting them to turn out in larger and larger numbers. This was the case in Ukraine’s Euromaidan revolution, where perceptions that Vladimir Putin was intervening to support Yanukovych spurred increasingly large groups of people to take to the streets in anger and defiance against the actions of the Russian government.

In fully autocratic states where the regime is equipped with a powerful security apparatus, however, I propose the second mechanism will dominate – intervention will cause deterrence and intimidation as protesters perceive the dangers involved in challenging the regime as even more threatening than before. In these situations, the risk calculus for individuals will shift dramatically, reducing the chance that they will remain willing to challenge autocratic rulers. Evidence of this can be seen from Bahrain – protesters there were heavily intimidated when authorities in Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates sent troops to quash their nascent movement, increasing the domestic repressive capacity of Bahrain’s own security forces and raising the perceived costs of participation so dramatically that many individuals chose to return home rather than continue their fight.
I have presented three empirical chapters in this dissertation to provide evidence that my proposed theoretical mechanisms operate across geographical and temporal contexts today. First, I turn in Chapter 3 to a case study of Ukraine’s 2013-2014 Euromaidan protest movement involving six months of fieldwork conducted across two trips to Ukraine in 2017. Both Western states and the Russian government accused the other of having undue influence on the Euromaidan protests’ evolution. In order to determine how these external forces shaped the beliefs of activists on the ground in Kyiv, I interviewed more than 120 Members of Parliament, reporters, activists, civil society leaders, and academics to examine ways in which protesters’ beliefs about Western support and Russian intervention shaped their behavior and decision-making strategies.

My findings show that many activists heavily considered the impact of external support when deciding to act, indicating that the world’s attention provided a significant boost in enhancing their determination to challenge the Yanukovych administration. Several interview respondents (particularly those who were on Kyiv’s Maidan square from the beginning) pointed to the mechanisms of purposive solidarity that I outlined above, stressing that Euromaidan protests held in other countries bolstered their spirits and convinced them that they actually stood a chance at success. Equally important was the assistance of human rights groups and the Ukrainian diaspora, who lobbied officials in their adopted nations to highlight the movement’s importance and sent resources and funding to strengthen the campaign.

Furthermore, many of my interviewees showed how protesters resented overt Russian support for Yanukovych and stressed the fact that their actions were driven partly by the need to keep Ukraine from transforming into “the next Russia.” Frustration with both Putin’s unwanted influence in the country’s internal affairs and a
fear of becoming too similar to their autocratic neighbor made many Ukrainians realize that the country stood at a precipice, convincing them to take action in order to prevent an undesirable and potentially irreversible outcome. This was made possible by the fact that Ukraine was a semi-autocratic – rather than a fully authoritarian – state with a relatively free and open media environment. Because of this, protesters were able to regularly share messages on Twitter, Facebook, and YouTube, allowing them to circumvent messages issued by media that were more closely tied to the state. In addition, the Yanukovych regime was never repressive enough to contain the movement by itself. In this case, therefore, both external democratic intervention and autocratic support played a meaningful role in shaping activists’ decision to sustain a movement that was ultimately successful in securing regime change.

My second empirical chapter provides further evidence in support of my fundamental theoretical claims. In Chapter 4, I present the results of an original survey experiment that I designed and carried out in Ukraine, involving nearly two hundred undergraduates. In recruiting subjects, I targeted students from Ukrainian universities that had reputations for promoting strong traditions of democratic activism, as these types of institutions are the locations from which future protest participants would likely emerge. This led me to travel to and recruit student participants from the National University of Kyiv – Mohyla Academy in Kyiv, Taras Shevchenko National University in Kyiv, and Ukrainian Catholic University in Lviv.

All participants in my sample were therefore students, making them the precise population of actors about which I aimed to make inferences with my experiment – I am not claiming to explain the motivations of senior citizens or middle-aged Ukrainians through the results of my work, but rather the perceptions of young, reform-minded
activists. All participants were randomly assigned into two treatment groups and one control group, ensuring that the results of my experiment were not biased in any way. Participants read a vignette requesting them to imagine that they lived in a repressive state where students had begun to protest against an authoritarian government that was reversing recent democratic reforms in favor of retrenched autocracy. Following this, subjects rated their willingness on a ten-point scale to engage in three increasingly intense forms of protest – signing a petition, contacting an elected official, or joining a lawful anti-governmental movement. Subjects in the first treatment group learned that democracies elsewhere were actively supporting the protests, participants in the second treatment group learned that autocracies elsewhere were intervening to suppress the protests, and participants in the control group received no information about external actors whatsoever. No other difference between the vignettes existed, meaning that any significant difference in protest willingness between groups could be attributed entirely to the experimental manipulation at hand.

T-tests comparing mean rates of protest willingness between groups provided null results for the first two forms of protest behavior that I was testing, as there was no significant difference between those in the treatment groups and those in the control for signing a petition or contacting an elected official. In these cases, participants’ decision-making strategies were not affected by either democratic or authoritarian intervention. However, the results for the most intense form of behavior – actually committing to joining a movement – strongly support my theory. For this final dependent variable, participants in the liberal democratic treatment are far more likely to protest than those in the other two groups (p<0.001). On a scale of protest willingness ranging from 1 to 10, those in the democratic treatment expressed a rate that was more than 1.6 points
higher than the mean rate of the control group. This suggests that for the most intensive form of participation in my project, respondents were likely to consider external democratic support to the greatest extent when stakes were highest.

Finally, I present a series of comparative analyses in Chapter 5, my third empirical chapter. Here, I assess five case studies that illustrate different mechanisms from my theoretical framework in action. In selecting specific cases to examine, I chose to focus on countries representing a range of temporal and geographical conditions to show that my mechanisms do not operate in only one part of the world or one particular moment in time. I therefore analyze Ukraine’s 2004 Orange Revolution; a failed 2011 uprising in Bahrain; a failed rebellion in 2006 in the Uzbek village of Andijan; Lebanon’s successful 2005 Cedar Revolution; and the protests that have been taking place in Venezuela since the mid-2010s. Taken together, these cases span a time period of more than fifteen years and include states from Eastern Europe, the Middle East, Central Asia, and Latin America.

In general, none of these case studies highlight every one of my mechanisms in action. Rather, each illustrates several mechanisms on its own, showing how certain aspects of international influences shaped protesters’ actions dependent on the context at hand. In Ukraine’s Orange Revolution, crowds were strengthened in their efforts to wage a campaign against the Yanukovych regime by the fact that numerous Western governments and non-governmental organizations provided ample transnational linkages and training on the ground in Kyiv. Further, activists were heartened by statements made by world leaders in support of their cause, lending them a significant sense of purposive solidarity and assuring them that the eyes of the world were on Ukraine.
External support was equally important for protesters in Lebanon and Venezuela. In Lebanon, protesters actively solicited global attention, and were significantly aided by members of the Lebanese diaspora who pressured their home governments to speak out in favor of the uprising. This external attention reduced the barriers to joining the movement, and Lebanese were therefore able to campaign actively against both their own leaders and against Syria’s decades-long autocratic intervention into their country’s affairs. Similarly, significant evidence exists that transnational linkages with activists in Brazil and Colombia and the efforts of the Venezuelan diaspora ensure that much international attention remains focused on Caracas. This concerted effort has even persuaded the leaders of more than fifty countries to recognize oppositional leader Juan Guaidó as Venezuela’s official President. While the ultimate outcome of the protests is unclear as of 2019, it seems probable that external actors will continue to shape Venezuela’s domestic affairs for some time to come.

Finally, the cases of Bahrain and Uzbekistan provide cautionary examples of what can happen when external democratic support is too weak to counter authoritarian intervention or a durable and repressive domestic capacity. In Bahrain, liberal actors elsewhere failed to pay much attention to the movement or to offer any serious aid to the campaign. Instead, Bahrain’s autocratic neighbors Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates sent in troops to help put down the movement and prevent it from achieving its goals. Protesters saw their level of threat perception increase dramatically, and rationally decided to step down. Similarly, the Uzbek regime’s repressive capacity and ability to violently suppress any independent media proved central to the event’s undoing. Activists there were unable to capture much attention from the outside world, effectively sealing off their calls for reform from a broader audience. Moreover, a
moderate amount of external support from the United States of America and the United Kingdom was undermined when politicians decided that maintaining strategic ties with Uzbek leaders was more important than championing protesters. In both cases, a lack of democratic aid and an imposing amount of autocratic power proved to be too much for activists to overcome.

**Theoretical and Normative Implications**

These findings produce a number of important implications both theoretical and normative. From an academic perspective, this dissertation implies that future studies of protest behavior should be particularly intent on incorporating some consideration of external factors into their analyses. In many authoritarian and hybrid states around the globe, protesters are able to transmit their messages to the outside world and monitor the reaction of states elsewhere. This indicates that democratically-minded activists will increasingly view international allies as an important bargaining tool in their campaigns against autocratic leaders, and that studies of this topic should be sure not to ignore this fact. Failing to grant this variable the influential power that it can hold might undermine a project’s ability to capture all aspects of a movement, leading a study to be less comprehensive than it otherwise would be.

This dissertation has produced a number of relevant findings from a more normative and policy-oriented perspective as well. It is important to precede the following discussion by noting that the foreign policy efforts of democracies in the modern world must certainly incorporate a variety of factors into consideration when deciding which course of action to pursue. Combatting international challenges to the global order such as terrorism or climate change can often require governments of all stripes to work together, overlooking one another’s domestic failings and challenges in
order to achieve a common goal. Concerns about democracy will therefore obviously not always override the need to cooperate when doing so is of critical importance. Nevertheless, this project posits that democratic actors should recognize and capitalize on their ability to make a meaningful difference in supporting liberal movements around the world today. This is particularly true given the alarming declines that have been seen in global democratic governance, as right-wing, populist, and illiberal regimes capture power in states across Europe, Asia, and elsewhere. Furthermore, as certain political leaders in long-standing democracies including the United States and the United Kingdom favor a nativist, exclusionary, and inwardly-oriented foreign policy at the expense of international engagement and cooperation, promoting an active and participatory approach towards global politics should be of central importance today.

Supporting nascent democratic uprisings in authoritarian countries matters for both domestic and international reasons. From a domestic perspective, protesters deserve the right to live in a state that values freedom, tolerance, liberty, and respect for human rights. Dictatorial governments suppress these important norms, and individuals who work to fight back against oppression and injustice should be commended and assisted. Championing these democratic campaigns matters on a larger, global level as well. It is certainly important to acknowledge that pro-democratic movements can sometimes destabilize countries, resulting in either domestic turmoil or re-entrenched authoritarian rule – many of the failed Arab Spring movements attest to this fact, as Libya and Egypt are no more free or fair in 2019 than they were in 2011. Nevertheless, in other cases including Tunisia and Georgia, uprisings did introduce new regimes that were more democratic and adhered to human rights standards more deeply than did their predecessors. Democracies can work together to better address
illiberal challenges facing other parts of the globe, and supporting reformist movements can help stabilize the entire international order by creating new allies and coalition partners that are willing to seriously tackle these issues.

**Extending my Analysis: Proposed Directions for Future Research**

There are a number of different areas into which I plan to expand this research agenda in the future. First, I plan to draft this dissertation as a book manuscript. This would involve surveying additional individuals about Ukrainian affairs to develop my findings more deeply, as speaking with a greater number of analysts, activists, and academics would increase my certainty that the results of my existing interviews are valid and provide me with a broader amount of data both qualitative and quantitative.

Beyond drafting my dissertation as a book manuscript, there are several other projects that I aim to undertake. My extensive experience studying and traveling to both European and post-Soviet states has prepared me to maintain a focus on this region, and I expect to continue studying the post-Soviet space because many of these countries are not democratic and remain important cases for testing my theory. First, I plan to extend the scope of my research to studying protest behavior in other parts of Ukraine that I have not yet reached. The country is still highly volatile in this regard— I saw this first-hand during my second round of fieldwork, as protesters driven by frustration over corruption camped outside Parliament and again occupied the central Maidan square.

Much of my doctoral research was conducted in Kyiv and Lviv, regions where citizens are generally much more favorable towards the global West than towards Russia. I can now extend my study to different parts of the country where Russian intervention has been more visible, and where citizens’ geopolitical views of the West (and liberal democracy more broadly) are much less straightforward. It is
important to determine which aspects of my theoretical framework would hold in Ukraine’s Southern and Eastern regions, where people likely view pro-Western democratic protests very differently than do the individuals that I contacted for my dissertation. I hypothesize that subjects’ beliefs and values in these parts of Ukraine would place less value on the need for democratic government and liberal reforms, and that democracy promotion efforts would not be as effective with this population because of that fact. Testing these claims in a new context would involve drafting a new round of surveys and experiments, and finding new student subjects to serve as participants in future research.

My efforts to complete this analysis would be strengthened by contacts that I established with many individuals during my fieldwork at the three universities mentioned above as well as policy institutes such as the European Union Advisory Mission to Ukraine. (Ukrainian Catholic University is particularly relevant for studies of political, sociological, and psychological behavior, as their campus contains a sociological lab that regularly designs and implements such projects, and professors there have close ties with behavioral scientists in other parts of the country.) Extending my analysis to these new regions of Ukraine could illustrate a valuable amount of insightful trends, and I believe that there is much to be gained by pursuing this channel of scholarship.

In addition to this, I plan to pursue a second avenue of research focusing on the “supply” side of external support for democratic protests in authoritarian regimes. My prior research focuses primarily on the “demand” or “receiving” side of this relationship, as I have worked to understand what protesters themselves desire, think, and perceive. However, I am also cognizant of the need to speak with individuals that are actually involved in producing this democratic assistance. How do governmental agencies or
non-governmental organizations decide which groups of activists to support in a given authoritarian or hybrid state? This question can be particularly fraught when the anti-governmental opposition in a country is unorganized, weak, or fragmented. In these cases, democratic operatives run the risk of choosing to back individuals or groups that might in fact be highly intolerant or otherwise controversial. Beyond the decision of whom to support, those involved in democracy promotion must also determine ways to measure whether their assistance is effective in achieving its goals. What types of indicators do these groups rely upon to assess social and political outcomes, particularly when it can be difficult to decisively state that progress has been achieved? In studying these issues, I therefore extend my analysis into a new (but related) research agenda that could be relevant for projects in a variety of academic disciplines.

My primary goal for this second project would be to interview and survey people who are actively involved in democracy promotion efforts. Because of my prior work for the Joint Baltic American National Committee a non-governmental organization aimed at bolstering American support for democratic movements in Central and Eastern Europe. I have maintained contacts at several think tanks and non-governmental organizations in Washington, D.C. including the Atlantic Council, the United States Institute for Peace, the International Republican Institute, and Freedom House through whom I could reach actors involved in this area.

Turning to an international level, I recognize the need to focus not only on democracy promotion originating from the United States, but also on the role played by liberal forces in other parts of the world as well. Considering my regional specialization in Central and Eastern Europe, I would aim to reach policymakers in Brussels who are extensively involved in the European Union’s “Eastern Partnership” mission. The Eastern
Partnership plays a significant role in championing democracy in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine. Interviewing actors there would greatly inform my research by helping me understand how their efforts are implemented and measured on the ground, and also how to determine the ways in which progress has been made. Conducting these interviews would let me obtain primary, qualitative data from first-hand sources directly involved in this area, strengthening the quality and veracity of my findings. Democracy assistance has come under attack from many different forces, and understanding the precise mechanisms of this foreign policy in action is essential.

Finally, I conclude by discussing two other lines of research that I am interested in pursuing. First, to extend my Euromaidan analysis explored in Chapter 3 and the five case studies presented in Chapter 5, it would be possible to conduct both a textual examination of Tweets that were issued during those movements and a content analysis of news reports written at the time that they were taking place. Analyzing these published materials, particularly the Twitter postings of leading oppositional figures, could reveal the ways in which protesters were speaking about international factors while the movement was actually happening; this would provide a great amount of real-time insight into what protesters were thinking and considering.

Second, it would be possible for me to extend my theories about the effects of external intervention on protesters’ perceptions and beliefs into a democratic context. More specifically, it would be highly relevant to apply my findings about Ukrainians’ resentment of unwanted Russian interference to the context of the United States, where multiple sources throughout the American intelligence community and the media have accused Russia of unduly influencing our own country’s domestic political situation. What do Americans think about potential
interference from outside forces in shaping our elections or charting the nature of our political discourse? How would political knowledge, ideology, or partisanship affect these feelings? Would these perceptions change when such interference is tacitly welcomed (or even explicitly invited) by elected officials including the President? There is much to be explored in this area of study, and I believe that this research agenda could produce many valuable findings in the future.

**Conclusion**

Political protest has become an extremely effective tool for pursuing and implementing change in authoritarian countries today. Over the past decade, individuals have taken to the streets against rulers in places as diverse as Hong Kong, Nicaragua, Algeria, Russia, and Zimbabwe. Participants in these movements are willing to face very real and significant threats to their occupations, their families, and even their lives in order to demand social and political reforms from leaders who suppress calls for democratic governance or human rights. While these movements certainly face a number of obstacles in achieving their goals, such campaigns can significantly improve the quality of life for their fellow citizens if they are successful.

At the same time, international forces have the ability to support these protest movements more now than ever before. Through the use of targeted sanctions against autocratic leaders, training and tactical assistance provided to activists, and expressions of solidarity with protesters, outside actors can affect the decision-making strategies of both oppositional figures and governmental elites. In the preceding dissertation, I have shown through an original case study of Ukraine’s Euromaidan movement involving more than 120 interviews and six months of fieldwork; a field survey experiment involving nearly 200 Ukrainian students; and a series of
comparative case studies that democratic support can often play a crucial role in shaping the dynamics of these developments. Supporting demands for human rights and civil liberties is a critical task, and should remain central to the foreign policies of democratic states across the globe for many years to come.
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APPENDIX A: CLOSED-ENDED SURVEY QUESTIONS
(ENGLISH LANGUAGE)

1. Were you personally involved in the Euromaidan protest movement?
   a. Yes, I joined the protests near the beginning of the movement
   b. Yes, I joined the protests in the middle of the movement
   c. Yes, I joined the protests near the end of the movement
   d. No, I never joined the protests but I approved of the movement
   e. No, I never joined the protests and I had no opinion of the movement
   f. No, I never joined the protests and I generally disapproved of the movement
   g. Don’t know/other

2. Did you support the basic goals of those who were participating in the movement at the time?
   a. Strongly supported
   b. Supported
   c. Neither supported nor opposed
   d. Opposed
   e. Strongly opposed

3. Based on your observations, did “Western” states or organizations (such as civil society groups based in European Union member nations or the United States) have any effect on the protesters’ perceptions, strategies, or goals?
   a. Yes, Western states or organizations had a strong effect
   b. Yes, Western states or organizations had a moderate effect
   c. Yes, Western states or organizations had a weak effect
   d. No, Western organizations had no effect
   e. Don’t know/other

4. Based on your observations, did protesters’ calculations about the Russian government’s reaction to Euromaidan have any effect on peoples’ perceptions, strategies, or goals?
   a. Yes, it is very likely that considerations about Russia’s reaction mattered
   b. Yes, it is somewhat likely that considerations about Russia’s reaction mattered
   c. No, it is somewhat unlikely that considerations about Russia’s reaction mattered
   d. No, it is very unlikely that calculations about Russia’s reaction mattered
   e. Don’t know/other

5. If you feel that Russia was intervening to undermine Euromaidan’s success, what are some ways in which the Russian regime might have been acting?
   a. Military aid to the Yanukovych regime mentioned
   b. Sending troops mentioned
   c. Providing financial aid mentioned
   d. Online and media propaganda campaign mentioned
   e. Other mentioned
6. How would you characterize the movement’s long-term effects today?
   a. Very successful
   b. Somewhat successful
   c. Neither successful nor unsuccessful
   d. Somewhat unsuccessful
   e. Very unsuccessful
   f. Don’t know/other

7. How likely is it that a similar movement would emerge in the future?
   a. Very likely
   b. Somewhat likely
   c. Not very likely
   d. Not at all likely
   e. Don’t know/other

8. Do you ultimately think that Ukraine will join Western organizations like the European Union?
   a. Ukraine will likely move towards the West
   b. Ukraine will likely move towards Russia
   c. Ukraine will likely remain situated equally between the West and Russia
   d. Don’t know/other

9. How important is it that Western states and organizations support democratic protests in Ukraine?
   a. Very important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Not very important
   d. Not at all important
   e. Don’t know/other

10. If a mass protest movement such as Euromaidan arose again in the future, how likely is it that you would join the movement?
    a. 10 Very likely
    b. 9
    c. 8
    d. 7
    e. 6
    f. 5
    g. 4
    h. 3
    i. 2
    j. 1 Not at all likely

**Demographic Questions**

11. Which of the following categories best describes your current occupational status?
    a. Politician or elected official
    b. Political consultant
    c. Activist
    d. Policy analyst/think tank analyst
e. Professor/academic
f. Student
g. Non-governmental organization employee
h. Media
i. Don’t know/other

12. Gender
   a. Male
   b. Female

13. Ethnicity
   a. Ukrainian
   b. Russian
   c. Equally Ukrainian and Russian
   d. Other

14. Age
   a. 18-24 years old
   b. 25-34 years old
   c. 35-44 years old
   d. 45-54 years old
   e. 55-64 years old
   f. 65-74 years old
   g. 75 years or older
   h. Prefer not to answer

15. What is the highest level of education that you have completed?
   a. No schooling completed
   b. Some high school, no diploma
   c. High school graduate, diploma or the equivalent (for example: GED)
   d. Some college credit, no degree
   e. Trade/technical/vocational training
   f. Associate degree
   g. Bachelor’s degree
   h. Master’s degree
   i. Professional degree
   j. Doctorate degree
   k. Prefer not to answer

16. On a scale of political ideology from very liberal (represented as 10) to very conservative (represented by 1), where would you place yourself?
   a. 10 – very liberal
   b. 9
   c. 8
   d. 7
   e. 6
   f. 5
   g. 4
   h. 3
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i. 2
j. 1 – very conservative

17. Have you ever signed a petition?
   a. Yes
   b. Have not, but would
   c. Have not and would not
   d. Other/don’t know

18. Have you ever contacted an elected official to express your views on an issue?
   a. Yes
   b. Have not, but would
   c. Have not and would not
   d. Other/don’t know

19. Have you ever participated in a lawful demonstration?
   a. Yes
   b. Have not, but would
   c. Have not and would not
   d. Other/don’t know

20. How important is it for you to live in a country that is governed democratically?
   a. 10 – Absolutely important
   b. 9
   c. 8
   d. 7
   e. 6
   f. 5
   g. 4
   h. 3
   i. 2
   j. 1 – Not at all important

21. Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you need to be very careful in dealing with people?
   a. Most people can be trusted
   b. Some people can be trusted
   c. Few people can be trusted
   d. Need to be very careful

22. How satisfied are you with the way that democracy is working in your country?
   a. Very satisfied
   b. Somewhat satisfied
   c. Not very satisfied
   d. Not at all satisfied
Опитування Питання

1. Чи були ви особисто брати участь в протестному русі євромайдан?
   a. Так, я приєднався до протестів біля початку руху
   b. Так, я приєднався до протестів в середині руху
   c. Так, я приєднався до протестів в кінці руху
   d. Ні, я ніколи не приєднався до протестів, але я схвалив руху
   e. Ні, я ніколи не приєднався до протестів і у мене не було ніякої думки руху
   f. Ні, я ніколи не приєднався до протестів, і я взагалі не схвалював руху
   g. Не знаю / інше

2. Ви підтримуєте основні цілі тих, хто брав участь в русі в той час?
   a. сильно підтримується
   b. підтриманий
   c. Ні підтримується, ні проти
   d. проти
   e. сильно проти

3. Грунтуючись на своїх спостереженнях, так і «західні» держави або організації (такі як групи громадянського суспільства, які базуються в країнах-членах Європейського Союзу або США) впливають на сприйняття або цілі протестуючих?
   a. Так, західні держави або організації, зробили сильний вплив
   b. Так, західні держави або організації мали помірений ефект
   c. Так, західні держави або організації мали слабкий вплив
   d. Ні, західні організації не мали ніякого ефекту
   e. Не знаю / інше

4. Грунтуючись на своїх спостереженнях, так і протестуючих розрахунки про реакцію російського уряду на євромайдан робить ніякого впливу на народи сприйняття або цілі?
   a. Так, це дуже ймовірно, що міркування про реакцію Росії мали значення
   b. Так, це кілька ймовірно, що міркування про реакцію Росії мали значення
   c. Ні, тут щось малоймовірно, що міркування про реакцію Росії мали значення
   d. Ні, це дуже малоймовірно, що розрахунки про реакцію Росії мали значення
   e. Не знаю / інше
5. Якщо ви відчуваєте, що Росія втручається, щоб підірвати успіх євромайдану в те, що деякі способи, в яких російська режим, можливо, діяв?
   a. Військова допомога режиму Януковича
   b. Відправка військ
   c. Надання фінансової допомоги
   d. Інтернет та медіа-пропагандистська кампанія
   e. Інший

6. Якби ви охарактеризували довгострокові наслідки цього руху сьогодні?
   a. дуже успішний
   b. кілька успішно
   c. Ні успішно, ні безуспішні
   d. кілька невдало
   e. дуже невдала
   f. Не знаю / інше

7. Наскільки велика ймовірність того, що подібний рух буде з'являтися в майбутньому?
   a. Ймовірно
   b. швидше за все,
   c. Не дуже ймовірно,
   d. Не зовсім ймовірно,
   e. Не знаю / інше

8. Чи є в кінцевому рахунку, здається, що Україна приєднається західні організації, такі як Європейський Союз?
   a. Україна, швидше за все, рухатися в бік Заходу
   b. Україна, швидше за все, рухатися в напрямку Росії
   c. Україна, швидше за все, залишиться розташованої порівну між Росією і Заходом
   d. Не знаю / інше

9. Наскільки важливо, що західні держави і організації підтримують демократичні протести в Україні?
   a. Дуже важливо
   b. досить важливо
   c. Не дуже важливо
   d. Зовсім не важливо
   e. Не знаю / інше

10. Якщо масовий рух протесту, такі як євромайдан знову виникла в майбутньому, наскільки ймовірно, що ви б приєднатися до руху?
    a. 10 Досить імовірно,
    b. 9
c. 8
d. 7
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11. Які з наступних категорій найкраще описує поточний професійний статус?
   a. Політик або виборна посадова особа
   b. політичний консультант
   c. активіст
   d. аналітик / аналітик думає танк
   e. Професор / академічне
   f. студент
   g. Співробітник Неурядова організація
   h. годину засоби масової інформації
   i. Не знаю / інше

12. Стать
   a. чоловік
   b. Жінка

13. Етнос
   a. український
   b. російський
   c. Настільки ж український і російський
   d. Інший

14. Вік
   a. 18-24 років
   b. 25-34 років
   c. 35-44 років
   d. 45-54 років
   e. 55-64 років
   f. 65-74 років
   g. 75 років і старше
   h. За краще не відповідати

15. Який найвищий рівень освіти, який ви завершили?
   a. Немає шкільної освіти завершена
   b. Деякі середньої школи, що не диплом
   c. Середне, диплом або еквівалент (наприклад: GED)
   d. Вища кредит, немає ступеня
   e. Торгівля / технічна / професійну освіту
   f. асоційований ступінь
g. Диплом бакалавра
h. Диплом магістра
i. професійна ступінь
j. докторська ступінь
k. За краще не відповідати

16. За шкалою політичної ідеології з дуже ліберальним (представлено у вигляді 10) дуже консервативно (в особі 1), де б ви поставити себе?
a. 10 - дуже ліберальні
b. 9
c. 8
d. 7
e. 6
f. 5
g. 4
h. 3
i. 2
j. 1 - дуже консервативний

17. Ви коли-небудь підписали петицію?
a. Так
b. Ні, але буде
c. Нехай і не буде
d. Інші / не знаю

18. Ви коли-небудь зв'язався виборна посадова особа, щоб висловити свою думку з питання?
a. Так
b. Ні, але буде
c. Нехай і не буде
d. Інші / не знаю

19. Ви коли-небудь брали участь в законній демонстрації?
a. Так
b. Ні, але буде
c. Нехай і не буде
d. Інші / не знаю

20. Наскільки важливо для вас, щоб жити в країні, яка управляється демократично?
a. 10 Абсолютно важливо
b. 9
c. 8
d. 7
e. 6
f. 5
21. Взагалі кажучи, ви б сказати, що більшість людей можна довіряти, або що ви повинні бути дуже обережні в спілкуванні з людьми?

а. Більшість людей можна довіряти
b. Деякі люди можуть довіряти
c. Мало людей можна довіряти
d. Потрібно бути дуже обережним

22. Наскільки ви задоволені тим, як демократія працює у вашій країні?

а. Дуже задоволений
b. Частково задоволений
c. Не дуже задоволений
d. Зовсім не задоволені

Дякую!
APPENDIX C: COMPARING PERCEPTIONS OF WESTERN SUPPORT AMONG EUROMAIDAN PARTICIPANTS AND NON-PARTICIPANTS

Figure C.1. Interviewees’ Perceptions of the Role Played by Western Forces during the Protests (Euromaidan Participants)

Figure C.2. Interviewees’ Perceptions of the Role Played by Western Forces during the Protests (Euromaidan Non-Participants)
APPENDIX D: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD CONSENT FORM FOR OPEN-ENDED INTERVIEWS AND CLOSED-ENDED SURVEYS

SOCIAL BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH CONSENT FORM TEMPLATE
Research Information and Consent for Participation in Social Behavioral Research

The Revolution Will be Made Public

You are being asked to participate in a research study. Researchers are required to provide a consent form such as this one to tell you about the research, to explain that taking part is voluntary, to describe the risks and benefits of participation, and to help you to make an informed decision. You should feel free to ask the researchers any questions you may have.

**Principal Investigator Name and Title:** Professor Carol Leff  
e-mail: leff@illinois.edu

**Student Investigator Name and Title:** Peter Chereson  
e-mail: pcheres2@illinois.edu

**Department and Institution:** Department of Political Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

**Address and Contact Information:**  
420 David Kinley Hall MC-713  
1407 W Gregory Drive  
Urbana, IL  61801

**Why am I being asked?**

You are being asked to participate as a subject in a research project focusing on the Euromaidan movement that took place in Ukraine in 2013 and 2014. The project aims to understand the primary causes that brought Ukrainians to the streets against Viktor Yanukovych and his government, and to more closely study the effects of both domestic and international factors on citizens’ decisions to join the broader protest campaign.

You have been asked to participate in this research project because your broad knowledge of Ukrainian politics and your specific familiarity with the Euromaidan movement could provide helpful insight into the dynamics of this movement, improving the quality of this study’s findings.
Your participation in this research is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future dealings with the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. **If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without affecting that relationship.**

**What is the purpose of this research?**

The purpose of this research is to gain a deeper understanding of the causes that led Ukrainians to protest against the Yanukovych regime during the Euromaidan movement of 2013 and 2014. This study’s goal is to speak with people who are familiar with the protests’ dynamics, and to understand the role played by both domestic and international factors. The information obtained through these interviews will be used to complete one component of the researcher’s dissertation in the Department of Political Science at the University of Illinois.

**What procedures are involved?**

This research will be performed at a location that is convenient for you – the researcher is able to travel to meet interview subjects.

You will need to come to the study site only one time, for a visit that will last approximately thirty to sixty minutes.

The study procedure is conversational. We will ask you a series of questions regarding your thoughts on the causes of Euromaidan and record your answers. We will be audio-recording the conversation. However, this procedure is optional and is not necessary. If you would prefer not be recorded, this is possible as well. Please indicate your preference for utilizing or not utilizing audio-recording below:

I give permission for my interview to be audio-recorded.____YES______NO

If our conversation is recorded, we may later transcribe these answers for incorporation into the text of my dissertation. However, your identity will be kept wholly confidential during the entire process. We will affix a code number to your interview, remove your name and all other identifying information, and delete the recording as soon as we have transcribed the interview.
Upon completion of our conversation, the researcher will then ask you to complete a relatively short survey consisting of twenty-two closed-ended questions. These questions will address the same topics that are covered in the course of the conversation, and will also include a few demographic indicators as well. As is the case with any of the interview questions, you are entirely free not to answer any questions that you do not wish to answer. This component of the interview should take approximately five minutes to complete.

**What are the potential risks and discomforts?**

To the best of our knowledge, the things you will be doing have no more risk of harm than you would experience in everyday life. One risk of this research is a loss of privacy (revealing to others that you are taking part in this study) or confidentiality (revealing information about you to others to whom you have not given permission to see this information). There is also a slight risk in divulging prior personal participation in protests if such behavior was illegal at the time. However, every precaution will be taken to minimize these risks by confidentially protecting your identity and any personal statements that you express through the course of the conversation. Additionally, to further minimize any potential risk, you are free to skip any questions that you prefer not to answer.

**Are there benefits to taking part in the research?**

Taking part in this research study may not benefit you personally, but your contribution could be very valuable by illustrating important findings relevant to the project’s outcome.

**What other options are there?**

You have the option to not participate in this study OR to participate at a later date and time if you so choose.

**Will my study-related information be kept confidential?**

Faculty, staff, students, and others with permission or authority to see your study information will maintain its confidentiality to the extent permitted and required by laws and university policies. The names or personal identifiers of participants will not be published or presented.

**What are the costs for participating in this research?**

There are no costs to you for participating in this research – participation is entirely free and voluntary.
**Will I be reimbursed for any of my expenses or paid for my participation in this research?**

You will not be offered payment for being in this study. All participation is entirely voluntary.

**Can I withdraw or be removed from the study?**

If you decide to participate, **you are entirely free to withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time.** Additionally, you are able to move on to a different question if you do not wish to discuss a particular topic or question.

The Researchers also have the right to stop your participation in this study without your consent if:

→ They believe it is in your best interests;
→ You were to object to any future changes that may be made in the study plan;

In the event you withdraw or are asked to leave the study, you will still be compensated as described above.

**Who should I contact if I have questions?**

Please contact either of the two primary researchers involved in this project – you are able to e-mail Peter Chereson (pcheres2@illinois.edu), Professor Carol Leff (leffc@illinois.edu), or Mariia Vasilets at the National University of Kyiv – Mohyla Academy (at int_students@ukma.edu.ua):

- if you have any questions about this study or your part in it,
- if you have questions, concerns or complaints about the research.

**What are my rights as a research subject?**

If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or if you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, including questions, concerns, complaints, or to offer input, you may call the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS) at 217-333-2670 or e-mail OPRS at irb@illinois.edu

**Remember:**

Your participation in this research is voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with the University. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without affecting that relationship.
I have read (or someone has read to me) the above information. I have been given an opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this research. I will be given a copy of this signed and dated form.

__________________________    ________________
Signature                    Date

__________________________
Printed Name

__________________________    ________________
Signature of Person Obtaining Consent        Date (must be same as subject’s)

__________________________
Printed Name of Person Obtaining Consent
## APPENDIX E: SYNTHESIZING VARIABLES’ SIGNIFICANCE ACROSS SURVEY EXPERIMENT’S SIX MODELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>OLS Join a Protest Movement</th>
<th>OLS Sign a Petition</th>
<th>OLS Contact an Elected Official</th>
<th>Logit Join a Protest Movement</th>
<th>Logit Sign a Petition</th>
<th>Logit Contact an Elected Official</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Int’l Actor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic Int’l Actor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects of Int’l Actors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior protest participation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior signing a petition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in others</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in the news</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine will move West</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important for West support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sat. with democracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F: FULL TEXT OF SURVEY EXPERIMENT QUESTIONS
(ENGLISH LANGUAGE)

Liberal International Actor Treatment Vignette

1. Imagine that you live in an authoritarian country in which elections are neither free nor fair. Freedom of speech and expression are limited by harsh laws and restrictions, the economy has been suffering, and corruption is pervasive. While your leaders began to democratize recently, this progress abruptly ended a month ago when security forces aggressively clamped down on pro-democracy rallies.

Increasing numbers of students have started to demonstrate against the government. These protests have been praised by democratic Western states, which are providing funding and manpower to help sustain the movement.

How much influence do you think outside actors can have on protests in other countries?

a. 10 – A great deal of influence
b. 9
c. 8
d. 7
e. 6
f. 5
g. 4
h. 3
i. 2
j. 1 – No influence at all

Optional comments:

Authoritarian International Actor Treatment Vignette

1. Imagine that you live in an authoritarian country in which elections are neither free nor fair. Freedom of speech and expression are limited by harsh laws and restrictions, the economy has been suffering, and corruption is pervasive. While your leaders began to democratize recently, this progress abruptly ended a month ago when security forces aggressively clamped down on pro-democracy rallies.

Increasing numbers of students have started to demonstrate against the government. These protests have been criticized by other authoritarian states, which are providing funding and manpower to help contain the movement.
How much influence do you think outside actors can have on protests in other countries?

a. 10 – A great deal of influence
b. 9
c. 8
d. 7
e. 6
f. 5
g. 4
h. 3
i. 2
j. 1 – No influence at all

Optional comments:

**Control Vignette**

1. Imagine that you live in an authoritarian country in which elections are neither free nor fair. Freedom of speech and expression are limited by harsh laws and restrictions, the economy has been suffering, and corruption is pervasive. While your leaders began to democratize recently, this progress abruptly ended a month ago when security forces aggressively clamped down on pro-democracy rallies.

Increasing numbers of students have started to demonstrate against the government.

How much influence do you think outside actors can have on protests in other countries?

a. 10 – A great deal of influence
b. 9
c. 8
d. 7
e. 6
f. 5
g. 4
h. 3
i. 2
j. 1 – No influence at all

Optional comments:
Dependent Variables & Remaining Survey Questions

Given the dangers that might be involved in the situation above, how likely is it that you would sign a petition against the government’s actions?

a. 10 – Very likely
b. 9
c. 8
d. 7
e. 6
f. 5
g. 4
h. 3
i. 2
j. 1 – Not at all likely

Optional comments:

Given the dangers that might be involved in the situation above, how likely is it that you would contact an elected official to express your views on the issue?

a. 10 – Very likely
b. 9
c. 8
d. 7
e. 6
f. 5
g. 4
h. 3
i. 2
j. 1 – Not at all likely

Optional comments:

Given the dangers that might be involved in the situation above, how likely is it that you would join the protesters’ lawful demonstrations in their calls for democracy?

a. 10 – Very likely to protest
b. 9
c. 8
d. 7
e. 6
f. 5
g. 4
2. How interested would you say you are in politics?

   a. Very interested
   b. Somewhat interested
   c. Neither interested nor disinterested
   d. Not very interested
   e. Not at all interested

3. Have you ever signed a petition?

   a. Have done
   b. Have not, but might do
   c. Would never do
   d. Other/don’t know

4. Have you ever attended a peaceful political demonstration?

   a. Have done
   b. Have not, but might do
   c. Would never do
   d. Other/don’t know

5. Have you ever contacted an elected official to express your views on an issue?

   a. Yes
   b. Have not, but would
   c. Have not and would not
   d. Other/don’t know

6. How important is it for you to live in a country that is governed democratically?

   a. 10 – Absolutely important
   b. 9
   c. 8
   d. 7
   e. 6
   f. 5
   g. 4
7. Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you need to be very careful in dealing with people?

a. Most people can be trusted
b. Some people can be trusted
c. Few people can be trusted
d. Need to be very careful

8. Are you male or female?

a. Male
b. Female

9. What is your ethnicity?

a. Ukrainian
b. Russian
c. Equally Ukrainian and Russian
d. Other

10. What is your age?

11. What is your political ideology? Do you consider yourself liberal, conservative, or neither?

a. 10 – Very liberal
b. 9
c. 8
d. 7
e. 6
f. 5
g. 4
h. 3
i. 2
j. 1 – Very conservative

12. How closely do you follow the news?

a. Very closely
b. Somewhat closely
c. Not very closely
d. Not at all
13. How closely do you follow international news?
   a. Very closely
   b. Somewhat closely
   c. Not very closely
   d. Not at all

14. Do you ultimately think that Ukraine will move towards Western organizations like the European Union?
   a. Ukraine will likely move towards the West
   b. Ukraine will likely move towards Russia
   c. Ukraine will likely be situated equally between the West and Russia
   d. Don’t know/other

15. How important is it that Western states and organizations support democratic protests in Ukraine?
   a. Very important
   b. Somewhat important
   c. Not very important
   d. Not at all important
   e. Don’t know/other

16. How satisfied are you with the way that democracy is working in your country?
   a. Very satisfied
   b. Somewhat satisfied
   c. Not very satisfied
   d. Not at all satisfied
APPENDIX G: FULL TEXT OF SURVEY EXPERIMENT QUESTIONS
(UKRAINIAN LANGUAGE)

Liberal International Actor Treatment Vignette
1. Уявіть, що ви живете в авторитарній країні, в якій вибори не є ані вільними, ані справедливими. Свобода слова та висловлювання обмежені жорстокими законами, економіка страждає, всеохоплююча корупція. Ваші політичні лідери нещодавно почали лібералізацію, та цей прогрес різко завершився місяць тому, коли силові органи почали агресивно розганяти демократичні мітинги.

Безперервно збільшувалась кількість студентів, що виступали проти діяльності уряду. Ці протести були схвалені демократичними західними державами, що підтримували протестні рухи, забезпечуючи їх фінансуванням та людьми.

На вашу думку, наскільки потужний вплив можуть мати сторонні актори на акціях протесту в інших країнах?

A. 10 Потужний вплив
B. 9
V. 8
Г. 7
D. 6
E. 5
Є. 4
Ж. 3
З. 2
И. 1 Ніякого впливу

Коментарі:

Authoritarian International Actor Treatment Vignette
1. Уявіть, що ви живете в авторитарній країні, в якій вибори не є ані вільними, ані справедливими. Свобода слова та висловлювання обмежені жорстокими законами, економіка страждає, всеохоплююча корупція. Ваші політичні лідери нещодавно почали лібералізацію, та цей прогрес різко завершився місяць тому, коли силові органи почали агресивно розганяти демократичні мітинги.

Безперервно збільшувалась кількість студентів, що виступали проти діяльності уряду. Ці протести були піддані критиці іншими авторитарними державами, які виділяють гроші і людей для протидії цим протестам.

На вашу думку, наскільки потужний вплив можуть мати сторонні актори на акціях протесту в інших країнах?
Коментарі:

Control Vignette

1. Уявіть, що ви живете в авторитарній країні, в якій вибори не є ані вільними, ані справедливими. Свобода слова та висловлювання обмежені жорстокими законами, економіка страждає, всеохоплююча корупція. Ваші політичні лідери нещодавно почали лібералізацію, та цей прогрес різко завершився місяць тому, коли силові органи почали агресивно розганяти демократичні мітинги.

Безперервно збільшувалась кількість студентів, що виступали проти діяльності уряду.

На вашу думку, наскільки потужний вплив можуть мати сторонні актори на акціях протесту в інших країнах?

Коментарі:
Dependent Variables & Remaining Survey Questions

З огляду на небезпеку, яка обумовлена вище змальованою ситуацією, наскільки велика ймовірність того, що Ви би підписали петицію проти дій існуючого уряду?

А. 10 Дуже ймовірно
Б. 9
В. 8
Г. 7
Д. 6
Е. 5
Є. 4
Ж. 3
З. 2
И. 1 Точно ні

Коментарі:

З огляду на небезпеку, яка обумовлена вище змальованою ситуацією, наскільки велика ймовірність того, що Ви би звернулися до посадової особи, щоб висловити свої погляди на існуючу проблему?

А. 10 Дуже ймовірно
Б. 9
В. 8
Г. 7
Д. 6
Е. 5
Є. 4
Ж. 3
З. 2
И. 1 Точно ні

Коментарі:

З огляду на небезпеку, яка обумовлена вище змальованою ситуацією, наскільки велика ймовірність того, що Ви приєдналися до законних демонстрацій у їхніх закликах до демократії?

А. 10 Дуже ймовірно
Б. 9
В. 8
Г. 7
Д. 6
Е. 5
Є. 4
Ж. 3
З. 2
И. 1  Точно ні

Коментарі:

2. Наскільки Ви зацікавлені політикою?
   А. Дуже зацікавлений(ла)
   Б. Достатньо зацікавлений(ла)
   В. Ні зацікавлений(а), ані незацікавлений(а)
   Г. Не дуже зацікавлений(а)
   Д. Не зацікавлений(а) взагалі

3. Чи Ви коли-небудь підписували петицію?
   А. Підписував(ла)
   Б. Не підписував(ла), але можу
   В. Ніколи не підпишу
   Г. Не знаю (інше)

4. Ви коли-небудь відвідували мирну політичну демонстрацію?
   А. Відвідував(ла)
   Б. Не відвідував(ла), але можу
   В. Ніколи не відвідуватиму
   Г. Не знаю (інше)

5. Ви коли-небудь зверталися до обраної посадової особи, щоб висловити свої погляди на певну проблему?
   А. Так
   Б. Не звертався(лася), але збираюсь
   В. Не звертався(лася) та не збираюсь
   Г. Не знаю (інше)

6. Наскільки важливо для Вас жити в країні з демократичним управлінням?
   А. 10  Абсолютно важливо
   Б. 9
   В. 8
   Г. 7
   Д. 6
   Е. 5
   Є. 4
   Ж. 3
   З. 2
1. Абсолютно неважливо

7. На вашу думку, чи могли би Ви стверджувати, що більшості людей можна довіряти або чи бути обережним в спілкуванні з іншими людьми?
   A. Переважній більшості людей можна довіряти
   B. Деяким людям можна довіряти
   V. Невеликій кількості людей можна довіряти
   Г. Необхідно бути дуже обережним

8. Стать
   A. Чоловіча
   B. Жіноча

9. Етнічна принадлежність
   A. Українець(ка)
   B. Росіянин(ка)
   V. Маю і українське, і російське коріння
   Г. Інше

10. Вкажіть Ваш вік?

11. Оцініть себе за шкалою політичної ідеології від дуже ліберального (10) до дуже консервативного (1)?
   A. 10 Дуже ліберальне
   B. 9
   В. 8
   Г. 7
   Д. 6
   Е. 5
   Є. 4
   Ж. 3
   З. 2
   И. 1 Дуже консервативне

12. Наскільки уважно Ви слідкуєте за новинами?
   A. Дуже уважно
   B. Достатньо уважно
   V. Не дуже уважно
   Г. Зовсім не слідкую

13. Наскільки уважно Ви слідкуєте за міжнародними новинами?
   A. Дуже уважно
   B. Достатньо уважно
   V. Не дуже уважно
   Г. Зовсім не слідкую
14. Чи вважаєте Ви, що в кінцевому підсумку Україна долучиться до «західних» організацій, таких як Європейський Союз?
   А. Україна, ймовірно, рухатиметься на захід
   Б. Україна, ймовірно, рухатиметься до Росії
   В. Україна, ймовірно, залишиться в рівній мірі між Заходом та Росією
   Г. Не знаю (інше)

15. Наскільки важливою є підтримка «західних» держав та організацій демократичних протестів в Україні?
   А. Дуже важлива
   Б. Достатньо важлива
   В. Не дуже важлива
   Г. Зовсім не важлива
   Д. Не знаю (інше)

16. Наскільки Ви задоволені рівнем розвитку демократії у вашій країні?
   А. Дуже задоволений(ла)
   Б. Частково задоволений(ла)
   В. Не дуже задоволений(ла)
   Г. Зовсім не задоволений(ла)
APPENDIX H: INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD CONSENT FORM FOR SURVEY EXPERIMENT

Consent Form

The purpose of this research project is to understand the dynamics of social movements in the world today. This is a research project being conducted by Peter Chereson and Professor Carol Leff at the University of Illinois. You are invited to participate in this research project because we are interested in understanding the opinions and beliefs of people like you.

Your participation in this research study is voluntary. You may choose not to participate. If you decide to participate in this research survey, you may withdraw at any time. If you decide not to participate in this study or if you withdraw from participating at any time, you will not be penalized in any way.

The procedure involves filling a short and anonymous survey that will take approximately five minutes. Your responses will be kept entirely confidential and we do not collect identifying information such as your name.

We will do our best to keep your information confidential. All data is stored in a password protected electronic format. To help protect your confidentiality, the surveys will not contain information that will personally identify you. The results of this study will be used for scholarly purposes only and may be shared with professors and graduate students at the University of Illinois, as well as with members of the broader American political science research community.

When this research is discussed or published, no one will know that you were in the study. However, laws and university rules might require us to disclose information about you. For example, if required by laws or University Policy, study information you supply may be seen or copied by the following people or groups: a) the university committee and office that reviews and approves research studies, the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and Office for Protection of Research Subjects; and b) University and state auditors, and Departments of the university responsible for oversight of research.

If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or if you have any questions about your rights as a research subject, including questions, concerns, complaints, or to offer input, you may call the Office for the Protection of Research Subjects (OPRS) at 217-333-2670 or e-mail OPRS at irb@illinois.edu. If you have any further questions about the study, please contact Peter Chereson at pcheres2@illinois.edu. This research has been reviewed according to University of Illinois Institutional Review Board procedures for research involving human subjects.
EXPRESSION OF CONSENT: Please select your choice below.

Checking the "agree" option below indicates that:
• you have read the above information
• you voluntarily agree to participate
• you are at least 18 years of age

If you do not wish to participate in the research study, please decline participation by checking the "disagree" option instead.

___Agree
___Disagree