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Recent events of Ukrainian revolution of 2013-2014 brought not only changes of political landscape in Ukraine but also transformation of the country’s map; Thus the Crimea region returned to Russian Federation and on the East of the country two independent republics formed: Donetskaya (DPR) and Luhanskaya (LPR) people republics, which historically had been part of Novorossiya.

On November 2nd 2014 local and state elections were conducted in DPR and LPR to select head of state and local deputies. The environment during elections was highly complicated by shelling, humanitarian crisis, shortage of qualified personnel. Despite all of those facts, elections were initially designed to be democratic, transparent, with respect to legal rights of people. Thus elections were conducted democratically to the extend possible in military situation.

There was heightened attention to election campaigns in DPR and DPR by not just local and Russian Media, but also by Foreign Media. On election day in DPR alone there were 320 accredited journalists including those from Europe and USA. There were weekly news press-conferences conducted by local deputies for Media, briefings for all participants and candidates in election process, and road trips of candidates to regions. Percent of election participation was maximum possible in a war situation. In both DPR and LPR there were queues of thousands of voters to election centers. After election finished there were more then a million of people who voted in DPR and more then 700 thousands who voted in LPR.
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At the end of 2014, it is safe to say that the year was largely shaped by events in Ukraine, with Ukraine itself having little to be proud of. A comparison with the Libya of 2011, which also attracted worldwide attention, is not out of place here. We are not going to focus on every stage of the demise of the Ukrainian state; instead, we will concentrate on a few key moments.

The Ukrainian authorities’ decision to suspend the preparation of the Ukraine-European Union Association Agreement triggered the mass civil protests in Kiev right on the eve of the Eastern Partnership summit in Vilnius on November 28-29, 2013. At the same time, Ukraine’s European integration effort, however strange it may seem, had dramatically intensified after V. Yanukovich became president in 2010.

The mutual striving for rapprochement of the Ukrainian elite and the EU was conditioned by a number of criteria that should have

---

1. Ochlocracy (ochlos is a crowd in Greek, kratein is rule) — government by a mass of people. According to Aristotle, ochlocracy is a form of the decay of democracy. — Encyclopedic dictionary of philosophy. 2010.

2. The Ukraine government has suspended the signing of the EU Association Agreement. — Kiev Centre for Political and Reconciliation Studies. — 25.11.13. — URL: http://www.analitik.org.ua/current-comment/int/52931fe2a2486b/pagedoc1096_4/
been used to assess the Ukraine’s readiness to join the EU. The EU Council of foreign ministers worked out a number of criteria in December 2012 to evaluate Ukraine’s readiness to sign the Association Agreement. The list of 19 points came to be named after its main author, Štefan Füle, the European Commissioner for Enlargement and European Neighborhood Policy. The document contained requirements for systemic reforms in all spheres that would bring the country closer to meeting European standards. They can be divided approximately into moves aimed at reforming constitutional and electoral law, the legal system, and measures to improve freedom of trade and the investment climate, as well as decisions concerning individual political prisoners.

However, the Ukraine government simulated, rather than actually carried out work in these directions, both in December 2012 and throughout 2013. The EU itself fully understood this, but European officials regarded the notorious Füle’s List’s questions of values, regardless of what they thought of them, as a merely formal basis for paying lip service to “Western values”. They realized the Ukrainian leadership would not meet the criteria by the summit in Vilnius, or even later. The countries of the West would later demonstrate this quite literally hypocritical position on the events in Ukraine on multiple occasions.

There were several ways out of the gridlock. Three-way talks as suggested by Russia were an option. However, Yanukovich’s attempts to bargain for more favors from both Russia and the EU, as well as the uncompromising position of the Europeans on “breaking Ukraine away from Russia” made this option unviable.

We would like to remind the reader that the Russian authorities have reiterated on several occasions that signing the EU As-

---

sociation Agreement is “a sovereign right of the Ukrainian people and the Ukrainian leadership represented by the President, Parliament and Government”. They have added, though, that any choice Ukraine made would have corresponding consequences. If Ukraine’s market was opened up to Europe, the entire package of economic cooperation with Russia would be revised.

But Europe was saying the same thing! As long ago as February 2013, Füle stated that, although the EU did not object to cooperation between Ukraine and the Customs Union, it could not “assume responsibilities under the Association Agreement with a country that has no sovereign right, or that does not control its own foreign trade policy”. In pursuing its own interests, the EU proved even harsher. President of the European Commission J.M. Barroso categorically refused to hold three-way talks between the Ukraine, EU and Russia. However, this was the only way to guarantee Ukraine’s economic sovereignty.

A second way to resolve Ukraine’s internal conflict could have been to hold a referendum — a direct declaration of intent of the people on major questions of the country’s development, foreign policy orientation undoubtedly being one of them. This is what democratic procedures exist for.

The fact that Ukraine’s authorities did not want to hold a referendum, and that the opposition was naturally more interested in self-promotion on the Maidan, rather than applying real democratic mechanisms, suggests that Ukraine’s previous political system fell infinitely short of democratic standards and was alienated from its own people. This is equally applicable to the Yanukovich team, as well as the opposition that since 2004 has got used to the fact that the Maidan has turned into the main instrument of popular rule. It

---

6. (Russian) Сотрудничество Украины с Таможенным союзом может быть настолько широким, насколько это не противоречит уже парафированному соглашению об ассоциации // Комментарии. – February 5, 2014. URL: http://comments.ua/politics/386111-evrope-uverili-protiv-ukraini.html

was this choice, made at the very beginning of the crisis in Ukraine — the choice between the civilized institutions of direct democracy, and the ochlocracy which the Maidan undoubtedly became in political self-interests— which predetermined the further development of the crisis in Ukraine, resulting in the complete erosion of the state and the growth of Nazi sentiment in society. What has happened in Ukraine since November 2013 clearly proves this point.

The initial Maidan slogans of European integration were soon replaced with demands that Yanukovich and the Party of Regions’ officials be dismissed. In other words, the question of what was to be done became lost against the background of the much clearer and simpler question of who was to blame.

In fact, this inability of the opposition, not so much to develop a clear political program that no one would need or understand in the revolutionary delirium, but even to come to an agreement on joint action at the time of the “victorious Euromaidan”, i.e. on the promotion of a single opposition candidate, was the reason why the protest’s energy was soon exhausted and lost any meaning and, most importantly, any direction for further development. Why indeed bother to gather every Sunday on the Maidan if the same leaders repeat the same slogans over and over again with no intention of turning them into deeds?

Fortunately for the opposition, Yanukovich and his circle themselves kept giving excuses for continuing the protests. Firstly, the crackdown on protesters on Bankovaya Street on the night of December 1 was used as an excuse for the subsiding Euromaidan protests, with barricades soon being constructed around the Maidan. This campaign was in essence an attempt to storm the Presidential Administration on Bankovkaya Street by radicals from the Black Committee, The Patriot of Ukraine, the Right Sector and Social-National Assembly (SNA). The occasional attempts of the authorities to demolish the barricades around the Khreshchatyk and clear the city center of activists invariably resulted in the subsiding protests returning with renewed energy over and over again.

This bipolar disorder\(^9\) of Ukraine society continued until January 19 when the Maidan did not come back in response to the adoption of a package of so-called “draconian laws”.\(^{10}\) The problem is not that similar laws exist in some form in most EU countries and in the US, but that they were adopted at such a completely wrong time.

The passing of unpopular law №3879 amid the acute political crisis came as a bombshell largely affecting the then authorities.

January 19, when it was no longer a mob, but trained militia who stormed the administrative buildings with slogans of “glory to the provocators”, “down with integration!” and even attacked Klitschko with a fire extinguisher, can be regarded as the turning point in the Ukrainian protests. The illusion of a “rebellion of angry citizens” finally turned into the establishment of Ukrainian nationalism.

The dramatic radicalization of the protests that had begun on Khreshchatyk, and the alternative “People’s Rada” gathering, were viewed as a signal for action in the west of Ukraine, where takeovers of administrative buildings and attempted regime change began. This was no longer limitless demonstrations in the center of Kiev, that hardly affected anything beyond the downtown area. This was the beginning of a state nationalist revolution that threatened not only the regime, but also rights and liberties, as well as the security of millions of residents of other regions of Ukraine. The authors drew this conclusion as early as January 25\(^{11}\), and, unfortunately, the way events unfolded fully proved our idea.

The confrontation would not subside and climaxed with the bloody events of February. On February 18, the day of a Ukrainian parlia-
ment session, radicals attempted a “peaceful storm” of the building of the Supreme Rada. However, the “peaceful storm” soon degenerated into armed confrontations with the forces of law enforcement, with over twenty people dying on both sides. Negotiations between Yanukovich and the opposition leaders Klitschko and Yatsenyuk failed, and the parties could not come to a compromise.12

Radical nationalists came to play a key role in the conflict, with the clear helplessness of the authorities and the unwillingness to look for a compromise of the Parliamentary opposition. Radical Right Sector activists published an appeal to everyone who had firearms to take to the center of Kiev to help the protesters. The radicals started to take over administrative buildings in the western oblasts. Lviv and Ternopil saw the most severe protests. On the night of February 18, the buildings of the Lviv Oblast Chief Administration of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Lviv Oblast Administration of the Security Service, and the Prosecutor’s Oblast office and two regional offices were taken over in Lviv. On Wednesday February 19, radicals stormed the building of the Lychakovsky regional office and City Police department. The Head of the Lviv Oblast Chief Administration of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Aleksandr Rudyak, reported that over 1170 items of fire arms (nearly a thousand Makarov pistols, over 170 Kalashnikov machine guns, sniper rifles, and over 18 thousand rounds of varying caliber) had been taken.13 Tyahnybok announced a general mobilization of Euromaidan supporters to be sent to Kiev. On February 19, the Security Service of Ukraine announced an anti-terrorist operation.

Amid the spreading fights in the center of Kiev and an emerging insurgency in the west of the country, Yanukovich and the system opposition leaders reached an agreement to hold negotiations with foreign mediation. As a result, on February 21 the Agreement on the Settlement of the Political Crisis in Ukraine was signed.14

12. (Russian) Янина И. Кровавый вторник// Взгляд. Деловая газета. 18.02.2014. URL: http://vz.ru/world/2014/2/18/673194.html
The agreement stipulated restoration of the 2004 constitution, i.e. semi-presidential form of government, a snap presidential election to be held before the end of December 2014, and a national unity government to be formed involving all the political powers. It also included the withdrawal of the forces of law enforcement from the center of Kiev, an end to the violence, and the surrender of arms by the opposition.

The Agreement was signed by President Viktor Yanukovich and the Opposition leaders Vitali Klitschko (UDAR), Arseniy Yatsenyuk (Batkivshchyna) and Oleh Tyahnibok (Svoboda) and was guaranteed by the German and Polish foreign ministers Frank-Walter Steinmeier and Radoslaw Sikorski, as well as the Director of the Continental Europe Department of the French Foreign Ministry, Eric Fournier. None of its provisions were implemented, and the Western mediators soon disavowed their role, stating that they only witnessed the Agreement signing.

By the evening of the day when the Agreement was signed, the Automaidan refused to recognize it and demanded Yanukovich to be dismissed immediately, while the Right Sector leader D. Yarosh announced that his organization would not lay down arms and would not stop the blockade of administrative buildings until their main demand – Yanukovich’s resignation – was met. On the night of February 22, people from Euromaidan military wing seized the Supreme Rada, the Presidential Administration, the Government building and the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and President Yanukovich left Kiev. As soon as the evening of February 22, the Supreme Rada, at the suggestion of Vitaly Klitschko and Arseny Yatsenyuk, who a day earlier had signed the Agreement, voted (with 328 votes in favor) to remove the President from power.

This was when the political conflict, more or less within the confines of the constitutional law, ended – the Euromaidan defeated the representative democracy in Ukraine.

This is not an unsubstantiated propaganda cliché. Anyone who is in the know has to understand that many decision made in contradiction to recommendations and the main law — the Ukrainian Constitution — creates a dangerous basis for repeatedly producing political crises in Ukraine. For instance, the Constitution contains an exhaustive list of grounds for the early termination of Presidential powers. “The President himself refusing to fulfill his constitutional duties” (this was the reason why the Supreme Rada voted to hold snap elections on February 22, 2014) was not on the list. This is probably why the new version of the Law of Ukraine “On Elections for the President of Ukraine” later included the provision that “extraordinary elections for the President of Ukraine are held in connection with an according ruling from the Supreme Rada of Ukraine”. This implies in the future that the Ukrainian Parliament may arbitrarily adopt the ruling to announce extraordinary presidential elections, which completely delegitimizes the regime in Ukraine.

These are some of the immediate outcomes of the activities of the mob rule in Ukraine that degenerated from the idea of European integration into the clearer slogan of “Ukraine – Above All!” that the crowds would understand. A country that used to be proud of itself, that did not know the problem of terrorism and could maneuver between centers of power on its foreign policy course, overnight found itself on the verge of a social, economic, and then political collapse, and immersed in a civil war.

The authorities’ inability to contain the situation within the framework of the law, and the opposition’s unwillingness to act within the law, with direct support of the West, resulted in the initial idea of the protests being forgotten and an extremely dangerous, inhuman Neo-Nazi delirium emerging.

It is safe to say now that if Yanukovich had managed to somehow control the situation in Kiev, the western regions of Ukraine would have started an armed rebellion and the situation with defending a unified Ukraine could have been completely opposite. But, nobody would have held a referendum in the “Galicia People’s Republic” because the Western Ukrainian political forces are too accustomed to achieving their goals on the Maidan, which can sim-
ply shout down opponents, rather than with the aid of instruments of civilized democracy. On the other hand, the east of what was still then the Ukraine that had been considered passive and unable to work out its political program for a long time, turned out more politically mature and managed to come up with a completely different model for a peaceful resolution to the social and political conflicts.

This model has developed a remarkable trend brought about by 2014, which is the emergence and efficiency of direct democratic institutions.

THE CRIMEA REFERENDUM – DEMOCRACY AGAINST OCHLOCRACY

Crimean autonomy had always been an important issue in Ukraine. Its status and its citizens’ sentiments had always been a challenge for Ukrainian nationalists. A number of Ukrainian politicians said that a unitary state could know no autonomy. Statements like this demonstrated poor knowledge of the subject, for several unitary countries have functioning autonomies, including France, a unified indivisible republic since the revolution, with the Corsican autonomy, Italy with as many as five autonomies, and even China, also with five autonomous districts. Nevertheless, threats to the autonomy were real.

Amid yet another regime change under way in Kiev, the Crimean authorities took the position of opposing the Euromaidan from the very beginning. However, right up until February 22, separatist sentiments were even not a question in Crimea. One could rather say that cycles of the activity of Crimean politicians were directly related to the Euromaidan’s activity. Right up until the question put forward to the referendum was confirmed, the actions of the autonomy were merely reactions to the growing chaos in Kiev.

The region initially had to defend its right to autonomy without any coordination with the official Kiev regime or the head of the executive powers of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea (ARC). President Yanukovich and the Prime Minister of Crimea Anatoly Mogi-
lev went on an extraordinary trip to China when the protests had just started. Despite this, Crimeans acted consistently and decisively.

December 2, 2013 saw an emergency session of the Supreme Council of Crimea that adopted two documents laying the foundation for confrontation with the Euromaidan: “On the Escalation of the Political Situation in Ukraine”, which denounced “attempts of a violent takeover of power in the country by the opposition, camouflaged as a fight for the European direction of development, the spread of Neo-Nazi and anti-Russian sentiment, and unbridled actions inspired by the leaders of radical political forces”; as well as an appeal to the President of Ukraine to “prevent an unconstitutional form of revenge from bankrupt political movements professing extreme nationalism that has already crossed the line dividing it from Nazism”.18

The meeting of the Supreme Council of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea on December 3, attended by the representative of the President of Ukraine in Crimea Viktor Plakida, First Deputy Prime Minister of Crimea Pavel Burlakov, and law enforcement representatives, passed a ruling “On the Social and Political Situation in Ukraine” which, among other things, contained a call to “act only within the legal framework and the limits of authority stipulated by the Constitution of Ukraine and Laws of Ukraine, and to prevent abuse of power and calls for strikes or mass actions which could lead to an escalation of tensions”.19

On December 9, the Presidium of the Crimean Parliament passed an appeal to Crimeans assuring the people that it would not let “rabid European integrators, Neo-Nazis and Russophobes tear Crimea apart”, and calling on “deputies of local councils of the autonomy with a popular mandate to publicly support the regime and condemn violence and anarchy”.20

On December 11, the Presidium of the Crimean Parliament passed another harsher appeal to the citizens of Crimea that focused on the threats to the autonomy: “Knowing well the initiators and sponsors of this criminal plot, it is fair and safe to say that the destructive processes are very likely to affect the Crimea’s autonomous status. All of us risk losing everything we have been working so hard on over the years our Republic has existed. We will lose the right to speak, write and be educated in Russian, the mother tongue for most Crimeans. Crimea is faced with a choice today: either to tolerate violent Maidanization, or to stand up decisively to anti-government and anti-Crimea forces. Therefore, we are appealing to each of you, regardless of your ethnicity, faith and political beliefs, to demonstrate our shared position. There should be no illusions left in Kiev that Crimea will obediently put up with somebody else’s will imposed on us. It is only together that we can defend our shared Crimean fate. The autonomy is in danger! Be ready to defend it!”21

On December 12, the Crimean Parliament launched the round-the-clock telephone hotline “Crimeans, protect the autonomy!”22

Returning to Crimea, Prime Minister Anatoly Mogilev also proposed not only to assess what had been happening, but also to outline a plan of action for the future. However, he did not seem to realize how serious the situation was and expected the Party of Regions to maintain its position. First Deputy Prime Minister P. Burlakov did not share his optimism. It was Burlakov who initiated the decision to protect the autonomy in the Council of Ministers. As a result, the Party of Regions’ local offices in all districts of the autonomy set up “people’s offices to stabilize the political situation” aimed at arranging help for “everyone who is concerned with what has been happening in the country and is willing to stand up to the Euromaidan provocateurs”.

Nevertheless, a mutual distrust between the executive and legislative branches of power in Crimea continued throughout the cri-

sir, right up until the Party of Regions’ ultimate demise in Kiev. The Donetsk-Kiev team in the Crimean Council of Ministers focused entirely on resolving the conflict and the necessity to recover from the crisis through a number of campaigns to “unite the country”. Snap presidential elections were viewed as a last resort, with V. Yanukovich expected to win. Changing the Ukraine’s unitary form of government into a federation was seen as the most negative scenario. This all suggests a catastrophically wrong assessment of the state of affairs in the country by the ruling party in general, and the Crimean Council of Ministers in particular.

In these circumstances, the Chairman of the Supreme Council V. Konstantinov became the most ardent defender of the autonomy. He outspokenly advocated ensuring reliable legal guarantees to protect the political, social and cultural interests of Crimeans, however the situation unfolded in Ukraine, and consistently proposed a number of anti-Maidan initiatives.

Thus, the draft agenda for the last plenary session of the ARC Supreme Council on December 25, 2013 included a report on the prospects of Crimea joining the Customs Union and an appeal to Ukraine’s law enforcement agencies demanding that they ban the Svoboda Party and other extremist organizations, but they were excluded at the very last moment because A. Mogilev objected to them at a meeting of the Party of Regions faction.23

The January escalation of the situation in Kiev and emergent rebellion in the west of Ukraine provoked another spike in the Crimean parliament’s activity.

On January 24, the Presidium of the Crimean Parliament called on Yanukovich to impose a state of emergency and stop providing public funding to “regions that declared themselves outside the law, and where the regime had been toppled, until constitutional order had been restored there”.24

The decision to ban the Communist Party of Ukraine and the Party of Regions by local councils of some western oblasts was

23. (Russian) Бедрицкий А. Симферопольская Ёлка и киевская Йолка // Modus Agendi. 15.01.2014. URL: http://modus-agendi.org/articles/2626
24. (Russian) Об обращении Президиума Верховной Рады Автономной Республики Крым. 24.01.2014. URL: http://www.rada.crimea.ua/act/11563
responded to by the Presidium of the Crimean Parliament’s decision on January 27 “On measures to ensure law enforcement and public security on the territory of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea”, the first point of which was a ban on the activity and symbols of the Svoboda All-Ukrainian Union in Crimea”.

However, the Crimean prosecutor’s office demanded this provision be cancelled on January 29 because it violated the Law of Ukraine “On political parties”. On February 7, less than two weeks before Yanukovich was removed from power, the ARC Supreme Council was forced to replace the provision with an appeal to the Prosecutor General of Ukraine to ban the Svoboda Union through legal means!

It is noteworthy that the decision on January 27 was no accident. On January 28, Crimea was anticipating provocations by Euromaidan radicals and attempts to take over administrative buildings. Tensions were rising, which affected the entire society: not only the different parties, but also the people, especially the youth, were going to take to the streets to protect Crimea. Young Crimeans had been gathering in separate groups after dark until late January on the main square of Simferopol. The people anticipated riots because a Mejlis demonstration was planned for January 28, and the Right Sector was calling on the Crimean Tatars to fight the authorities, offering their help in the takeover of local administrative buildings, and was going to take part in the Mejlis protest. Small groups of radicals started to gather in Crimea and settle in Tatar neighborhoods.

After Mejlis had applied for a permit for a demonstration on the square in front of the Council of Ministers in Simferopol, the Communists and S. Aksyonov’s Russian Unity party filed similar applications on the same day. This is when Aksyonov’s political career took off.

All the law enforcement forces left on the peninsula had been mobilized by the date of the demonstration (most of the Crimean
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departments of the internal forces were in Kiev), some of Crimean Berkut came back from Kiev, and while the transport police inspected all cars entering Crimea, the police checked passenger trains looking for Euromaidan activists.

On the eve of the protest, Mejlis suddenly changed the venue, relocating it to the building of the President’s Office in Crimea. As a result, Mejlis managed to gather only 700-800 people, while organizers of the “Protect the Autonomy!” demonstration brought about 5 thousand people out on to the streets, despite heavy rain, with the core (around a thousand people) coming from the Russian Unity. Passers-by and employees of cafeterias and stores greeted the protesters. People called their friends and family saying happily: “the Russians are coming!”

It is noteworthy that nearly all the steps taken in Crimea in response to the events in Kiev were largely initiated by the Supreme Council. Its President V. Konstantinov advocated maintaining and expanding the right to Crimean autonomy, including secession from Ukraine in case the “opposition” won. At the same time, Prime Minister Mogilev showed himself as a technical functionary, fully loyal to the Party of Regions and Yanukovich personally. The first mention of the possibility of holding a referendum was perhaps made by V. Klychnikov, Chairman of Crimea’s Supreme Council Commission for cooperation with the organs of local self-government, on February 4 at a Parliament Presidium meeting: “to discuss the creation of a working group on the amendment of the ARC Constitution and the Ukrainian Constitution, conducting an All-Crimean opinion poll concerning Crimea’s status, and appealing to the President and Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation to guarantee the autonomous status and to protect the rights and liberties of its citizens”. In response the Security Service of Ukraine filed a lawsuit for threatening Ukraine’s territorial integrity.

The Supreme Rada reacted likewise: Batkivshchyna’s N. Tomenko called for dissolving the Crimean Supreme Council, while the Svoboda’s N. Shevchenko called for initiating criminal proceedings
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against Crimean deputies.\textsuperscript{29} However, even in such circumstances, Crimean secession was not seriously discussed. On February 19, just two days before the regime change in Kiev, Crimean Parliament Speaker V. Konstantinov interrupted V. Kolesnichenko’s speech proposing to discuss Crimea joining Russia in case Ukraine failed to resolve the crisis over the next few days.

Answering the question if a referendum on Crimea’s secession would be necessary if the situation in Ukraine became unfavorable, he said he did not want to have a long discussion on the issue because back then Crimea was a pillar of the regime, pointing out that if it failed, “we would have no choice but to denounce the 1954 decision of the Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party... Starting now, we will recognize the decisions we consider necessary”.\textsuperscript{30}

On February 20, in the Korsun-Shevchenkivskyi district of the Cherkassy oblast, armed nationalists stopped eight buses of anti-Maidan activists coming back from Kiev to Crimea. Four buses were burnt, dozens of Crimeans were injured, some brutally battered and bullied, with about 30 people going missing and at least seven killed.\textsuperscript{31}

This is a paradox when the autonomy and its citizens had been defending to the last the constitution and the regime of the state it was part of.

A similar situation took place in Gagauzia, which held a referendum, initiated by the National Assembly and the governor, to determine the people’s position on Gagauzian independence in case Moldova’s status as an independent state changed (i.e. to let Gagauzia decide its own fate in case Moldova became part of Romania).

Therefore, the referendum in Gagauzia can and should be viewed as a precedent of an emerging direct democratic institution, aimed
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most importantly at implementing the European principle of regional development. Unfortunately, pro-Romanian politicians in Chisinau (Kishinev), just like the nationalist opposition in Kiev, benefited from making it look like separatism, but eventually their actions led to the loss of Crimea. The given review shows that Crimean politicians ruled out secession before the regime change in Kiev.

Nonetheless, after the Supreme Rada had decided to remove Yanukovich “who had unconstitutionally removed himself from fulfilling his constitutional duties”, the Crimean leadership had no choice but to rely on the Crimean citizens’ institutional support. Even more so, given that the regime change was also accompanied with threats by the radicals. On February 25, the odious nationalist Ihor Mosiychuk said: “Attempts to disrupt Ukraine’s territorial integrity will be severely punished. If the authorities can’t do it, the Right Sector will arrange “friendship trains”. We will go to Crimea, just like UNA-UNSO did in 1990 when people like that ran away like rats when UNSO was entering Sevastopol...”

Further events unfolded as fast as in Kiev. Defenders of the Fatherland Day on February 23 saw a protest in Sevastopol that de facto proclaimed Aleksey Chaly the city mayor. Russky Blok Party leader Gennadiy Basov announced the creation of a volunteer self-defense force. On February 27, head of the Russian Unity Party S. Aksyonov was appointed by the Supreme Council as the President of the ARK Council of Ministers at the same session that discussed the referendum. After this he became the main driver and advocate of the referendum. At the same time, both Konstantinov and Aksyonov kept saying they considered Yanukovich the legitimate constitutional President of Ukraine.

Civilian society was more decisive. On February 21, on the day of an extraordinary session of the Supreme Council Presidium, an indefinite civil protest started calling for Crimea to secede from Ukraine and establish an independent state. On February 26, the cri-
sis climaxed when clashes between supporters of the autonomy and Mejlis activists broke out at the Supreme Council, with over 30 people injured and two dead.

In these circumstances, on February 27, the Crimean Supreme Council scheduled a referendum on “improving the status and powers of the region” for May 25. Several options of questions to be discussed were considered: maintaining the status of Crimea, broadening the powers of the autonomy, secession from Ukraine to establish an independent state.

Nevertheless, on March 1, the newly appointed Prime Minister S. Aksyonov announced the referendum had been moved to March 30, 2014 because “the conflict had turned into chaos. On March 4, he said the referendum could even be rescheduled to an earlier date, and on March 6 the Supreme Council decided to hold it on March 16, and throughout Crimea, including Sevastopol. Two questions were put to the referendum: 1) do you support reunifying Crimea with Russia, as a subject of the Russian Federation? 2) Do you support the restoration of the 1992 Crimean constitution and the status of Crimea as a part of Ukraine?

The referendum took place as scheduled and using these questions, despite Kiev’s opposition. Limited preparation time and opposition from Kiev failed to affect significantly the holding of the referendum. The Ukrainian Central Electoral Commission blocked access to state register data, but this barely had an impact. The register of voters was still available since the previous elections and resident registration offices and the police stored some information on voters as well. Voter registration lists as a result were naturally less accurate, but, nevertheless, this did not affect the referendum preparation significantly. The activity of the SSU and Central Electoral Commission proved mostly symbolic and demonstrated loyalty to the provisional government in Kiev, but failed to make an impact on the referendum. Ballots were printed fast and electoral commissions were formed in limited time. It may seem a paradox, but Ukraine’s
permanent elections largely helped to prepare for the referendum quickly and expeditiously. The turnout was 82.71%, with 96.6% voting for the reunification with Russia and 2.51 for the restoration of the 1992 Constitution. OSCE refused to take part in monitoring the referendum, although it received an official invitation from the Crimean leadership. According to the OSCE press secretary, Crimea did not have the authority to invite observers since it is a region, rather than a state or a member of the organization. Nevertheless, this did not prevent representatives of the OSCE ODIHR from making statements later concerning the artificially high turnout and fraudulent voting. Neither the EU, nor the US recognized the referendum.

The opinion of the Venice Commission of March 21, 2014 is often cited as a legal judgment on the legitimacy of the Crimean referendum. At the same time, the Venice Commission gave its opinion on the following question: “On whether the decision taken by the Supreme Council of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea in Ukraine to organize a referendum on becoming a constituent territory of the Russian Federation or restoring Crimea’s 1992 Constitution is compatible with constitutional principles”.

Here, we are dealing with a conscious (which suggests bias) or unconscious (which implies lack of professionalism) desire to replace an evaluation of a political phenomenon with an assertion of its insignificance, as well as direct manipulation of facts. The Venice Commission focused on studying the exclusively technical and legal aspects of the Crimean referendum. However, constitutional principles are known to be based on not only technical and legal but also political aspects. The constitutional principles of a democratic state governed by the rule of law rely on a combination of both.

Firstly, a direct political and legal parallel can be drawn between the Crimea referendum amid the anti-constitutional regime change in Kiev, the absence of legitimate central government and attempts by nationalists to infiltrate the autonomy, and the proclamation of Ukraine’s independence in 1991, which arose from “the mortal danger surrounding Ukraine in connection with the state coup in the USSR”.39 Secondly, one should look at the decision of the International Court of Justice of July 22, 2010 that Kosovo’s unilateral declaration of independence of part of the state did not violate international law.

The decision by the UN’s International Court of Justice (regarding Kosovo, of 22.07.2010) that the unilateral declaration of independence by a region does not violate international law is a general fact that any scrupulous expert must take into account when studying whether the decision to hold the Crimean referendum complied with constitutional principles. It was this decision by the UN’s International Court of Justice that constituted the dependence between
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39. Thus, the ruling of the Supreme Council of the ARC on the referendum states: “The events that took place in February 2014 in Kiev dramatically aggravated the social and political situation in Ukraine. The nationalist forces that took over power through an unconstitutional regime change grossly violate the Constitution and laws of Ukraine, and the inherent rights and liberties of the citizens, including the right to life, freedom of thought and speech and the right to speak their native language.

The nationalist groups have made a number of attempts to infiltrate Crimea in order to aggravate the situation, raise tensions and take power illegally.

Expressing great concern about the social and political situation surrounding Crimea, confirming the priority of universal human values, a commitment to universal principles of international law, in order to realise the will of the population of Crimea and in view of the absence of legitimate bodies of government in Ukraine, in accordance with subsection 7 of section one of Article 18 and subsection 3 of section two of Article 26 of the Constitution of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea...»

The Preamble to the Constitution of Ukraine cites the Act of Proclamation of the Independence of Ukraine of August, 24, 1991, approved on December 1, 1991 by a national vote in Ukraine stating “Arising from the mortal danger surrounding Ukraine in connection with the state coup in the USSR on August 19, 1991,

Continuing the thousand-year tradition of state development in Ukraine,

Proceeding from the right of a nation to self-determination in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and other international legal documents,

Implementing the Declaration of State Sovereignty of Ukraine, the Verkhovna Rada of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic solemnly declares the independence of Ukraine and the creation of the independent Ukrainian state – UKRAINE.

Ukraine’s territory is indivisible and inviolable.

From this day forward, only the Constitution and laws of Ukraine are valid on the territory of Ukraine.

This act comes into force upon its approval”.

Ukraine’s presidential elections took place on December 1, 1991, the same day as the All-Ukrainian referendum.
the technical and legal aspects of constitutionality and the political circumstances surrounding the question the unilateral declaration of independence of part of a state.

Therefore, the Venice Commission showed a bad example of bias when substituting the study of whether the decision to hold the All-Crimean referendum complied with the constitutional principles and political and legal conditions of the decision, with a consideration of only its technical and legal aspects. In avoiding a study of the whole range of facts and evidence, the Venice Commission could not produce its conclusion with the necessary conviction.40

THE DONBASS REFERENDUM – SOCIETY AGAINST INSURGENCY

As in Crimea, the referendum in the Donbass was a reaction to the anti-constitutional activity in the capital. At the same time, there are some significant differences, with a lack of institutional framework in the Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts being one of them. In these circumstances, the institutions of civil society, rather than the authorities of the autonomy, took on the initiative of organizing the expression of popular will. This very inability to form their identity eventually affected the fate of the Donetsk and Luhansk Republics. Nevertheless, their history started twenty years earlier, rather than in 2014.

Against the background of a severe economic downturn in the first years of Ukrainian independence, Donetsk and Luhansk often raised the question of broadening the authority of the oblasts and giving them more economic autonomy. In 1993, President of the Donetsk Oblast Council V. Chuprun even said “There have been talks about federalization for a long time. Unfortunately, we have not gone further than words. Many civilized states, taking into account their particularities, passed along this route long ago. We are studying the ex-

perience of Germany, Switzerland and the US. We have considered everything we think is acceptable for us. We have suggested adding an amendment to the draft constitution of the country. We suggest, broadly speaking, the federalization of economic management and a system for the formation of a regional market... The regions must have internal and external independence. Regional independence will strengthen the state”.41

On March 27, 1994, the same day the parliamentary elections took place, the Donetsk Oblast Council held a consultative referendum on the questions of autonomy and the free use of the Russian language. According to the referendum organizers, the turnout was 72% in Donetsk Oblast and 75% in Luhansk Oblast. The referendum put forward the following questions:42

– Do you agree that the Constitution of Ukraine should secure the territorial-federal structure of Ukraine? (For 79.69%);
– Do you agree that the Constitution of Ukraine should secure the Russian language as a state language of Ukraine together with the state Ukrainian language? (For 87.16%)
– Do you agree that in the Donetsk (Luhansk) region, the language of work, records and documentation, as well as education and science, should be the Russian language along with Ukrainian? (For 88.89%)
– Are you for the signing of the Charter of the CIS, Ukraine’s full participation in the economic union and the Interparliamentary Assembly of the CIS? (This was a synonym for European integration in 1994). (For 88.72%).

Ukraine’s prosecutor general filed a lawsuit concerning the legitimacy of the opinion poll. As a result, the Voroshlyovskiy district people’s court declared the results of the local referendum illegal, and as early as August 6, 1994, the newly elected President of Ukraine L. Kuchma signed a decree subordinating the chairmen of all oblast, city and area councils to the president. Remembering the way it had come to power, central unitarianism seemed to have defeated aspira-
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tions of autonomy, and the region returned to discussing the rights of the regions only ten years later, in 2004.

The idea of regionalism came to the fore again amid the political crisis later known as the Orange Revolution, which was provoked by the results of the second round of presidential elections (November 21, 2004), according to which V. Yanukovich was the winner.

The OSCE ODIHR mission of international observers immediately stated that the second round of voting “did not meet many criteria of OSCE and the Council of Europe and other European standards for democratic elections”.43

This was used as an excuse by representatives of the defeated side: before even hearing the official election results, Yushchenko’s supporters in the west of Ukraine and in Kiev launched a campaign of mass protests on November 22. The local authorities of several western Ukrainian oblasts (Lviv, Volyn, Ternopil and Ivano-Frankivsk), as well as Kiev city council and the Kiev oblast administration, passed a no-confidence motion against the Central Electoral Commission and recognized the victory of the “people’s president” V. Yushchenko, who even managed to arrange an “inauguration ceremony” in the building of the Supreme Rada. Mass disorder by Yanukovich’s opponents overtook Kiev and a number of cities in the center and west of Ukraine.

In response, on November 26, the session of Luhansk oblast council passed a decision on forming the Autonomous South-East Ukrainian Republic.

Oblast deputies announced the closing of external borders and appealed to the President of Russia Vladimir Putin asking for support. On November 27, an emergency session of Kharkiv oblast council decided to establish executive commissions of oblast and district councils and give them the authority of state bodies. The chairman of the executive oblast commission Yevgeny Kushnaryov was put in charge of coordinating activities to stabilize the social and political situation in cooperation with the Supreme Council of Crimea and the Donetsk, Dnipropetrovsk, Zaporizhia, Luhansk, Odessa, Kher-

son and Mykolaiv oblast councils, as well as the Sevastopol city council. Representatives of the Odessa oblast center announced their intention to convene an Assembly of people’s deputies of all levels from the southern and eastern oblasts, to make a decision concerning the proclamation of the Novorossiya krai as a free self-governing territory.

As early as November 28, Severodonetsk (in Luhansk Oblast) saw an All-Ukrainian Congress of people’s deputies and deputies of local councils of all levels that gathered over 4,000 delegates from 17 regions of Ukraine. The convention’s main decision was to announce the possible creation of a Southeast autonomy in case “illegitimate president” V. Yushchenko came to power. A referendum was to be held to this end. A decision was also made to set up an interregional council of municipal bodies for the self-administration of Ukrainian regions. However, the indecisiveness of the congress organizers and general focus of the regional leaders on the clan of winners prevented the initiatives from being implemented. The most coherent leaders of Kharkiv Oblast Donetsk Oblast Council, Y. Kushnaryov and B. Kolesnikov, were accused of separatism and arrested. However, the lawsuits were soon dropped due to the absence of any element of crime. After V. Yushchenko had formally won the “third round of elections”, autonomous sentiment remained only in the name of the oppositionist Party of Regions.

The next wave aimed at raising the status of the Ukrainian regions started another ten years later, in February 2014.

On February 12, Livadiya in the Yalta Municipality saw an All-Ukrainian forum of representatives of oblast councils and the Supreme Council of the ARC. The event was initiated by the chairman of Kharkiv Oblast council Sergey Chernov, of Kiev Oblast council Aleksandr Kachnys, of Kirovohrad oblast council Mykola Kovalchuk, of Luhansk oblast council Valery Golenko and the head of the Crimean Supreme Council Vladimir Konstantinov. The agen-

da was coordinated with Crimea’s Prime Minister A. Mogilev and was approved by the presidential administration in Kiev.

Representatives of all regions of Ukraine had been invited to the forum to avoid accusations of separatism. Nevertheless, representatives of eight western regions did not come to Crimea. However, even in this reduced format, the participation of representatives of the central regions did not allow the full discussion of all the issues on the agenda related to broadening the powers of the regions.

The southeast saw Crimea as the natural initiator of federalization because it was the only autonomy in Ukraine. At the same time, the strict power hierarchy of the Party of Regions, fear of repressions by representatives from Donetsk in case the situation in Ukraine stabilized, and a lack of well-qualified professionals to suggest possible scenarios within the constitutional framework, prevented any concrete decisions from being reached. It is no accident that the Luhansk and Donetsk Oblasts have traditionally depended on Yanukovych’s opinion.

At the end of the forum, participants named priority steps to take to overcome the deep political conflict the country was suffering from. All parties in the conflict were advised firstly to avoid any violence and secondly to involve legitimately elected representatives of oblast councils in negotiations between the regime and the opposition. Participants in the forum called for abstaining from any ultimatums during negotiations and resuming civil peace. Only V. Kolesnichenko mentioned federalization of the country in his speech. Perhaps the proposal to form a two-chamber parliament was the boldest idea included in the final statement.\textsuperscript{46} The forum itself became more of a precedent of regional resistance to the unfolding regime change, while the statement adopted at the forum turned into a declaration of intentions, all aspects of which required detailed work. This was due to both the participants’ poor competence in constitutional law and federalism, and partly the fears of official Kiev’s response. For, as early as February 14, V. Yanukovich said in
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an interview that “the question of a federative model of government for Ukraine is not realistic at the moment”.47

In these conditions, on February 20, the All-Ukrainian Union “Ukrainian Front” announced a congress of deputies of all levels from the southeastern oblasts of Ukraine48 to develop the ideas of the Yalta forum. In response, on the same day, the SSU warned that it would react harshly to any manifestation of separatism. However, the convention opened on February 22 when the former “protectors of Ukrainian sovereignty” were no longer in power.

The deputy head of the Party of Regions faction in the Rada O. Tsarev talked about the armed regime change in Ukraine and called on participants of the congress to agree on further action to prevent the political destabilization in Kiev from spreading to the Southeast. Tsarev stressed that no one could guarantee that 20 thousand armed men in Kiev would not be sent to the southeast of Ukraine. “We have order here and we don’t need armed men... Our main task is to get organized and prevent chaos”. The resolution adopted at the convention emphasized that “the opposition have failed to meet the conditions of the treaty of February 2 on the settlement of the crisis in Ukraine; illegal armed groups have not laid down arms and continue taking over organs of power and killing civilians and law enforcement officers. The Supreme Rada is working under terror and at gunpoint. Decisions taken by the Ukrainian parliament in such conditions should be questioned in terms of how voluntary, legitimate and legal they are”.49 In essence, legally rightless regions took on responsibility when the Constitution of Ukraine was no longer in force. Moreover, as in the example of Crimea, a parallel with the formation of the Ukrainian state is valid. Its founding father L. Kravchuk’s electoral program included the principles of: great power statehood, democracy, prosperity, spirituality and trust, that were opposed to “the mortal danger surrounding Ukraine in con-
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nection with the state coup in the USSR of 19 August 1991”. It is perfectly clear that by March 2014, there was nothing left of the ideals of the creation of the Ukrainian state.

Having asserted that the “central bodies of power are paralyzed”, delegates of the convention stated that “until constitutional law and order are restored... municipal bodies of all levels, the Supreme Council of ARC and Sevastopol City Council have decided to assume responsibility for ensuring constitutional order, law, the rights of citizens and their safety on their territories”.

A wave of mass protests and demonstrations demanding a referendum passed throughout the Southeast of Ukraine.

Thus, March 1 saw an emergency session of the Donetsk Oblast Council where deputies suggested a referendum “on the further fate of the Donbass”. On March 2, “acting President” O. Turchynov dismissed Donetsk Oblast governor Andriy Shishatskiy and appointed to the post the oligarch S. Taruta. March 3 brought about a demonstration against this decision that gathered about 1.5 thousand people. Signature collection started for a referendum on the status of the Donbass.

Participants of a pro-Russian protest in Donetsk stormed and took over the building of the Donetsk Oblast City Administration after the oblast council refused to recognize “the people’s governor” P. Gubarev. At a press-conference, Gubarev announced the questions to be put forward at the referendum in Donetsk Oblast: on the future form of government, elections for Donetsk Oblast governor and the state language in the oblast.

In Luhansk Oblast on March 2, deputies of the oblast council voted for a referendum on a federal form of government in Ukraine. This happened amid a protest at the oblast council building demanding a resolution on the non-recognition of the new regime and on a ban of pro-fascist and neo-Nazi political parties, and social movements that violated Ukrainian law. March 9 saw a demonstration gathering about 3,000 people demanding a referendum on the self-
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determination of Luhansk Oblast. The building of the Oblast City Administration was taken over, with the number of protesters reaching 10,000 people.

Protests by federalization supporters that started in March in Luhansk and Donetsk went on unabated. In April, the coordinator of Luhansk people’s community, O. Dereko, announced a decision to secure the temporary status of the oblast as an autonomous territorial unit within Ukraine that would not be subject to the illegitimate authorities in Kiev. He also said the referendum on Luhansk Oblast status would take place on May 11.

On April 28, protesters in Luhansk announced the creation of the Luhansk People’s Republic. On May 5, Luhansk Oblast Council supported the initiative concerning the referendum on May 11, calling on the international community to help arrange negotiations between Kiev and the southeast. Ballots had only one question: do you support the declaration of state independence of the Luhansk People’s Republic?

The Donetsk Republic was proclaimed in Donetsk on April 7, 2014. On April 10, 2014 the self-proclaimed DPR started to set up an electoral commission to arrange the referendum. Voters could also select yes or no in response to only one question: “Do you support the declaration of state independence of the Donetsk People’s Republic?”

In response to the decision to hold a referendum according to the Crimea model, “acting President of Ukraine” O. Turchynov announced on April 7, 2014 an “anti-terrorist operation” with the use of armed forces in the Donetsk, Kharkiv and Luhansk Oblasts. This is de facto when the civil war broke out in Ukraine. This is to be the subject of separate research.

The results of the referendum showed that, according to the Central Electoral Commission (CEC) of the DPR, the turnout was 74.87 %, with 89.7% voting for the declaration of state independence and 10.19% voting against, with 0.74% of ballots spoilt; the results in the LPR proved similar: the turnout was 81%, with 90.53% voting for LPR independence and 9.04% voting for a “united Ukraine”,
with 0.43% ballots spoilt. One should agree with the opinion of the chief electoral officer of the DPR R. Lyagin that people regarded the referendum as being in opposition to the war which the new Kiev regime had initiated. The opinion of the majority of the population of the region, voiced in the form of an officially approved referendum, is not to be ignored. Likewise, it is wrong to analyze the referendums in the Donbass outside the Ukrainian political context or without comparing them with those in Gagauzia and Crimea.

Even a simple comparison of the first “Orange Revolution” of 2004-2005 and the Euromaidan of 2013-2014 allows one to draw several parallels. Firstly, the opinion of an overwhelming majority of the population in regards to the questions posed at the referendum in 1994 remained unchanged. Yet, regionalist aspirations began to appear only when the southeast felt a direct threat to its vital interests from the west of Ukraine. This is demonstrated by both the rupture of public conscience in Ukraine and the reflexive nature of the activity in the southeast. Secondly, following on directly from the first point, is that the western oblasts have always initiated political instability and promoted the idea of ochlocracy throughout the whole history of independent Ukraine. Thirdly, the political system of Ukraine has evolved around “the party of winners”, which explains the constant migration of politicians from the losing side to the winning side. Rarely do politicians truly share the ideas they endorse, but rather use them to gain tactical advantages from winning people’s support. Ukraine has developed a kind of political culture of rational betrayal. Finally, the West has always played an active part in instigating protest in Ukraine. However, in seeking to divorce Ukraine from Russia, the West has placed its stake on ochlocracy, not its own traditional democratic institutions and is therefore fully responsible for setting in motion the political and social chaos in the country. It is noteworthy that even in 2014, were it not

52. (Russian) В ДНР и ЛНР обнародовали результаты референдума // Интернет-журнал Вести-Репортер. 12.05.2014 г. URL: http://vesti.ukr.com/donbass/51307-v-dnr-i-lnr-podbili-rezul-taty-referenduma
53. (Russian) Референдум в Донецке и Луганске 11 мая итоги // News-капитал. 11.05.2014 г. URL: http://news-kapital.ru/referendum-v-donecke-i-luganske-2014-11-maya-igoti/
for the bloody events in Kiev and the dehumanization of their political opponents by supporters of the Euromaidan, Crimean politicians and Donetsk and Luhansk would most likely have taken a position of compromise. It was the radicals who brought the Euromaidan to victory, who destroyed the united Ukraine.

It is also natural that the West did not recognize the results of the referendums. However, the referendums in Novorossiya, happening so close in time to the snap presidential election in Ukraine, allows a comparison of both and brings to the question the legitimacy of the latter.54

According to the conclusions of the OSCE ODIHR international election monitors55, the early presidential election “was characterized by high voter turnout and the clear resolve of the authorities to hold what was a genuine election largely in line with international standards and with respect for fundamental civil freedoms in the vast majority of the country”. This came despite the facts collected by the monitors and the political conclusions in the final report, that often contradict each other and raise doubts about either the collected data (which is difficult because it was the largest monitoring mission in the history of election monitoring), or about the impartiality of the assessments. Some of these assessments may result in quite negative consequences in the future.

For instance, the ODIHR experts pointed out that “the entire legal framework of the presidential election underwent several substantive changes in the three months prior to the election” and “the election law alone was amended six times in 2014”. These moves are also analyzed in the report, but for some reason in the footnotes of the document it is written: “Previous OSCE/ODIHR reports on elections in Ukraine have criticized changes in electoral legislation shortly prior to an election, which is contrary to accepted international practice and potentially confusing for participants. Moreover, the Venice Commission’s Code of Good Practice in Electoral Mat-

---
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ters recommends not modifying key aspects of electoral legislation within a year prior to an election (point II.2.65)”. Isn’t this a striking conformation to international standards?

It is surprising that the passage saying that the March amendments were part of a larger push for electoral reform addressing recommendations previously made by the OSCE/ODIHR and the Council of Europe’s Commission for Democracy through Law (Venice Commission), touches on the fact, pointed out in the same paragraph, that “a clear formula was added to the election law among the March amendments, according to which election results must be established independently of the number of polling stations where elections were held”. This seemingly suggests that this amendment also meets the recommendations of the ODIHR and the Venice Commission, which in fact contradicts both the reality and the principles of universal suffrage.

It is very typical that the OSCE/ODIHR monitoring mission of the presidential electoral campaign intentionally ignored several important political events in Ukraine. For example, the conclusion stresses that the mission did not monitor the referendums in Crimea or in the Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts. Yet, even omitting the electoral aspect itself, these referendums were major political events directly affecting the electoral campaign.

What is more, the military operation against the country’s own citizens, that came to be known as the “anti-terrorist operation in Kiev”, is shamefully called “an attempt to take control of the situation” in the conclusion. Yet, the report ignores the facts of the mass murder of civilians as a result of such an “attempt”, along with the bloodshed in Odessa on May 2. On the whole, the Mission de facto holds “the separatists” (according to the text) exclusively responsible for what has been happening in Ukraine.

Perhaps, a similar ignoring or distorting of the political factors directly affecting the electoral campaign could have been forgivable if the mission had focused solely on monitoring the procedures of the voting day. However, monitoring the development of the political processes of the entire electoral period is one of the principles of ODIHR.
The turnout data also raise serious doubts. Firstly, Crimea was fully excluded from the electoral process (Kiev still perceives Crimea to be part of Ukraine and considers its voters among the total number of voters in Ukraine), as were by and large the Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts. According to the mission of international monitors, the elections were held (i.e. at least some polling stations were open) in only two districts out of 12 in the Luhansk Oblast and eight out of 22 in the Donetsk Oblast. Also, according to the official data of the CEC, the turnout in the Luhansk Oblast was 38.94% and just 15.37% in the Donetsk Oblast. The data of international observers and the CEC are virtually incomparable.

On the whole, the turnout is estimated at 60.29% throughout Ukraine.

If we exclude the voters from Crimea and the Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts from the analysis, simple arithmetic calculations suggest about 80% voter turnout in the rest of Ukraine. On the one hand, this differs from the official CEC data, which say that the most “conscious”, but far from the most populous, the Lviv Oblast had about 78% turnout, but on the other hand, it gives grounds for comparing the turnout of the referendums that have not been recognized by the ODIHR or Kiev, with the turnout of the presidential elections.

Let’s say we do not know the real voter participation in the referendums. Then we can only state that there were “many” voters and this was demonstrated by crowds outside the polling stations, polling stations full of people and difficult work for the electoral commissions during the entire day of voting. These are quality parameters that could have been easily assessed by unbiased international monitors even if they did not want to give a political assessment of the events. Going back to the unbiased data of the ODIHR mission, crowded polling stations were only noticed in 11% of stations, with queues outside only in 6%. The observers themselves tended to explain this by pointing to inefficient organization and management of the queues, as well as holding presidential elections and elections for local authorities in some oblasts on the same day. What was the real turnout in this case? A simple comparative qualitative
(not even quantitative) analysis suggests that the official data are at best dubious.

The observers assessed the vote count as 95% positive for the 363 polling stations monitored. At the same time, according to the mission, 17% of polling stations had problems with filling in the reports of the vote count, while 20% of commissions had to re-view the initial figures. The CIS-EMO observers pointed out 30 in-
stances of the use of empty protocols signed in advance.

The process of determining election outcomes was assessed negatively at an early stage in 52 out of 300 reports submitted by the monitors. One can only guess what actually happened in the dis-
trict commissions.

Nevertheless, special coordinator of the electoral observer team João Soares said at the mission press conference on May 26: “If we consider that these elections didn’t conform to democratic stand-
ards, we will have a situation where aggressive minorities in other countries of the world can disrupt elections”. One can only guess who Soares views as a minority – the people who came to the refer-
endums or those who were standing on a very large square in a cer-
tain city? So, the support for the Ukrainian “peaceful majority” as the antithesis of an “aggressive minority”, to use Soares’s, phrase is an undeniable fact for the West. It is a fact just like the terrorizing of objectors by the “peaceful majority”, like the Odessa massacre, or like the thousands killed and dozens of thousands of refugees from the Donbass.

The fact that the politicians brought to power by the Ukrainian Maidan revolutions turned out to be clearly anti-democratic, ful-
ly reliant on advantages of the moment stolen from opponents on the square, and not ready to compromise or stick to agreements made with opponents, is both the fault and a generic trait of the Maid-
an revolutions. It is this fact that eventually became the key factor in the collapse of the Ukrainian state. Indeed, if we imagine that the February 21 agreements between the opposition and Yanukovich had been implemented, there would not have been the referendum in Crimea, nor the Odessa massacre, nor the referendum in the Don-
bass, nor the bloody civil war, and most likely somebody other than
Yanukovitch would have become President of Ukraine. However, given the logic of ochlocracy, it is just as clear that this was impossible. For the leaders of opposition are through and through square-dwelling provocateurs, pushed from behind by a similar, though far more radical, breed.

These are the realities one has to learn to evaluate correctly. The institution of representative democracy attracts less and less the attention of the citizens of different countries. If there is still some interest in elections for the head of state (although fatigue builds up because all politicians are the same), people rarely understand who to vote for and why, when it comes to parliamentary elections. The shows put on, or the intensified controversies between politicians before elections, only show that national leadership does everything possible to attract people’s attention to a voting procedure that has become uninteresting or meaningless for them. On the other hand, the instruments of direct democracy, such as referendums that decide truly life-changing questions for a country or a region, draw more and more people. The answer to the question of why this is happening is obvious — people show their civic-mindedness when something is vital, when their voice defines the fate of their country, but they do not want to take part in meaningless games imposed on them. On the other hand, this suggests the more profound conclusion that the public conscience, the proverbial civil society is a real, sizeable phenomenon, rather than a “Frondesque” narrow circle of party activists. And the position of the true civil society, i.e. people who perceive themselves as citizens of their country who care about its future, has long since outgrown the meaningless formalism of liberal democracy.

Unfortunately, Europe itself has never paid any attention to this phenomenon. This is not only a problem of double standards. The thing is also that countries with undeveloped democratic institutions that disrespect both the will of the people and basic European principles, are now seeking to join the European Union. In trying to secure geopolitical success, Europeans themselves are adding to the decay of the system of their own basic values.
In the meantime, a referendum is one of the most democratic forms of expressing one’s civic position on important questions. A referendum is a form of direct democracy when people themselves make decisions on key questions and directions for the functioning of the state. Switzerland addresses national issues through referendums. A referendum in France buried the project for EU constitutional reform, and Brussels had to revisit the EU integration strategy.

To be fair, it should be noted that the institution of referendums, unlike elections, is typical of very few democratic states and is not formalized or recognized formally in international law. However, world experience shows quite a few examples of state dissociation through the self-determination of the people, including the use of the results of the people’s will at a referendum.

As regards the referendums in Gagauzia (February 2, 2014) and Crimea (March 16, 2014), they not only met constitutional norms, but also were quite well organized in terms of the law, which undoubtedly contributed to a fuller implementation of the principles of popular government. However, while the referendum in Gagauzia took place amid a relatively stable political situation, even if opposed by the Chisinau authorities, the decision to hold the referendum in Crimea was taken amid the coup d’état in Kiev, and was adjusted several times in terms of both the date and the questions put forward at the referendum.

On the other hand, one cannot ignore the danger related to excessive use of the institutions of direct democracy, without proper attention to laws and regulations, i.e. the danger of the development of ochlocracy, mob rule. The period of Soviet Perestroika, with its endless protests and de facto collapse of government, is a glaring example. Ukraine, undergoing all the phases of “Maidan rule” from 2004 until 2014, from a coup d’état to a de facto collapse of the state itself, is another example.
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CHAPTER 1.
Crimes Committed by Participants in Anti-Terrorist Operations against the Populations of the DPR and LPR

The elections in the Donetsk and Luhansk People’s Republics that this book is devoted to cannot be studied outside the context they took place in. While, in analyzing electoral processes in normal peaceful conditions, researchers describe the political context of events (crises, statements, scandals and wars of blackmail, etc.), elections in the DPR and LPR were elections amid a war not of blackmail, but an actual war where “the soundtrack” of a fight somewhere far away or nearby could be interrupted by a shell hitting a residential building or the death of a family member or a friend. “The anti-terrorist operation” (ATO) started by the “revolutionary” Kiev government against Donetsk and Luhansk, strengthened the determination of the people living in the self-proclaimed republics to define their fate, instead of undermining it.

THE SHELLING OF CITIES

Instances of the shelling of residential areas and unarmed civilians have been registered many times during the so-called “anti-terrorist operation”. Military reporters have fallen victim on many occasions.
RUPTLY freelance video journalist Fyodor Zavaleykov was the first reporter to be shot in the east of Ukraine. On May 9, the 23 year-old journalist was hit by a bullet and suffered a serious abdominal injury, in the town of Mariupol. He underwent an emergency operation. The Ukrainian side refused to allow evacuation from the nearest airport in Mariupol to Moscow, and after three days of negotiations they eventually gave permission for the wounded man to be taken to the city of Donetsk. On May 27, after a series of operations, Zavaleykov was discharged from hospital.

In May, LifeNews reporters Marat Saychenko and Oleg Sidyakin were arrested near Kramatorsk by Ukrainian law enforcement officials for possession of arms. They were kept hostage for nearly a week and were released on May 25.

On June 6, Zvezda TV channel cameraman Andrei Sushenkov and sound engineer Anton Malyshev were detained by representatives of the National Guard on suspicion of gathering information about Ukrainian checkpoints.

On June 30, a cameraman from Russia’s First Channel, Anatoly Klyan, was shot and killed by Ukrainian law enforcement officers. On the same night law enforcement officers also shot at a car containing LifeNews reporters.

On July 1, REN-TV channel reporter Denis Kulaga and cameraman Vadim Yudin were wounded by shellfire in Ukraine’s Luhansk Region a kilometer away from the border with Russia, when the film crew was working at a poultry factory that the Ukrainian military attacked with mortars. A shell exploded beside the journalists. Denis Kulaga suffered a contusion and his ears bled.

On July 2, the Ukrainian military staged a large-scale artillery bombardment of Kramatorsk.

On July 2, Ukrainian law enforcement shelled the village of Metalist killing two civilians.

The number of internally displaced persons in Ukraine had reached 25.5 thousand people by July due to military action in the Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts.
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On **July 4**, Luhansk Mayor Sergey Kravchenko demanded the destruction of the city to be stopped. He appealed to both sides of the armed standoff\(^{58}\). This is his statement unabridged:

«As Luhansk City Mayor and on behalf of the territorial community, I demand that you stop destroying our city and its residents.

The war has come today into the houses of civilians in Luhansk, with military actions taking place on the streets, people dying and shells destroying residential buildings and schools. Shelling a city of half a million is a crime against one’s own people.

Our fathers reconstructed this city after the war. Thousands of people painstakingly built up its industrial and cultural potential and devoted their lives to developing Luhansk. Is it possible that the hard work of many generations of Luhansk residents will turn today to ruins, and the people will be left without a roof over their heads in the ashes of their own houses, and citizens will die from bullets and shells from both sides?

Any reasonable man understands that all conflicts, including military ones, should be resolved through negotiations, rather than air attacks or artillery bombardments of residential areas, during which people are frozen, listening to every explosion and thinking every minute will be the last of their lives.

Come to your senses! Stop! Do not let your own city be wiped off the face of the earth! While there is still a chance to stop the war, you must not let it slip!”

**On July 6**, Ukrainian law enforcement led a rocket attack on Aleksandrovka near Luhansk\(^ {59}\). When planes appeared in the sky, an air attack warning was announced and sirens sounded.

Besides this, fighting resumed near the village of Metalist. However, local rebels managed to reposition, which is why no one suffered during the attack. At the same time, the Ukrainian army promised to block Donetsk and Luhansk.

---


According to the locals, a military plane flew over the neighborhood of Dzerzhinsky and dropped a bomb. Eyewitnesses said it was flying very low, seemingly touching the roofs.

The Ukrainian military aviation attacked a residential area, although Kiev authorities had promised to stop bombing Luhansk and Donetsk.

On July 10, a bus full of miners was targeted by mortar fire near the Krasny Partizan Mine of the Donbass Fuel and Energy Company (DTEK) in Chervonopartyzansky in the Luhansk Oblast. The bus was literally torn into two parts killing five people and injuring more than ten.

On July 11, Krasnodon and Dzerzhinsk were shelled by artillery fire. Fighting in Luhansk and near Donetsk airport continued.

Shelling of Luhansk tripled. Locals said an elderly woman was killed in a house on Kirova Street. Several shells fell on an oncological hospital killing four people.

Long-range weapons attacked villages around the city, with some of them reaching the center. A woman was killed on her balcony by shrapnel when a shell fell nearby.

In response, rebels opened salvo fire from a BM-21 launch vehicle at the Ukrainian army near the village of Zelenopolye near Luhansk.

Artillery fire from the Ukrainian army killed a worker in Krasnodon, with two other people being hospitalized. Shells fell on the repair workshop of an industrial enterprise.

A Ukrainian shell tore apart an entire bus full of miners injuring 16 people. Some were killed. After the tragedy, the DTEK announced the closure, for safety reasons, of four mines, employing over 4,000 people, in the Luhansk Oblast.

During the evening of the same day, the center of Donetsk heard an explosion in a shopping mall injuring one person. According to the rebels, diversionary groups of Ukrainian law enforcement were working in the city.

---
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On **July of 12**, overnight shelling from a Grad launch vehicle targeted Marinka, a town near Donetsk\(^{62}\). This happened a day after the Ukrainian army sustained serious losses in the Luhansk Oblast. High rise apartment blocks suffered. There was information concerning significant destruction and civilian losses.

The rebel commander in the southeast Igor Strelkov posted a video address saying that Marinka had been attacked by Ukrainian law enforcement with Grad and Uragan launch vehicles damaging residential houses and factories. According to Strelkov, the first shelling on Friday night into Saturday killed about 30 civilians.

**On July 6**, Ukrainian law enforcement said they would not use aviation and artillery to attack rebel positions in Donetsk and Luhansk\(^{63}\).

Despite the announcement, on **July 13** starting at 2 am, aviation perpetrated destructive attacks on concentrations of people and equipment. Five attacks were made, one of them near Luhansk airport, two in Izvarino and Lisichansk. A convoy that had entered the area the day before was virtually completely destroyed\(^{64}\).

In the morning a Ukrainian shell fell in the garden of a residential house on Baltiiskaya Street in the village of Dvadtsatka in Donetsk, Rostov Oblast, destroying two houses, killing Andrey Shuliatyev, b.1967, and injuring two more people, including an elderly woman\(^{65}\). The Investigative Committee of Russia filed a lawsuit for causing the death of a man.

A multi-way border car checkpoint was shut down because of shelling from the Ukrainian side and all the customs employees were evacuated.

Shelling in Luhansk killed six civilians on **July 13**. Shells fell on residential houses and a bus station. The artillery bombardment left

---
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over 4,800 people in the Luhansk Oblast without electricity, 750 people without water and 300 without gas.

After Slavyansk, Kramatorsk and other locations in the east were freed, Donetsk and Luhansk became the main hot spots of the ATO. A rebel convoy drove through two neighborhoods of Donetsk. Information was received of unknown armed men on the territory of a former chemical plant. Explosions and shooting were heard in some neighborhoods.

**July 15, 16 and 17** were announced as days of mourning in Luhansk due to numerous civilian losses in the fighting between the army and rebels.66

*On July 14,* an air attack on the town of Snezhnoye in Donetsk Oblast killed three people. Eight people died during the day, including a child.

Explosions were heard at night in different parts of Donetsk. In addition, shelling of rebel positions continued near the village of Karlovka to the west of Donetsk.

Shelling in Luhansk on July 19 killed at least 16 civilians and seriously damaged dozens of buildings, including a church. According to OSCE, the overall number of people killed in Luhansk from the beginning of June to July reached 250 people.67

In one of these instances, eight people died at the same time when a shell fell onto a pedestrian crossing. Although the President of Ukraine Petro Poroshenko had promised that the Army would not fire at civilians, this special operation targeted them.

**On July 21-22,** military action near Avdeevka damaged three high-voltage lines supplying a number of facilities, including Donetsk water filtering station, reducing water supply to a minimum for the Kirov, Kuybyshev and Leninskiy neighborhoods of Donetsk.

On July 23, overnight shooting and explosions were heard in the outskirts of Donetsk. The situation had stabilized by the morning. Three high-voltage lines were damaged in the fighting. More-

---
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over, the shelling by Ukrainian law enforcement started a fire at the Donetsk chemical plant. Three people were killed in Luhansk by a military operation.

Overnight shelling by the Ukrainian military on July 23 started a fire in the Donetsk chemical plant, with an artillery shell falling on the territory of the Donetsk state chemical plant, which caused a fire. The fire was put out at 7.00.

**On July 23**, Luhansk authorities reported three civilians dead and ten injured as a result of shooting in the city. About 20 buildings were damaged over 24 hours.

The endless artillery attacks resulted in accidents and damage to the city infrastructure. A targeted attack also damaged substations in Dimitrov and the Lenin factory.

**On July 26**, mortar fire in Luhansk killed 15 civilians and injured about 60 people. In Donetsk, Ukrainian troops again used phosphor bombs, which are prohibited all over the world. Videos recorded that night show bright flashes which are explosions of phosphor bombs dropped on Mandrykino in the south of Donetsk.

Artillery bombardment continued to rock the city. The situation was difficult in the area around the airport where the Ukrainian military was trying to get help to their blocked divisions. Artillery damaged over a dozen residential houses, leaving most of the city without power. An explosion in Donetsk caused a fire at a factory producing explosives and munitions.

The Ukrainian military used multiple rocket launchers in fighting with rebels, damaging Debaltsevo station about 40 miles (70 km) from Donetsk, the city market and residential buildings in the village of Oktyabrskoye in the outskirts of Donetsk.

Holes made by mines were seen right on roads. The city streets were almost abandoned. People wandered around the ruins of houses attacked by Ukrainian artillery.

**On July 31**, Kiev was found out to be preparing to attack waste treatment facilities in Donetsk and Luhansk to bring about an envi-
ronmental catastrophe. The news was reported by rebel commander Igor Strelkov.

“According to the information we have, Tochka-U missile launchers have been delivered to Kramatorsk. Kiev is going to use them to attack the waste treatment facilities of Donetsk and Luhansk, which each store at least 150 tons of chlorine. The Stirol plant in Gorlovka is their alternative target”, said Strelkov citing his own intelligence70.

He thought Kiev was going to cause an environmental catastrophe in the besieged cities.

The east of Ukraine was plunging into chaos. Civilians kept dying under the shelling in Donetsk and Luhansk. The cities were on the brink of a humanitarian catastrophe. Those who did not manage to leave the areas of the ATO had to survive without gas, water, electricity and communication.

**On August 1**, Donetsk and Luhansk suffered another shelling by Ukrainian law enforcement, killing more civilians. The fighting damaged power, gas and water utilities in many regions. People were deprived of basic domestic conveniences71.

A morning artillery bombardment of the village of the Abakumovo coal mine in the Donetsk Oblast killed one and injured three. When a bomb exploded near a shuttle bus, the driver took the injured to hospital by himself, one of the injured died immediately on arrival.

Moreover, 26 electrical substations in Donetsk were taken offline. Over 4.5 thousand private residential houses, 44 high-rise apartment blocks and four boiler facilities were left without power. Water supply has still not been resumed in two neighborhoods.

**On August 1**, five civilians died and nine were injured in Luhansk. Power shutdown stopped the work of pumping stations and the water supply was cut off.

Luhansk residents were left without electricity and water, with mobile connections off and the city landlines working with disruptions.

---
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Ukrainian troops attacked the Artyomovskiy, Leninskiy, Zhovtnevskiy neighborhoods of Luhansk, starting several fires and destroying the building of school №4 on Chapaev Street and the Luhansk department store on Karl Marx Street.

On August 2, shelling of Pervomaysk in the Luhansk Oblast destroyed a hospital, crèche and water utilities. The same day, the military targeted a school in Donetsk, and the next day attacked the outskirts of the city with Grad rocket launchers. The military had used the same gun in Gorlovka killing 40 people, which was proven by the Human Rights Watch organization.

On August 10, Donetsk and Luhansk suffered more artillery shelling, destroying part of a hospital in Donetsk and injuring a woman. Luhansk had been besieged for eight days without water, power and gas. Rebels and Ukrainian military fought for the towns and cities connecting the Donetsk and Luhansk People’s Republics.

On the night of August 9, shooting and shelling was heard from time to time in Donetsk. Large-scale shelling started at 4 am, according to numerous reports by residents.

Shelling in the Kiev region destroyed a private residential house and part of hospital №18, injuring a woman near the hospital.

A shell fell on a gas distribution substation in Shirokiy neighborhood. Shelling also knocked off line 19 transformer substations. Moreover, there were reports of a grocery store burning in the Kirov neighborhood.

Luhansk continued to suffer shelling as well. Many stores are still closed. Gas supplies have been exhausted and only a few pharmacies are working. Banks are also closed, no pensions, salaries or social benefits are being paid.

Fighting seriously damaged the Saur-Mogila Great Patriotic War memorial. A nine-meter figure of a soldier fell and broke. A 36-meter obelisk was also shattered.

According to UN Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights Ivan Simonovic, fifty people died or were injured every day in the east.
of Ukraine. On the whole, 1543 people died and several thousand were inured since spring in the region because of the punitive operation.

On **August 14**, Donetsk suffered from another artillery shelling. According to eyewitnesses, people left offices in the center of the city as soon as they heard evacuation alerts. The shelling damaged the local prosecutor’s office and a college. The shelling of Donetsk started amid reports that trucks with humanitarian aid from Russia were approaching the border with Ukraine. Twenty-two people fell victim. Shells also damaged a bus, a store and several residential houses. The city had already been without water, light and communications for twenty days, totally blockaded by Ukrainian forces.

On **August 16**, several houses were wrecked by shelling in Donetsk. Over 40,000 people remained without electricity in three neighborhoods of the city. Repair work was under way.

Shelling that continued all night led to multiple fires and serious damage in Luhansk. A fire broke out at the Epicentr supermarket in the east of the city.

On **August 21**, more shelling of Donetsk and its outskirts by the military resulted in more civilian deaths. Shells fell on residential houses and a correction facility. Residential neighborhoods were targeted at by mortars in Luhansk. Two Ukrainian military helicopters were hit near the village of Georgievka.

On **August 23**, two people died in the Kievsk district of Donetsk while waiting for a bus. Another civilian received shrapnel wound in the Kirovsk district and died in hospital.

On **August 28**, school №33 and a 16-storied apartment block were set on fire after systematic artillery shelling of the Leninskiy neighborhood of Donetsk, which began at 22.00 Moscow time. The oblast central clinical hospital was also targeted by the shelling.

---
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77. (Russian) РИА Новости. Горсовет Донецка: трое мирных жителей погибли при утренних обстрелах. URL: http://ria.ru/world/20140823/1021125140.html#ixzz3EQASk2K3
78. (Russian) РИА Новости. Ополченцы: школа и жилой дом загорелись после обстрела Донецка. URL: http://ria.ru/world/20140828/1021681589.html#ixzz3EQDvm1Xz
Mines exploded in the Kalinin region, with shells falling on a residential house. Shelling started a big fire in the recreation center of the Kalinin region and blew out windows in houses nearby, injuring civilians.

Three civilians were burned to death in a car because of shelling on Taras Shevchenko Blvd. in the center of Donetsk.

On **August 29**, Donetsk and Luhansk suffered more artillery attacks. The Ukrainian army targeted densely populated parts of the city.

Besides the northern and western outskirts of Donetsk, the army went on to attack Debaltsevo, Ilovaysk and Starobeshevo\(^79\).

People had nothing else to do but clean up the ruins, crying about destroyed houses and being happy that they had survived. This can be considered lucky given that the army was targeting people.

When shelling starts outside and explosions are heard, running away hoping that they will not touch you is the only thing people can do. However, there are always some who do not manage to escape, adding more names to the list of victims of the punitive operation.

There is no point in asking why a street market was targeted by the Ukrainian army artillery, and what people had done wrong to deserve to die when shopping for groceries. The shelling killed six people. The army seems to destroy schools, daycare centers, hospitals and stores on purpose. The more successful the rebels are, the more ferocious the army shelling is.

---

### THE MASS GRAVES OF ATO VICTIMS

On **September 25**, another three mass burials were discovered in different locations. The count of mass graves left behind by Ukrainian participants in the punitive operation in the Donbass has reached dozens. The remains of more than 30 people were found in the largest of them\(^80\).

---

79. (Russian) Первый канал. Донецк и Луганск в эпицентре обстрелов. Власти ДНР заявляют, что готовят контрудар. URL: http://www.1tv.ru/news/world/266529

It is clear now that atrocities and tortures of civilians were common in all the territories controlled by the Ukrainian military.

More burial sites have been found in villages left by National Guard divisions. Locals are reporting graves left behind by Ukrainian punishers. One of the graves had two bodies, those of a man and a woman, with their arms tied with tape. Civilians were shot and several dozen graves with executed victims have been discovered in the villages of Kommunar, Nizhnyaya Krynka, Telmanovo and Starobeshevo. The number of victims amounts to hundreds. Those not shot had been terrorized.

On September 23, militia representatives of the DPR found a mass burial on the territory of a lumber yard of Kommunar mine № 22 (Nizhnyaya Krynka, 60 km from Donetsk). National Guard combat rations were found near the graves.

On September 24, a group of OSCE monitors in Ukraine found three mass burial sites near Donetsk. A special OSCE monitoring mission discovered two sites 50 meters from each other on the territory of the Kommunar Mine, each containing two bodies in states of decay. The observers also managed to find eight 9 mm Makarov cartridges about five meters away from the bodies.

Also, a stretch of freshly disturbed soil with a stick in it displaying the names and initials in Russian of the five people buried underneath was noticed on the road leading to Nizhnyaya Krynka. The sign also gave a suggested date of their death, August 27, 2014.

The Investigative Committee of Russia (ICR) said it intended to make an inquiry into a mass grave found on the territory of the lumber yard of the Kommunar Mine near Donetsk.

“The information on the murders of the people whose bodies were found in a mass grave near Donetsk, will be checked by the Main Investigative Office of the Investigative Committee of Russia as part of a criminal investigation into the use of prohibited means and methods of warfare against civilians in the southeast of Ukraine” said ICR spokesperson Vladimir Markin.

81. (Russian) Интерфакс. В ОБСЕ заявили об обнаружении трех братских могил под Донецком. URL: http://www.interfax.ru/world/398557
82. (Russian) Интерфакс. СКР подключится к расследованию захоронений в Донбассе. URL: http://www.interfax.ru/world/398449
According to DPR Prime Minister Aleksandr Zakharchenko, internal organs had been removed from the bodies found near Donetsk. The same is true of the bodies of women found not far from Komurka Mine № 22 and other bodies of civilians from other graves\textsuperscript{83}.

It is unknown how and when the organs were removed, but only two scenarios can be seriously looked into: they were either severely damaged because of wounds, or removed intentionally, perhaps during torture.

Overall, by the end of September rebels had found four burial sites of locals and six law enforcement officers on the territories that had been controlled by the Ukrainian armed forces.

The Ukrainian military denied being involved in the murders of civilians: “The ATO media center officially states that the information is inconsistent with reality and is aimed at discrediting the Ukrainian military which continues to fulfill its duty to defend the territorial integrity of Ukraine in the Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts”.

Ukraine’s National Guard also denied involvement in the murders. Representative of the Council of National Security and Defense of Ukraine Andrey Lysenko reported that it was not National Guard fighters near Donetsk but some other law enforcement divisions.

The Council of Europe assigned the duty to look into the murders to Kiev. Daniel Höltingen, Director of Communication at the Council of Europe (CE), said that the investigation into the mass murder near Donetsk is the responsibility of the Ukrainian authorities, “it must be a task for the relevant national government agency to investigate crimes like this”\textsuperscript{84}.

He explained that the Council of Europe refused to look into the tragedy because it did not have the right authority. Höltingen added that the CE could “oversee an investigation carried out by the relevant Ukrainian agencies”.

\textsuperscript{83} (Russian) РСН. Захарченко: У найденных под Донецком тел удалены внутренние органы. URL: http://rusnovosti.ru/news/342843/

\textsuperscript{84} (Russian) KM.ru. Совет Европы возложил на Киев обязанность расследовать убийства в Донбассе. URL: http://www.km.ru/world/2014/09/24/protivostoyanie-na-ukraine-2013-14/748859-sovet-evropy-vozlozhil-na-kiev-obyazannos
He also pointed out that the organization was busy overseeing the investigation into murders in the February disturbances in Kiev and the May massacre in Odessa.

In turn, Aleksey Pushkov, the head of the foreign-affairs committee in the State Duma, said that Russia will raise the question of an investigation into the mass graves near Donetsk with international organizations – the Council of Europe, Parliamentary Assembly of the CE and OSCE.

The deputy said “Russia must and will raise the question with international organizations – with PACE and OSCE – of Kiev now being controlled by the people who are directly responsible for these war crimes and crimes against humanity”.85

According to him, since Kiev “is unable to carry out any investigation, this should be subject of a very serious consideration within these organizations”.

The head of the State Duma Committee, who leads Russia’s delegation in the Parliamentary Assembly of the CE, said that he intended to write a letter to the leadership of the Assembly and its Ukraine monitoring committee, to demand they pay priority attention to the graves found. “The letter will also remind them that PACE has played no role in investigating the Odessa tragedy”, he added.

“If PACE keeps silent this time too and does nothing again, this could be regarded as a conscious position aimed at suppressing these crimes. I hope that the leadership of PACE will respond to the position of the Russian delegation”, commented Pushkov.

Pushkov also said that he meant to get in touch with Secretary General of the Council of Europe Thorbjørn Jagland and “also raise the question that the Council should be more active in this direction and perhaps it will head such an investigative committee”.

The president of the Duma International Committee explained that an investigative international committee could be initiated by the CE and OSCE. “We are considering which framework will be

---

85. (Russian) ИТАР-ТАСС. Пушков: Россия поставит в ПАСЕ и ОБСЕ вопрос о расследовании захоронений под Донецком. URL: http://itar-tass.com/politika/1462377
more practical for the committee to be more efficient so that it will not get bogged down in bureaucracy”, he said.

“Representatives of the law enforcement of Ukraine should not give a surprised look and claim, shrugging their shoulders, that they know nothing of, and have nothing to do with, this, given that equipment, supplies, military rations, etc. were found at the mass graves, which proves that National Guard forces had been there. After the Odessa tragedy on May 2, it will be hard for the Ukrainian military to deny any connection to the burials found near Donetsk, because multiple evidence has been gathered proving their involvement in war crimes” said Pushkov. According to him, it is high time world public opinion finally recognized what Russia has been warning about, which is that ultranationalist armed groups in Ukraine, acting under cover of the official regime in Kiev, such as the National Guard and the Right Sector, are very dangerous organizations that think nothing of killing people for their beliefs.

Pushkov was not surprised by the statements from the Ukrainian military that “they have nothing to do with it”. “However, no one would doubt that it was the Ukrainian ultranationalists, perhaps on orders from “above” – from at least one or several influential figures in Ukraine – who had dealt with the supporters of federalization in Odessa. The official data alone say at least 40 people died there, while according to unofficial data, the number of victims reached 116 to 220, and they did not burn themselves or shoot themselves in the face”, continued the politician. He reminded us that the pictures and videos taken then “demonstrate that it was Ukrainian ultra-right groups acting while Ukrainian law enforcement failed to act”.

Pushkov was confident that the “physical elimination of dissidents is, I think, a signature of Ukrainian law enforcement, no matter what you call them — the National Guard or something else”. He thinks that “if it had not been for Odessa, it would have been a question who committed the crimes near Donetsk. But Odessa, the shelling of civilians, the murder, kidnapping and torture of Russian journalists all shows that the Ukrainian side is waging the war
very mercilessly, with facts to prove this”. This is why he believes that the burials are a case of “war crimes, crimes against humanity”.

The head of the Duma International Committee pointed out that Amnesty International had recently “accused both parties, rebels and the Kiev regime, of war crimes” in its report. He called this “some progress in the position of Western organizations that until recently would accuse only the so-called separatists”. “It has been recognized now that law enforcement agencies representing Kiev are to blame for the war crimes”, Pushkov emphasized.

“This is why I think that after Odessa, after the murders of Russian reporters, after the fact of using phosphor bombs against cities in the east of Ukraine has been revealed, after the confirmation — including by the American side — of the fact of the use (by the Ukrainian military) of ballistic missiles against cities in the east — after all this, anyone who is capable of looking objectively at the situation in Ukraine should admit that an urgent and very thorough investigation into these facts is necessary”, Pushkov concluded.

The president of the State Duma Committee on International Relations thinks that the potential for the West defending the Kiev regime is being gradually exhausted because the world cannot turn a blind eye to large-scale crimes by the Ukrainian military.

“They can defend those who came to power in Ukraine illegally, but there is a certain limit after which a critical mass of facts is reached, and defense becomes difficult”, the deputy said.

He believes that the discovery of the mass graves in the Donbass will make the West change the way they assess the Kiev regime. “They cannot always blame Russia or the so-called separatists allegedly supported by Russia. I have even noticed some progress at a session of the monitoring committee of PACE that I attended, in that PACE representatives no longer say “they are absolutely sure that the Ukrainian authorities are not to blame for these crimes”, the head of the Duma committee explained.

According to him, it has become clear at PACE that “the potential for defending Kiev, especially as regards the Odessa issue, is getting thinner and thinner. I think that the West’s ability to defend
Kiev is being exhausted in general, because they cannot continue to turn a blind eye to these mass crimes” Pushkov stressed, adding that the West will find it even harder to pretend that the Ukrainian authorities have nothing to do with the crimes after the new discoveries.

The Office of the United Nations Commissioner for Human Rights in Geneva also expressed the necessity for an independent investigation.

Konstantin Dolgov, the Russian Foreign Ministry’s Commissioner for Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law, stated that there is serious reason to believe that the National Guard fighters may be involved in the murders of civilians. He pointed out that National Guard battalions controlled the territory at the time of the crimes.

According to Dolgov, Russia is going to press for international organizations to participate in investigating the murders of civilians near Donetsk. “We are investing effort in attracting the attention of intergovernmental organizations, the UN, OSCE and the Council of Europe, so that they will engage in the investigation”, added Dolgov. He stressed that the Ukrainian authorities must be held responsible for these crimes because they took place on the territory of Ukraine. He pointed out that the crimes committed within the ATO in the southeast of the country must be looked into thoroughly and all the guilty must be punished.

Russia raised the question of an international investigation in the OSCE, as well. Russia’s permanent representative in the OSCE Andrey Kelin said “We have approached the Swiss representatives in the OSCE, advising them to authorize the OSCE mission in Ukraine to deal with this issue”.

The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) in Geneva also emphasized the need of an independent investigation into the deaths around Donetsk86.

Rupert Colville, the spokesman for the UNHCR said, “It is perfectly clear that an independent investigation into the situation, 86. (Russian) РИА Новости. РФ, ОБСЕ и ООН выступают за расследование убийства людей под Донецком. URL: http://www.ria.ru/world/20140924/1025465450.html#ixzz3EJ7KV97h
in accordance with international standards, including a forensic evaluation, is required. It is too early for us to discuss what actually happened and who is responsible for this”.

According to him, the UN mission to investigate human rights violations in Ukraine “knows about the situation and is monitoring it”.

Italian journalist and former Member of the European Parliament Giulietto Chiesa thinks Europe will most likely ignore the information about the mass graves of civilians in the Donbass.

The information about these graves is obviously sensational, and Russia, the rebel leadership and the heads of the self-proclaimed DPR and LPR must speak out loudly and clearly about them.

Like the Odessa tragedy on May 2, 2014, these facts are important not only for Ukraine, but for the entire world. It should be arranged that not only Russia or the Donbass, but also the Council of Europe, European Parliament and OSCE representatives talk about the execution of civilians.

In fact, very little is known about what has actually been going on during these terrible months in the Donbass, particularly what the so-called National Guard has been doing, besides taking an active part in the punitive operation against the self-proclaimed republics. There have been terrible rumors. It appears that the actual number of victims among civilians is enormous — much higher than the official figures.

The statements by A. Pushkov, head of the Russian delegation to the Council of Europe’s Parliamentary Assembly, are a good reason to start an international investigation. It obviously cannot be an investigation solely by the Ukrainian authorities, which may have been involved themselves in what happened and would want to cover up their traces. It must be a truly international investigation.

Since the Odessa tragedy, Ukraine has shown it does not want an impartial investigation.

However, there is in fact little hope that an investigation will start, let alone that it will lead to an objective outcome. The information on the mass graves was only distributed by the Russian media. The Eu-
European media has kept silent, which is why the European public knows nothing about them and may never do. There will never even be a question raised in the media about the executed civilians.

The facts, just as the information about the people who died in Odessa, will be simply ignored.

According to Italian journalist and former Member of the European Parliament Giulietto Chiesa\textsuperscript{87}, he once happened to attend a meeting in Northern Italy where he talked about the situation in Ukraine. None of the 400 people present knew anything about what had happened in Odessa. The level of suppression of information in the European media is enormous. This is like censorship that does not allow unnecessary or unwanted news.

In fact, Europe has honest human rights activists who may be willing to start an independent investigation, but they are isolated when not covered by major media. European governments are either going to keep silent, or support Kiev, the Right Sector and President Poroshenko no matter what.

\textsuperscript{87} (Russian) Известия. Джульетто Кьеза: Европа будет молчать. URL: http://www.izvestia.ru/news/577142#ixzz3EJ8toPi2
The Minsk Protocol to halt the war in the Donetsk and Luhansk regions was signed on September 5, 2014 in the President Hotel in Minsk. The agreement was signed as a protocol as a result of consultations of the Trilateral Contact Group on Ukraine, regarding a joint effort to implement Ukrainian President P. Poroshenko’s peace plan and Russian President V. Putin’s initiative. The protocol was signed by the Russian Ambassador to Ukraine Mikhail Zurabov, former president of Leonid Kuchma (both authorized by their respective countries)\textsuperscript{88}, Swiss diplomat and OSCE representative Heidi Tagliavini, and the DPR and LPR leaders Aleksandr Zakharchenko and Ihor Plotnytskyi. The agreement to cease fire came into effect the same day at 6:00 pm local time\textsuperscript{89}.

\textbf{THE PREPARATION AND INITIATORS OF THE NEGOTIATIONS}

\textbf{The First Session of the Trilateral Contact Group}

On June 8, Ukraine’s President Petro Porohenko started a session of the Trilateral Contact Group to facilitate the peace plan

\textsuperscript{88} (Russian) Росбалт: МИД Украины разъяснил статус Кучмы на переговорах в Минске. URL: http://www.rosbalt.ru/ukraina/2014/09/08/1312636.html

\textsuperscript{89} (Russian) Вести-Репортёр: В Минске договорились об объявлении перемирия на Донбассе. URL: http://vesti-ukr.com/donbass/68415-v-minske-dogovorilis-ob-objavlenii-peremirija-na-donbasse-s-18-00
in the east of Ukraine\(^{90}\), which he had presented on June 6 during a visit to France.

At the session, attended by then emergency Ambassador of Ukraine to Germany Pavlo Klimkin, special representative of the acting head of the OSCE Heidi Tagliavini, and emergency Russian Ambassador to Ukraine Mikhail Zurabov, the President of Ukraine pointed out that the sides must work on implementing the agreements reached in Normandy at the meeting with German Chancellor Angela Merkel, French President François Hollande and Russian President Vladimir Putin\(^{91}\).

“We must cease fire this week. Every day when people die, every day when Ukraine pays this high price, is unacceptable for me. Therefore, firstly, work at the Ukrainian state border must be resumed to guarantee security of every Ukrainian citizen who lives in the Donbass, regardless of their political allegiances”, Poroshenko stressed.

He proposed to hold sessions of the Trilateral Contact Group every day to process progress made and coordinate further action to implement the peace plan in the east of Ukraine.

**Poroshenko’s Inauguration Speech**

The inauguration speech of President Petro Poroshenko in the Supreme Rada on June 7 outlined his peace plan to resolve the conflict in the Donbass. The plan implied disarmament of all those who took up arms illegally, an amnesty, ensuring a corridor for the evacuation of “Russian mercenaries”, and a broad peace dialogue, as well as early local elections in the Donbass and a package of economic reforms\(^{92}\).

“I strongly urge everyone who illegally took weapons in their hands to lay them down. In response, I first of all guarantee exemp-
tion from criminal responsibility for those who do not have the blood of Ukrainian soldiers and civilians on their hands, and those who are not involved in funding terrorism. Secondly, a controlled corridor for Russian mercenaries who would like to return home. Thirdly, peaceful dialogue”, the President laid out his plan.

Poroshenko pointed out there can be no dialogue with “shooters”, “Abwehr”, “demons” and “other evil”. “Today, we need a legitimate partner for dialogue. We will not speak to bandits. We are ready to declare early local elections in the Donbass”, the President said.

Addressing his compatriots from Donetsk and Luhansk in Russian, Ukraine’s president stressed: “The nationwide presidential elections have put an end to the myth of the allegedly illegitimate Kyiv authorities. This myth has been created by Russian propaganda and the clan of Yanukovych, who betrayed the Donbass and robbed it even more than the whole country. He has been single-handedly ruling the Donetsk region for 17 years. And now he is funding terrorists. It is he who shall be totally responsible for the political and socio-economic situation of the region”.

He emphasized he was addressing the Donbass “with peace, with the project of the decentralization of power, with the guarantee of the free usage of the Russian language” as well as “with the strong intention not to divide Ukrainian people into right and wrong, and with respect for the specifics of the regions”.

Poroshenko promised to offer the Donbass a joint project with the European Union to create new jobs in the region. He also mentioned prospects for investment and a project of economic reconstruction for the Donbass.

“Peace has not come yet, but today we can confidently say that the hard challenges have united the Ukrainian family. They have strengthened us as the Ukrainian political nation that is confident in its European choice. Our people have never been so strong”, the Rada greeted these words with applause.

Speaking about the need to improve relations with Russia, P. Poroshenko said “There can be no compromise in the issues on Cri-
mea, the European choice and state structure. Anything else must be discussed and negotiated”.

**Poroshenko’s Plan**

On June 20, Ukraine’s President Petro Poroshenko unveiled his peace plan in the Donbass, where he arrived to inspect the “anti-terrorist center” of the National Guard. The plan was revealed on the official website of the President\(^93\).

Poroshenko’s Plan consisted of 15 points, including safety guarantees for all the participants in the negotiations, an amnesty for “those who lay down their weapons and have not committed serious crimes, and the release of hostages.

In addition, a 10-kilometer-wide buffer zone on the Ukraine-Russia border, the removal of illegal armed groups and “a secure corridor to be opened for the evacuation of Russian and Ukrainian mercenaries” were specified in the plan among other ideas.

The plan also included disarmament, creating police subdivisions to patrol the streets together, freeing the illegally occupied administrative buildings in the Donetsk and Luhansk provinces and the restoration of government services to the population.

Also, the plan called for the restoration in the Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts of television and radio transmissions.

Another point of the plan was the decentralization of executive powers through changes in the Constitution of Ukraine (including the protection of the regional status of the Russian language).

The plan also included choosing governor candidates in agreement with Donbass representatives, early local and parliamentary elections, as well as a program of creating new jobs in the regions and the reconstruction of industrial and social facilities.

The document highlighted that “Ukraine’s President guarantees security to all residents of the region, regardless of their political beliefs”.

After unveiling the plan, President Poroshenko ordered ATO forces to cease military operations from Friday June 20 until June 27.

\(^93\) (Russian) Подробности: Петр Порошенко представил свой мирный план по Донбассу. URL: http://podrobnosti.ua/power/2014/06/20/981383.html
The Start of Negotiations: Kiev – Moscow – Rebels

Multilateral negotiations started on June 23 between representatives of Ukraine, the self-proclaimed Donetsk and Luhansk People’s Republics, and the Russian Federation in the Donetsk Oblast State Administration\(^\text{94}\). Russian Ambassador to Ukraine Mikhail Zurabov, the second president of Ukraine Leonid Kuchma, representative of the acting head of the OSCE Heidi Tagliavini, the head of the Ukrainian Choice public organization Viktor Medvedchuk, the DPR’s Prime Minister Alexander Borodai, leader of the South-East movement Oleg Tsaryov, and representatives of the DPR and LPR took part in the negotiations.

The Ukrainian Presidential website announced a session of the Trilateral Contact Group aimed at defining stages to implement the peace plan.

Before the Contact Group left for Donetsk, President Poroshenko received its participants in Kiev. “Kuchma’s participation shows the former president’s close attention to this mission”, Poroshenko highlighted.

Dmitry Peskov, Press spokesman for the President of the Russian Federation, said on June 22 that V. Putin “welcomes the information concerning the beginning of Viktor Medvedchuk’s preliminary contacts in Donetsk and Luhansk”.

Some residents of Donetsk, however, did not meet the negotiations with optimism and protesters gathered at the building of the oblast administration. When former president Kuchma and former member of the Party of Regions Nestor Shufrych were leaving the building, protesters shouted “Disgrace!”, “Murderers!” and “Traitors!”\(^\text{95}\)

Despite the ceasefire announced on June 20 in accordance with Poroshenko’s Peace Plan, warfare continued in the DPR. Slavyansk and Kramatorsk experienced only a short-term respite.

\(^{94}\) (Russian) Вести: Стартовали переговоры между Киевом, Москвой и ополченцами. URL: http://www.vesti.ru/doc.html?id=1718493&cid=5

\(^{95}\) (Russian) ТСН: После переговоров "гастролер" Царев взялся спасать Кучму и Шуфрич от разъяренной толпы. URL: http://ru.tsn.ua/politika/poste-peregovorov-gastroler-carev-vzyalsya-spasat-kuchmu-i-shufricha-ot-razyarennoy-tolpy-373176.html
**Appealing to Lukashenko**

On July 29, Ukraine’s President P. Poroshenko appealed to Byelorussia’s President A. Lukashenko asking him to help arrange a session of the Trilateral Contact Group to settle the situation on the Donbass\(^96\).

The meeting was arranged to take place in Minsk.

“Poroshenko said he had appealed to President of Byelorussia Lukashenko asking him to help arrange a session of the Trilateral Contact Group on July 31 in Minsk, with the participation of the second President of Ukraine Leonid Kuchma, Russia’s Ambassador Mikhail Zurabov and the OSCE representative”, the President’s press office reported.

The Ukrainian side put forward two questions to be discussed at the meeting – the release of “all hostages the militia are still holding” and ensuring access for international experts to the Malaysian Airlines plane crash site.

Earlier, US Secretary of State John Kerry had reported Ukraine was ready for a ceasefire.

**The Trilateral Contact Group Session in Minsk, July 31**

On July 31, the Trilateral Contact Group on Ukraine agreed, at a meeting with militia representatives, to free a significant number of hostages and worked out conditions for a ceasefire in the south-east of the country. The media reported on the news, citing information on the OSCE website\(^97\).

Participants in the session discussed the situation with hostages and other people detained during the conflict. Their immediate release was the first step, and an important condition to “ensure a mutually agreed and sustainable ceasefire”.

---

\(^96\) (Russian) Вести-Репортёр: Порошенко решил провести мирные переговоры в Минске. URL: http://vesti-ukr.com/donbass/63285-poroshenko-reshil-provesti-trehstoronnie-peregovory-v-minske

\(^97\) Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe: Press Statement by the Trilateral Contact Group. URL: http://www.osce.org/home/122142
In addition, an agreement was reached to create a mechanism for the OSCE to monitor and control the ceasefire. Moreover, the Contact Group supported the idea of effective control of the border between Russia and Ukraine.

What is more, the sides addressed the issue of the Malaysian Airlines Boeing 777 crash, including ensuring safe access (a humanitarian corridor) for international investigators to the crash site until all forensic and investigation procedures were over. The sides stressed the need to comply fully with this condition.

There was little information about the session, with the Byelorussian authorities keeping secret the venue and date of the meeting. It was later revealed that the negotiations had taken place in the Belarussian government residence Zaslavl near Minsk.

Only the National Byelorussian Television crew was allowed to cover the meeting, with other reporters having to watch the preparations for the meeting from afar. Recording was strictly prohibited.

The OSCE was represented by Heidi Tagliavini. Mikhail Zurabov spoke for Russia, and on his arrival in the capital of Byelorussia he went directly to the Embassy of Russia in Minsk.

Former President of Ukraine L. Kuchma had already met with A. Lukashenko by this time. The Byelorussian leader reported that he wanted to help his neighboring country, but was not going to mediate in the negotiations.

“Do not read or listen to those saying anything about PR or image. We need none of this. You know this well. I do not like mediation at all. We will do everything necessary for our Ukraine, in order to reduce, at least a little, the tensions in the east of Ukraine”, Byelorussia’s President said.

L. Kuchma pointed out, “It is being decided now if Ukraine is going to exist or not. The events of the last few months raise more questions than answers. There have been no answers yet. We have come here for some answers”.

---

Delegations of the self-proclaimed Donetsk and Luhansk People’s Republics were also invited to the session of the Contact Group.

**Putin and Poroshenko Meet in Minsk**

On August 26, Russia’s President V. Putin, who had come to Minsk for the summit of the EU – Ukraine – Eurasia Troika, commented on relations between the Customs Union and Kiev in case Ukraine signed the EU Association Agreement, and said that Russia would cancel all advantages for imported goods from Ukraine. Putin also reiterated that the crisis in the Donbass could only be settled through dialogue with representatives of the southeast of Ukraine.

The meeting of the Presidents of Russia, Ukraine, Byelorussia, Kazakhstan and the EU took place in the Palace of Independence in Minsk. P. Poroshenko and V. Putin shook hands. Russia’s President called the meeting in Minsk “a good opportunity to discuss relations between Ukraine, the EU and the Customs Union”.

Putin viewed the growing interaction between the Customs Union countries and Ukraine as useful, but raised doubts that it would be possible alongside the association of Ukraine and the EU. “In our opinion, it would be worthwhile to not only maintain, but to significantly build up cooperation. However, the question now arises if this can be achieved if the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement comes into force”, he said at the meeting with Ukraine’s President Poroshenko and other leaders.

V. Putin added that Russia had warned its Ukrainian and European partners on many occasions of the possibility that events would develop this way and there was, according to Putin, evidence to prove his point. The Russian President thinks that the EU-Ukraine Association may cause losses to Russia worth in excess of 100 billion rubles “unless measures are taken”. “Entire sectors of our economy and agro-industry will be endangered followed by all kinds of con-

---


100. (Russian) NEWSru.com: Путин встретился с Порошенко в Минске: РФ отменит торговые преференции Киеву из-за ассоциации с EC. URL: http://www.newsru.com/arch/world/26aug2014/ptnminsk.html
sequences for the pace of economic development and employment. Byelorussia and Kazakhstan will suffer losses, too”, Putin stressed.

In turn, Ukraine’s President P. Poroshenko expressed hopes that ratification of the Association Agreement between Ukraine and the EU, due in September, would facilitate real reforms in the country and the development of economic relations with all partners and neighbours. He also commented on the war in the Donbass.

“Peace in the Donbass, that will stop people’s suffering, is our priority”, Poroshenko pointed out at the meeting with Byelorussia’s President A. Lukashenko. He stressed that settlement of the situation in the Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts is more important than questions of the economy and energy. “Peace is the priority”, Poroshenko said.

He expressed hopes that the negotiations would give a chance to not only discuss, but also to develop a solution to the situation. In turn, Lukashenko gave assurances that he had done everything he could to promote the Ukrainian President’s position to all participants in the crisis and that the meeting was a result of his hard work.

“The world community has gone through the stages of confrontation, containment and isolation, and has had a range of opportunities to find out that this is a road to nowhere. The future lies in respect of the norms of international law, fair fulfillment of undertaken obligations, and the development of mutually beneficial cooperation. I understand that all the players engaged in the situation would like to resolve the crisis and save face. We are willing to discuss different options that would lead to a strategy ensuring a peaceful future for Ukraine, a peaceful future for Europe”, Poroshenko said.

Meanwhile, V. Putin reiterated that the crisis in the southeast of Ukraine could not be settled through force, without considering the interests of the people who live in the war affected regions. “We are willing to exchange opinions on the acute crisis in Ukraine, which we are certain cannot be resolved through a further escalation of the war scenario”, he stressed.
Poroshenko was reserved at the negotiations and abstained from the traditional Ukrainian rhetoric about “Russian aggression, the Russian military on Ukrainian territory, the shipment of arms to the rebels, and incidents at the border”.

It was planned to end the negotiations with a briefing of the presidents and EU representatives, but it was cancelled at the end of the meeting. According to the media, the participants in the negotiations went to have a business lunch after the session, which had lasted about four hours. According to Poroshenko “so far the format has been multifaceted. Everything is yet to come”.

A meeting behind closed doors followed. A. Lukashenko revealed some details: “the negotiations were complicated, with the various positions different, at times radically so. We all wanted a breakthrough and the start of a political dialogue, but the very fact of the meeting itself is an undoubted success”101(Reuters).

Byelorussia’s President said that the participants in the meeting agreed that all hostages in the east of Ukraine must be released (RIA Novosti). Lukashenko also added that another meeting was likely on Wednesday in Minsk between Ukraine, Russia and the OSCE. According to him, all participants had agreed to his offer to make Minsk a permanent venue for the Ukraine Contact Group.

After the meeting, Poroshenko left the Palace of Independence and went to the Embassy of Ukraine without any statement or comment. ITAR-TASS reported: “The President of Ukraine will talk with Ukrainian media there”.

It was later revealed that Poroshenko had also met with High Representative of the Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy C. Ashton. Ashton called the Minsk negotiations “warm and positive”, Reuters reported. She stated that the EU was advocating a ceasefire in Ukraine, efficient control at the Russian-Ukrainian border, delivery of humanitarian aid, and a political process that would resolve the internal Ukrainian disagreements.

Phone Talks between Putin and Poroshenko

The presidents of Ukraine and Russia had agreed on a permanent ceasefire in the Donbass, reported Poroshenko’s press office on September 3102.

“The conversation resulted in an agreement on a permanent ceasefire in the Donbass. A mutual understanding has been reached as regards steps that would facilitate peace”, the official website of Ukraine’s leader reported.

The president’s spokesperson Dmitry Peskov pointed out that the “heads of state exchanged opinions on what is to be done first to end the bloodshed in the southeast of the country as soon as possible”.

“The Presidents’ perspectives on possible ways out of the severe crisis coincide to a significant degree”, he stressed.

After the official announcement appeared on the website of the press office of Ukraine’s President, the Russian President’s press office refuted the information of the agreements between Putin and Poroshenko on the ceasefire103.

According to Peskov, the presidents agreed only “on necessary steps” to end the conflict. “Putin and Poroshenko discussed measures that would contribute to a ceasefire between the rebels and the Ukrainian military. Russia physically cannot agree on a ceasefire because it is not party to the conflict”, Peskov stated.

The spokesperson of the Russian President abstained from comment on further contact between the leaders.

Politologists paid a lot of attention to the negotiations between the two presidents. For instance, Ukrainian expert Vadim Karasyov assumed “with modest optimism” that the negotiations may be “the beginning of a way out of war”.

“I think that the question of peace was, in fact, discussed. But the official position of Russia is that Kiev and, theoretically, Lu-

102. (Russian) Вести-Репортёр: Порошенко по телефону договорился с Путиным о перемирии на Донбассе. URL: http://vesti-ukr.com/donbass/68052-poroshenko-i-putin-dogovorilis-o-postojannom-prekravenii-ognja-na-donbasse
hansk and Donetsk, must make a final decision on a ceasefire and peace”, Karasyov said.

He believed that there was hope that Ukraine and Russia were approaching some way leading to peace negotiations. “But the situation has gone too far. For Putin and for everyone”, he stressed.

A few hours after the official website of the Ukrainian President had announced the agreement between Putin and Poroshenko on the permanent ceasefire, the news was changed¹⁰⁴.

The announcement initially said, “The conversation resulted in an agreement on a permanent ceasefire in the Donbass. Mutual understanding was reached as regards steps that will facilitate peace”.

The text was later changed, “The conversation resulted in an agreement on a ceasefire in the Donbass. Mutual understanding was reached as regards steps that would facilitate peace”. Thus, the word “permanent” was removed.

The self-proclaimed DPR expressed doubts that all Ukrainian divisions taking part in the special operation in the east of the country would comply with the Ukrainian President’s decision about the indefinite ceasefire in the region because “he does not control all of them”¹⁰⁵.

“Poroshenko does not control the punitive battalions and it is not certain that they will comply with his decision”, said Vladislav Brig, the head of the international information political department of the DPR.

He pointed out that he did not know about any agreements with the DPR regarding a ceasefire. “The DPR’s Army will not cease fire at least as long as there are participants in the punitive operation in the Donbass”, he said.

In turn, Serhiy Kunitsyn, an adviser to the President of Ukraine, raised similar doubts¹⁰⁶. There is a third party in this conflict —

¹⁰⁴. (Russian) ЛІГАбізнесІнформ: На сайті Порошенко змінили текст новості о

¹⁰⁵. (Russian) РИА Новости: В ДНР сомневаются, что все украинские подразделения

¹⁰⁶. (Russian) Вести-Репортер: Порошенко по телефону договорился с Путином о
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the militants, the separatists who are fighting there. I don’t think they will all listen to the President of Russia. You know how the corridor in Ilovaisk was pledged and the convoy was then shot at... The President of Russia may influence the leaders of the DPR-LPR, but there are so many militants there”, Kunitsyn said.

In his opinion, the conflict could be stopped fast if “the external factor” of shipments of arms to rebels stopped. “Ukrainian defense and law enforcement would take care of the rest very quickly. The larger problem needs to be solved. And we will have to fight the smaller ones for many years”, he said.

Kunitsyn did not know the details of the agreement. “I don’t know the details. The news is recent. I came back from Moscow last night, where I attended the Third International Convention of peacekeepers. The Ukrainian delegation of four people took part in the convention and put forward an initiative. An appeal was made on behalf of the convention to the Presidents of Russia and Ukraine, to sit down and negotiate a cease fire”, Poroshenko’s advisor said.

WORKING GROUPS AND THE TEXTS OF THE AGREEMENTS

Contact Group Negotiations on September 1

On September 1, the Contact Group on Ukraine held four-hour negotiations in Minsk. The group included representatives of the Kiev regime, Donetsk and Luhansk, as well as mediators from Russia and the OSCE.

The Byelorussian capital secured its status as a neutral field to discuss the situation in the southeast of Ukraine. Delegations from Kiev, Moscow, the EU and, what is important, representatives of the self-proclaimed republics have met there many times. The Contact Group is made up of Former President of Ukraine Leonid Kuchma; founder of the Donetsk Republic movement, then First Deputy Prime Minister of the DPR Andrei Purgin, and speaker of the People’s Council of the LPR Alexei Karyakin. Russia is repre-
sent by Ambassador to Ukraine Mikhail Zurabov; Swiss diplomat Heidi Tagliavini represents the OSCE.

Aleksandr Lukashenko did not take part in the negotiations. He only provided for them the building of his former residence. The leaders of the self-proclaimed republics were the first to arrive on September 1. Andrei Purgin and Alexei Karyakin’s car stopped unassumingly in front of the gates and they walked to the door. They stressed that the republics were acting as one at the negotiations and they were not going to negotiate with the Ukrainian side or international organizations separately.

“This is in essence an initial stage of negotiations, which means we are already trying to find common ground, to stop the war and reduce the number of victims as soon as possible. We have brought proposals, initial proposals to start discussions and later negotiations. They contain about 8 or 9 points and include everything: hostages, including the humanitarian mission, and so on and so forth. So this is in fact an exchange of documents and an exchange of visions from the Ukrainian side, from our side, so that we can look for common ground and be fellow passengers at some stage”, Andrey Purgin pointed out.

The key points were as follows:

1. Stop the special operation to hold free elections in the regions based on the principles of independent self-government;
2. Set up a committee to work out a treaty on a peaceful settlement of the conflict in Ukraine and the reconstruction of the Donbass;
3. Grant amnesty to political prisoners, rebels, politicians, deputies and members of the cabinets of ministers of the Republics;
4. Agree on a special regime of law enforcement and the appointment of prosecutors and judges by the authorities of the Republics;
5. Guarantee the right of the official use of the Russian language on their territories.
6. Create conditions for refugees to return.

107. (Russian) Первый канал: Контактная группа по Украине завершила консультации в Минске. URL: http://www.1tv.ru/news/world/266714
The Donetsk and Luhansk Republics had another proposal on sharing space with Ukraine and, Purgin stressed, this point implied a common security space. Other participants in the meeting did not talk to the press and went to the hall straight from their cars. Recording was allowed for not more than two minutes. The members of the Contact Group remained reserved in front of the cameras all this time. They did not shake hands, they took their seats at the table and asked reporters to leave. The doors were closed.

It was reported that journalists from Russia, Byelorussia and representatives of major world news agencies covered the work of the Contact Group. However, there were no correspondents from the Ukrainian media. Correspondents had to wait for the participants to leave for more than four hours. Deputy Prime Minister of the DPR Andrei Purgin was the only one to talk with the media after the meeting was over.

“The negotiations took the form of preliminary discussions and we exchanged documents. The Ukrainian side showed its perspective on the situation in one of these documents, while we gave them our documents. We are going to study it now. We are meeting again on the 5th to continue discussions and they are going to be more detailed. We are going to discuss possible stages and steps that would lead to a ceasefire and we are going to actively discuss the possibility of an exchange of hostages — all for all”, he said.

Representatives of the people’s republics asked Kiev to replace Former President Leonid Kuchma. They said they wanted to negotiate with incumbent politicians in government office.

**Contact Group Negotiations on September 5**

As of Friday night, September 5, parties to the conflict in the east of Ukraine were to stop fighting. The decision of the ceasefire was made by the meeting of the Contact Group in Minsk, which comprised representatives of Ukraine, the OSCE, Russia and the self-proclaimed republics. Nevertheless, no one could give a 100 % guarantee of a compliance with the agreements.108

---

108. (Russian) Газета.ru: В шесть часов вечера после войны. URL:http://www.gazeta.ru/politics/2014/09/05_a_6204229.shtml
“The ceasefire protocol was signed to come into effect at 18.00 on Friday (local time — Ed.). The protocol consists of 14 points including all aspects of control, hostage exchange and other questions”, sources close to the negotiations reported. The Ukrainian President’s twitter account specified that the protocol was preliminary.

In turn, head of the LPR Igor Plotnitsky stated that the “ceasefire is a necessary solution” and pointed out that the secession policy would continue.

Previously, Russia’s President and his Ukrainian counterpart had outlined proposals to settle the conflict. The heads of the DPR and LPR Alexander Zakharchenko and Igor Plotnitsky also put forward a peace plan involving a no-fly zone over the Donbass and a demilitarized security zone divided into five sectors under the supervision of OSCE monitors. In addition, the representatives of the self-proclaimed republics called for the opening, on September 7, of humanitarian corridors to ship supplies into the regions.

Putin’s plan also included humanitarian aid, hostage exchange and sending reconstruction brigades to the Donbass after the ceasefire. “An end to active offensive operations ... in Donetsk and Luhansk” was the starting point of the Russian President’s plan.

Since the beginning of the conflict in the east of Ukraine Moscow has insisted on the federalization of its neighbouring country, with greater regional autonomy. The rebel leaders from the DPR, from Deputy Prime Minister Andrei Purgin to Prime Minister Alexander Zakharchenko, have insisted on state independence. Moscow has reiterated on many occasions that it is not a party in the conflict.

Although Ukrainian Prime Minister Arseniy Yatsenyuk called Putin’s plan an attempt at “eye-washing” and demanded the withdrawal of Russian troops from the Donbass, Poroshenko agreed with the peace plan.

“We are going to do our best to stop the aggression, to stop the warfare because it is Ukraine that is paying the highest price every day and we are losing our soldiers and innocent civilians”, he said before the meeting in Minsk. The President promised that Ukraine would remain sovereign, independent and undivided.
Participants of the negotiating groups in Minsk have changed several times. In June, former Prime Minister of the DPR Alexander Borodai was the “contact face” of the rebels. Political scientist Aleksey Makarkin considers Borodai and former commander-in-chief of the DPR Igor Strelkov advocates of radical national-patriotic views ready to march to Lvov; therefore, they had to be “pushed aside” at some point.

“The initial idea was to create a proto-state entity à la Russian traditionalist or Russian Orthodox-Communist kind of enclave of Russia, free from Western values of globalization. But the idea failed”, Makarkin thinks.

Several stages of the negotiations in Donetsk have failed and, afterwards, locals have taken leading positions in the DPR.

“The national patriots exhausted themselves and the concept of positioning the conflict in the Donbass as internally Ukrainian emerged; therefore, locals were engaged instead of Russians”, Makarkin said. Borodai was replaced with Alexander Zakharchenko, who is close to the former Donetsk administration, and Donetsk militiaman Nikolay Kononov took the place of Strelkov.

On Friday September 5, it was already the new leaders who participated in the negotiations: Prime Ministers Alexander Zakharchenko and Igor Plotnitsky. Unlike Deputy Prime Minister of the DPR Andrei Purgin who had taken part in the previous round of consultations, these figures have a far higher status in the hierarchy of the self-proclaimed republics. Participation of the Prime Ministers undoubtedly increased their legitimacy.

Moreover, Zakharchenko and Plotnitsky are locals and it should be easier for Ukrainians to negotiate with them, explains Makarkin. The politologist defines Zakharchenko as a complicated person who is able to maneuver. The following example is telling: Ukrainian singer Ruslana came to see him recently to discuss a hostage exchange. She later said that Zakharchenko had impressed her strongly and pointed out many times that he was “one of them”, a Ukrainian who disapproved of and disliked fugitive President Viktor Yanukovich.
“But in front of reporters he is a staunch advocate of independence. We will find out later which position is just a game”, Makarkin says. While the Russian task is the Republic’s legitimacy, Kiev seeks to save maximum room for maneuver. Leonid Kuchma represented Ukraine in Minsk again, as previously.

“If at these meetings Ukraine has to address Zakharchenko as “Prime Minister” and shake his hand, pensioner Kuchma, who is not even in government office, is going to do it. All his formal manifestations of diplomacy can be later disavowed as a private opinion and scuttle the separatists’ legitimacy. However, all agreements signed will be harder to break. President Poroshenko announced the ceasefire and disavowing the agreement will result in refuting the President’s words”, Makarkin says.

Russia’s Ambassador to Ukraine Mikhail Zurabov, who maintains good relations with the Ukrainian elite, represented Moscow at the negotiations. The political scientist views Zurabov as a moderate figure who more or less satisfies everyone.

Many in the self-proclaimed republics have doubted that the agreements could be fully implemented. “The parties participating in the negotiations do not fully control the situation. And if the arrangements are sabotaged, the opposite side will be blamed. Technically, a ceasefire is possible, but local fighting is likely to persist”, a coordinator of non-humanitarian aid to the DPR, Alexander Zhuchkovskiy, commented.

**The text of the Minsk Protocol**

The Protocol signed by the Trilateral Contact Group on September 5 in Minsk was promulgated on Saturday night, September 7. Besides previously announced ideas, the documents proposed passing a law on a special status for the self-proclaimed republics, and holding early elections\(^{109}\).

The Minsk Protocol includes the following twelve points:

1. To ensure an immediate bilateral ceasefire.
2. To ensure the monitoring and verification by the OSCE of the ceasefire.

\(^{109}\) (Russian) Коммерсант.ру: Стали известны все пункты минского соглашения по Украине. URL: http://www.kommersant.ru/doc/2562133
3. A decentralization of power, including through the adoption of the law of Ukraine “on provisional local government in some areas of the Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts” (law on special status).

4. To ensure the permanent monitoring of the Ukrainian-Russian border and verification by the OSCE, with the creation of security zones in the border regions of Ukraine and the Russian Federation.

5. To immediately release all hostages and illegally detained persons.

6. To pass a law on preventing the prosecution and punishment of persons in connection with the events that have taken place in some areas of the Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts.

7. To continue the inclusive national dialogue.

8. To take measures to improve the humanitarian situation in the Donbass.

9. To ensure early local elections in accordance with the law of Ukraine “on provisional local government in some areas of the Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts” (law on special status).

10. To withdraw illegal armed groups, military equipment, as well as fighters and mercenaries from Ukraine.

11. To adopt a program of economic recovery and restoration of living conditions in the Donbass region.

12. To provide personal security for the participants in the consultations.

The following representatives signed the document: OSCE representative Heidi Tagliavini, Former President of Ukraine Leonid Kuchma, Russian Ambassador to Ukraine Mikhail Zurabov, as well as DPR and LPR leaders Alexander Zakharchenko and Igor Plotnitsky, with no specification of the positions of the latter two. This fact apparently brought about the idea that the DPR and LPR representatives participated in the negotiations in Minsk as observers, rather than parties to the negotiations.

The day the Minsk Protocol was signed, the representa-
tives of the self-proclaimed DPR and LPR submitted a number of measures for OSCE’s consideration, to implement the agreements reached. And called on the organization to ensure control of the ceasefire. “We think it is very important to stop the bloodshed and prevent a humanitarian catastrophe in the southeastern regions. Implementation of these tasks strongly calls for the potential and experience of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. We are relying on the priority measures proposed by the DPR and LPR to be agreed on as soon as possible”, says the appeal to the OSCE signed by A. Zakharchenko and Igor Plotnitsky cited by RIA Novosti\(^\text{112}\).

“We expect that the OSCE will ensure an impartial international control of the ceasefire and an objective monitoring of the situation in the southeast of Ukraine”, the document says.

Despite the ceasefire arrangements, explosions and shooting were heard in the outskirts of Donetsk and Mariupol on Sunday morning. Deputy Prime Minister of the DPR Andrei Purgin said that rebels did not use and were not planning to use arms.

**Memorandum of September 19**

On September 19, representatives of the Kiev regime (L. Kuchma) and the rebels (A. Zakharchenko and Igor Plotnitsky) signed a memorandum in Minsk and mediated by a Russian representative (M. Zurabov), calling for the withdrawal of heavy arms (of caliber above 100 mm) to a distance of not less than 15 km away from the line of contact and the prohibition of the flight of combat aircraft and the placement of landmine barriers in the safety zone\(^\text{113}\).

The OSCE website published the original of the Memorandum on the Protocol from the meetings of the Trilateral Contact Group, outlining the parameters for the implementation of the Peace Plan of the President of Ukraine P. Poroshenko and the initiatives of the President of Russia V. Putin.

---

\(^{112}\) (Russian) РИА Новости: ДНР и ЛНР предложили ОБСЕ меры по реализации минских договоренностей. URL: http://ria.ru/world/20140907/1023109943.html

\(^{113}\) (Russian) Интерфакс-Россия: ОБСЕ опубликовала оригинал минского Меморандума. URL: http://www.interfax-russia.ru/South/special.asp?id=542099&sec=1724
The document says that in accordance with point 1 of the Protocol signed on September 5, participants of the Trilateral Contact Group representing Ukraine, Russia, OSCE and certain areas of the Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts had reached an understanding regarding the following measures aimed at securing an agreement regarding the bilateral cessation of the use of weapons.

The full text of the Memorandum consists of the following points:
1. Cessation of the use of weapons shall be considered to be general.
2. Stopping all military and militia units in their positions as of September 19.
3. A ban on the use of all types of weapons and offensive action.
4. Within twenty four hours from the moment of the adoption of this Memorandum, the withdrawal of arms of caliber above 100 mm to a distance of not less than 15 km away from both sides of the line of contact (with the exceptions noted below), including from settlements, which will make it possible to create an area of the cessation of the use of weapons of not less than 30 km in width (security area). At the same time, the withdrawal of artillery systems of caliber above 100 mm to the maximum distance of their firing range away from the line of contact, and, in particular:
   - 100 mm cannon MT-12 – 9 km; 120 mm mortar – 8 km; 122 mm howitzer D-30 (2S1 Gvozdika) – 16 km; 152 mm 2S5 Giatsint-S (2S3 Akatsiya, 2S19 Msta-S, 2A65 Msta-B) – 33 km; MLRS 9K51 Grad – 21 km; 9K57 Uragan – 36 km; 9K58 Smerch – 70 km; MLRS Tornado-G – 40 km; MLRS Tornado-U – 70 km; MLRS Tornado-S – 120 km; – tactical missile systems – 120 km.
5. Under the monitoring of the OSCE, the prohibition of the placement of heavy weaponry and military hardware in the area bound by the settlements of Komsomol'skoye, Kumachevo, Novoazovsk and Sakhanka.
6. The prohibition of the placement of new landmine barriers within the boundaries of the security area.
The obligation to remove previously placed landmine-explosive barriers within the security area.

7. The prohibition, from the moment of the adoption of this Memorandum, of the flights of combat aircraft and foreign unmanned aerial vehicles (“UAV”), with the exception of UAVs used by the monitoring (observer) mission of the OSCE, along the entire line of contact between the sides in the area of the cessation of the use of weapons, to a width of not less than 30 km.

8. Within twenty-four hours from the moment of the adoption of this Memorandum, the deployment in the area of the cessation of the use of weapons of a monitoring (observer) mission of the OSCE, consisting of groups of observers of the Organization. The above-noted area should be divided into sectors, the number and the boundaries of which shall be agreed upon in the course of preparation for the work of the monitoring (observer) mission of the OSCE.

9. The removal of all foreign armed groups, military hardware, as well as militants and mercenaries from the territory of Ukraine, to be monitored by the OSCE.

The document is dated September 19, 2014. It was signed by ambassador Heidi Tagliavini (OSCE), Second President of Ukraine Leonid Kuchma, Ambassador of the Russian Federation in Ukraine Mikhail Zurabov, as well as Alexander Zakharchenko (DPR) and Igor Plotnitsky (LPR).

REACTION TO THE MINSK AGREEMENT

Joint Statement of the Donetsk People’s Republic and Luhansk People’s Republic

Supporting the initiatives of the President of Russia V. Putin, the Donetsk People’s Republic and Luhansk People’s Republic participated in yet another round of meetings of the Trilateral Contact Group that took place on September 5 this year in Minsk.
The fact that the DPR Prime Minister A. Zakharchenko and the LPR Prime Minister I. Plotnitsky took part in the negotiations representing the DPR and LPR respectively shows how much attention was given to the initiatives of V. Putin. Both people’s republics were represented by the heads of state, i.e. the top officials sanctioned to make decisions and be responsible for their implementation at the highest level.

Ukraine, on the other hand, was represented by Former President L. Kuchma who has no powers and is not accountable for decisions made. This fact demonstrated that the Ukrainian side turned the negotiations into a farce and mere formality, declining all the responsibility for any violations of the signed Protocol outlining the parameters for the implementation of the Peace Plan of the President of Ukraine P. Poroshenko and the initiatives of the President of Russia V. Putin, because no Ukrainian official with the relevant authority has signed it.

Ukraine needs the ceasefire negotiations for the sole purpose of arranging military redeployment and regaining the strength and means to continue the punitive aggressive war. This is proven by statements of A. Lysenko, a representative of the National Security and Defense Council of Ukraine, made live on September 6, 2014 and the continued shelling by the Kiev regime of cities and villages in our republics, resulting in people being injured and killed, including civilians.

Remaining committed to the responsibilities assumed by the ceasefire, the Donetsk People’s Republic and the Luhansk People’s Republic STATE: the first time Ukraine’s punitive formations use arms, we reserve the right to resume the military operation to release the occupied territories of the Donetsk and Luhansk People’s Republics.  

The UN Secretary General Welcomes the Ceasefire in Ukraine

UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon welcomed the agreement of a ceasefire in the east of Ukraine. He encouraged all who committed to the agreement to display good will and take concrete steps towards urgent, full and effective implementation, his spokesman Stéphane Dujarric reported\textsuperscript{115}.

He also added that the cessation of hostilities would allow humanitarian organisations to deliver critical assistance and other needed support to the affected areas.

Barack Obama Expresses Skepticism

The US and EU sanctions against Russia may be lifted if all the points of the agreement on the ceasefire in Ukraine are implemented, US President Barack Obama told journalists at a press-conference after the NATO summit in Wales\textsuperscript{116}.

“If in fact the elements of the plan that has been signed are implemented, then the sanctions could be lifted”, the US President said.

However, B. Obama viewed the ceasefire agreement with skepticism. He feared that it would be violated, with the rebels more likely to do this. In addition, he once again blamed Russia for violating Ukraine’s sovereignty. Therefore, Obama said, the ceasefire needed to be tested.

Vladimir Putin Welcomes the Peace Agreement

“The administration of Russia’s President welcomes the signing of the Minsk Protocol on the results of the decisions of the Trilateral Contact Group to implement the initiatives of P. Poroshenko and V. Putin”, Dmitry Peskov, spokesperson for the President of Russia, reported.

“Moscow expresses hopes that all the points of the document and the agreements reached will be thoroughly implemented by the par-

\textsuperscript{115} (Russian) Русская служба новостей: Генсек ООН приветствует решение о прекращении огня на Украине. URL: http://rusnovosti.ru/news/339551/

\textsuperscript{116} (Russian) НТВ: Обама скептически отнесся к протоколу о прекращении огня на Украине. URL: http://www.ntv.ru/novosti/1208076/#ixzz3JbiZGxR3
ties, as well as for further negotiations to settle the crisis in Ukraine completely”, ITAR-TASS cited Peskov’s statement\textsuperscript{117}.

**The Council of Europe and NATO**

**Welcome the Ceasefire**

Secretary General of the Council of Europe Thorbjørn Jagland welcomed the agreement on a ceasefire and truce reached by the Contact Group in Minsk, his press spokesperson Daniel Holtgen reported\textsuperscript{118}.

“Everyone I talked to yesterday in Moscow and previously in Kiev wanted to put an end to the bloodshed and a ceasefire to start. I am happy to hear this has become reality now”, the Secretary General of the Council of Europe said.

NATO “welcomed warmly” the agreements reached in Minsk, “if they result in a true ceasefire”, NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen said at the end of the NATO summit.

“NATO hopes that the Minsk agreements will signal the start of a constructive political process in Ukraine”, Rasmussen added.

**Lyashko Accuses Poroshenko of Capitulation**

On his Facebook page, head of the Radical Party Oleh Lyashko said that the agreements in Minsk are a disguised capitulation of Poroshenko before Putin\textsuperscript{119}.

“The signed disgraceful document imposes on Ukraine a Russian algorithm for the solution to a conflict Russia created itself, outlined by the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs as long ago as the spring. This is why the protocol contains neither an immediate withdrawal of Russian troops and special divisions from the territory of the Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts, nor the direct responsibility of Russia to stop trans-border shipment of arms”, he wrote.

\textsuperscript{117} (Russian) Вести: Песков: Кремль приветствует минские договоренности о мире на востоке Украины. URL: http://www.vesti.ru/doc.html?id=1947352

\textsuperscript{118} (Russian) Mail.ru: Мinskие соглашения: реакция в России и в мире. URL: http://news.mail.ru/politics/19435744/

\textsuperscript{119} (Russian) РБК-Украина: Ляшко назвал минские соглашения “капитуляцией Порошенко перед Путиным”. URL: http://www.rbc.ua/rus/news/politics/lyashko-nazval-minskie-soglasheniya-kapitulyatsiy-poroshenko-08092014154900
Lyashko thinks that the signed document crudely violates the Constitution of Ukraine and Ukrainian laws, including the Supreme Rada rule adopted in mid-April on his initiative.

The leader of the Radical Party stressed that the Protocol also did not include compensation by Russia for losses “to Ukrainian citizens, economy, social sphere and infrastructure suffered due to the armed annexation of Crimea and occupation of part of the Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts”.

Lyashko added that “in allowing Kuchma to sign the Protocol, Poroshenko, in essence, agreed to play by the aggressor’s – Putin’s – rules”.

In addition, the politician said that such concessions were inadmissible for him and an overwhelming majority of Ukrainian citizens. This is why he called for further fighting for Ukraine, its independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity.
An electoral campaign for the early elections of people’s deputies of the Supreme Rada unfolded amid the ongoing war in the Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts. The victorious ending to the “anti-terrorist operation” and maintaining Ukraine’s territorial integrity within its current borders became the key electoral points of most political parties that took part in the elections. Democratic slogans of the winning Maidan paradoxically (or naturally?) did not allow for giving residents of the newly formed people’s republics the right to choose their own fate. “Separatists” or “terrorists” are what they were called. The competition between the “Maidan” parties consisted only of finding out who would come up with the harshest measures against the Donbass.

In June 2014, newly elected President Petro Poroshenko stated that “supporting public sentiment for a full renewal of power, he intends to announce early parliamentary elections”. On July 24, the Supreme Rada saw a rupture in the coalition of the European Choice deputy faction, with The Svoboda All-Ukrainian Union and the UDAR Party leaving it. This was a legal opportunity for the President to hold early elections.

120. (Russian) Левый Берег. УДАР и «Свобода» вышли из коалиции, Рада будет распущена. URL: http://lb.ua/news/2014/07/24/273948_uder_vishel_koalitsii_.html
On August 24, Ukrainian Independence Day, the President announced his intention to dissolve Parliament. On August 25, he dissolved the 7th Supreme Rada121.

The snap parliamentary election in Ukraine took place on October 26, 2014. Ukrainians voted in a mixed electoral system, with a half of the deputies chosen according to party lists, and the other half in majority constituencies, with a 5% election threshold.

The election was held in a difficult situation amid a political crisis and military actions in the southeast of the country.

ELECTION PROCEDURE

Like in the previous parliamentary election (2012), the 2014 elections were held with a mixed electoral system: according to the law, 225 of 450 deputies are elected according to party lists, with the other 225 from majority constituencies.

However, given Crimea’s entering the Russian Federation as a result of a referendum, and the ongoing armed conflict in the east of Ukraine, only 198 of 225 were elected from constituencies.

According to the so-called “law on the status of temporarily occupied territories”, the election was not held in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and Sevastopol, where 12 majority constituencies are located: constituencies № 1-10 in the ARC and constituencies № 224 and 225 in Sevastopol.

Moreover, the election did not take place in 9 out of the 21 constituencies in the Donetsk Oblast and in 6 out of the 11 in the Luhansk Oblast. Ballots were not given to constituencies № 41, 42, 43, 44 (Donetsk), 51 (Gorlovka), 54 (Shakhtyorsk), 55 and 56 (Makeyevka), 61 (Starobeshevo) in the Donetsk Oblast, as well as constituencies № 104, 105 (Luhansk), 108 (Krasniy Luch), 109 (Krasnodon), 110 (Alchevsk) and 111 (Sverdlovsk) in the Luhansk Oblast122.

121. (Russian) Итоги 25 августа: Порошенко распустил Раду и объявил перевыборы, Кличко-младший отказался от титульного боя. URL: http://allnewsua.org/news-44299.html
122. (Russian) NEWSru.ua. По данным ЦИК, на Донбассе выборы не состоятся в 15 округах. URL: http://rus.newsru.ua/ukraine/25oct2014/nevidbydytsia.html
On July 31, the time for conducting electoral campaigns was reduced from 60 to 45 days.\(^{123}\)

On September 17, the Central Electoral Commission of Ukraine confirmed the snap election budget at 957.8 million hryvnias. On September 26, the registration of people’s deputies was finished, with 29 political parties taking part in the election.

On September 29, the CEC confirmed the form and text of the ballots according to party lists. The text is printed in the official state language on one side of a single sheet of paper of ivory color, with the use of special visible and invisible safety inks that change their characteristics under UV and infrared light, graphic safety elements, as well as with the number of the ballot station in protective ink. In addition, the CEC created a review committee to oversee the printing, by the government enterprise Polygraph Combine Ukraina and by The Central Bank Banknote Printing and Minting Works, of voting ballots for voting according to party lists and in constituencies. The committee consisted of representatives of parliamentary factions.

On October 2, Minister of Internal Affairs Arsen Avakov said that volunteer battalions of the Ministry would be used to ensure law and order during the election. On October 17, a joint session of representatives of the Prosecutor General’s Office, the Security Service of Ukraine and the Ministry of Internal Affairs, announced creating an office within the Ministry to ensure order during the election and to prevent voter bribing and manipulation of electoral documents. 82 thousand law enforcement officers maintained order on the Election Day, with 61 thousand protecting the documents, 18 thousand responsible for law enforcement on the streets, and another 4 thousand in a special response team in territories where “terrorist activity and aggressive action is possible by candidates”.

On October 3, the CEC confirmed the budget for preparation and holding the snap Supreme Rada election for foreign polling stations worth 7 million hryvnias, including 3.3 million for stationery.

\(^{123}\) (Russian) Левый Берег. Порошенко, Яценюк и Турчинов договорились сократить сроки предвыборной гонки. URL: http://lb.ua/news/2014/07/31/274753_poroshenko_yatsenyuk_turchinov.html
0.3 million for gas for vehicles, 0.6 million for arranging business trips and 2.8 million for other expenses. On October 11, the CEC set up 113 electoral committees abroad, with 63 representatives of political parties and 1514 representatives of electoral committees put forward by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

On October 13, Ukraine’s First National TV channel saw the first round of debates between the parties, the draw for participants of which had been held on October 7. The Communist Party refused to take part in the debates. In total, there were 7 rounds, each holding debates between four political forces on questions of four themes: domestic and foreign policy, the economy and issues of social and cultural policy.

August 2014 saw a rupture within the Fatherland Union (Batkivchshyna). Yulia Tymoshenko was reported to be planning to lead the new look party in the election, while a number of figures from the “old team”, including A. Yatsenyuk, O. Turchynov, S. Pashinsky and Arsen Avakov, would take part in the election separately from the party. They were also reported to be negotiating at joint effort with Dnipropetrovsk governor Ihor Kolomoisky. On September 14, the Fatherland party convention unilaterally accepted military pilot Nadezhda Savchenko as a member of the party and she was placed first on the pre-election party list.

On September 14, secretary of the Party of Regions presidium Borys Kolesnikov said that the party was not going to take part in the snap parliamentary election or the local elections in the territories controlled by the DPR and LPR because “the Party of Regions has no moral right to participate in the election when almost 7 million voters (in the southeast) cannot vote”. It was later revealed that the party members would participate in the election as independents and on the lists of other parties. The party considered the proportional election to be illegitimate and expected lawsuits from voters.

It is noteworthy that this was the first parliamentary election in the history of modern Ukraine to have two ruling parties – the People’s Front and the Petro Poroshenko Bloc – participating in the voting.
During the electoral campaign, some activists and journalists running for the Supreme Rada from the Democratic Alliance, the Petro Poroshenko Bloc, Batkivshchyna and the People’s Front, including reporters Mustafa Nayyem and Serhiy Leshchenko, called on their campaign offices to join against “scandalous candidates notorious for corruption, separatism and human rights abuse” and supported a single candidate in the respective constituencies. The People’s Front identified 11 constituencies where it, the Petro Poroshenko Bloc and Batkivshchyna would choose a single candidate. At a session of the second stage of its 13th Convention and after preliminary consultations with other democratic political forces, Batkivshchyna removed its candidates in six constituencies. On October 13, Mykola Tomenko, running for parliament from the Petro Poroshenko Bloc, announced that his party and the People’s Front had agreed candidates for the Verhovna Rada in 20 single-mandate constituencies. The Radical Party also decided to remove six candidates.

**Participants**

In total, 29 parties took part in the election according to party lists in the following order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Political Party</th>
<th>Number of Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Oleh Lyashko’s Radical Party</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Solidarity of the Women of Ukraine</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Internet Party of Ukraine</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Opposition Bloc</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The People’s Front</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The Zastup All Ukrainian Agrarian Union</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Revival</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>New Politics</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>United Country</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The Power of People</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The All-Ukrainian Union Freedom (Svoboda)</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The National Democratic Party of Ukraine</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>The Communist Party of Ukraine</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The Self Reliance Union</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Political Party</th>
<th>Number of Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The All-Ukrainian Political Union Ukraine is One Country</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>The Right Sector</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The Ukraine of the Future</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>The Liberal Party of Ukraine</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The Party of Greens of Ukraine</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Green Planet</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The Petro Poroshenko Bloc</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Strength and Honour</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>The Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>A Strong Ukraine</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>The Fatherland (Batkivshchyna)</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>(Anatoly Gritsenko’s) Civil Position</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The Bloc of Left Forces of Ukraine</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>The People’s Movement of Ukraine</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turnout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oblast</th>
<th>as of 12:00</th>
<th>as of 16:00</th>
<th>as of 20:00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vinnytsia Oblast</td>
<td>20.78</td>
<td>44.28</td>
<td>58.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volyn Oblast</td>
<td>23.16</td>
<td>47.47</td>
<td>64.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dnipropetrovsk Oblast</td>
<td>19.98</td>
<td>37.70</td>
<td>47.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donetsk Oblast</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>25.96</td>
<td>32.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhytomyr Oblast</td>
<td>22.80</td>
<td>44.57</td>
<td>56.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakarpattia Oblast</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>33.67</td>
<td>44.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zaporizhia Oblast</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>38.29</td>
<td>47.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivano-Frankivsk Oblast</td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>48.12</td>
<td>63.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiev Oblast</td>
<td>24.01</td>
<td>45.21</td>
<td>57.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirovohrad Oblast</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>44.51</td>
<td>53.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luhansk Oblast</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>24.27</td>
<td>32.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lviv Oblast</td>
<td>19.65</td>
<td>49.93</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykolaiv Oblast</td>
<td>20.22</td>
<td>35.72</td>
<td>42.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odessa Oblast</td>
<td>14.56</td>
<td>29.67</td>
<td>39.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poltava Oblast</td>
<td>22.71</td>
<td>43.09</td>
<td>54.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivne Oblast</td>
<td>21.17</td>
<td>46.62</td>
<td>59.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumy Oblast</td>
<td>23.68</td>
<td>44.34</td>
<td>54.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblast</td>
<td>as of 12:00</td>
<td>as of 16:00</td>
<td>as of 20:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ternopil Oblast</td>
<td>19.77</td>
<td>47.78</td>
<td>68.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharkiv Oblast</td>
<td>18.56</td>
<td>35.49</td>
<td>45.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kherson Oblast</td>
<td>19.58</td>
<td>34.23</td>
<td>41.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khmelnitsky Oblast</td>
<td>23.98</td>
<td>47.89</td>
<td>60.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherkassy Oblast</td>
<td>25.84</td>
<td>45.46</td>
<td>56.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chernivtsi Oblast</td>
<td>16.70</td>
<td>36.91</td>
<td>48.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chernihiv Oblast</td>
<td>22.68</td>
<td>44.84</td>
<td>56.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiev</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>42.26</td>
<td>55.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.33</strong></td>
<td><strong>40.69</strong></td>
<td><strong>52.42</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IRREGULARITIES**
**DURING THE ELECTORAL CAMPAIGN**

**Attacks on Candidates**

The electoral campaign in Ukraine saw acts of violence against candidates for deputies and incumbent deputies. Ukrainian deputies and officials were “publicly lustrated” one by one with the use of waste bins, paint and threats. This is the background of the electoral campaign, showing that political opponents allowed violence against individual deputies and political forces.

On September 6, 2014, representatives of the Right Sector in Odessa met with Oleh Rudenko, acting director of the oblast office of the Social Insurance Fund for Temporary Incapacity to Work, and pushed him into a garbage bin. The attack was triggered by the fact that Rudenko had been detained a week before by the Security Service of Ukraine while taking a bribe worth 558 thousand hryvnias. He had demanded that the heads of health facilities pay a bribe for the allotment of state funds sent to children’s summer camps, including children from eastern regions. The Primorsky Rayon Court of original jurisdiction removed Rudenko from his position for the two months of the trial. However, he appealed the conviction and remained in office after paying a fine of 600 thousand hryvnias.

124. Attack on Oleh Rudenko (video): http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eW8M7GAubbc
On September 16, Ukrainian MP Vitaly Zhuravsky went out for a break between sessions of the Supreme Rada and suffered an attack by Maidan activists who threw him into a garbage bin125. The perpetrators did not let him get out saying that “he was one of those who was making their brothers and friends die”. Vitaly Zhuravsky is known as the author of a law on libel that provoked a wave of protests among Ukrainian journalists.

On September 18, Ternopil Right Sector activists carried out “lustration” of the city’s government officials and threw the Chief of Staff of the Ternopol Regional State Administration Vitaly Fedak into a garbage bin126. The activists forced the official to write a letter of resignation and dragged him outside to throw him into a garbage bin. As the Right Sector itself reported, Fedak “is an active supporter and member of the Party of Regions and gained his position under Viktor Yanukovich”.

On September 19, Maidan activists threw deputy Mykola Koretsky into a garbage bin in Kirovohrad after a session of Kirovohrad Oblast Council127. Mykola Koretsky heads a permanent real estate, privatization and use of property committee within Kirovohrad Oblast Council. At the session, Koretsky protested against the vote of non-confidence of the newly appointed head of the Oblast Administration Council, an anti-Maidan participant and former member of the Party of Regions Serhiy Kuzmenko.

On September 23, people’s deputy Vitaly Grushevsky was attacked during an interview for GROM TV. 15 people surrounded him near the Supreme Rada and accused him of “taking money from Former President Viktor Yanukovich”, showed him a piece of paper with a signature on it, and beat him.

On September 25, activists caught MP Viktor Pylypyshyn in Kiev near the CEC, doused him with red paint and threw him into a garbage bin128. The mob was punishing him for supporting the January 16 laws and for trying to register as a parliamentary candidate.

125. Attack on Vitaly Zhuravsky (video): http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YjmksbBnObg
126. Attack on Vitaly Fedak (video): http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fa_EExqI9Qw
128. Attack on Viktor Pylypyshyn (video): http://news.bigmir.net/ukraine/848016-Depytata-Pilipishina-brosili-v-mysornik
again. After the attack, Pylypyshyn said he had recognized the three assailants. He said they were members of the nationalist Svoboda (Freedom) Party. Pylypyshyn had had a long-lasting conflict with Svoboda members — nationalist Yuriy Levchenko was his direct rival in constituency 57 during the 2012 parliamentary elections. According to Pylypyshyn, all three attackers had taken part in Levchenko’s electoral campaign.

On September 25, representatives of the Maidan coordination council pushed two MPs into dumpsters in Cherkassy, demanding lustration. The activists attacked former first Deputy Chairman of the Cherkassy Regional Council Vladimir Vovchenko and another deputy of the Regional Council Alexander Kharlamov.

On September 26, activists threw the first Deputy Chairman of the Rivne Regional Council Alexander Danilchuk into a dumpster. He was elected an MP from the Batkivshchyna but the activists accused him of cooperating with the formerly ruling Party of Regions (Danilchuk himself said he did not support the Party of Regions). His opponents led him out of the oblast council and threw him into a dumpster shouting “Disgrace!” He spent a few minutes in there and then they let him out.

On September 30, Right Sector activists beat MP Nestor Shufrych, who was running for a majority constitution, again at the building of the Odessa Oblast State Administration. He had a press-conference scheduled at noon in the Odessa media center opposite the Oblast Administration. Several dozen Right Sector representatives wearing camouflage and balaclavas stormed the building, blocked the entrance and brought in a dumpster. The radicals demanded that Shufrych leave Odessa and threatened to kill him if he refused. Then they tried to push him into the dumpster, and a fight broke out, as a result of which Shufrych was taken to hospital.

129. Attack on deputies in Cherkassy (video): http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UMlPqDHOeL0
130. Attack on Alexander Kharlamov (video): http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aiXCXgFW39A
with concussion. There were several dozen policemen in the Oblast Administration but they did not intervene to stop the radicals.

October 2 saw an attack on chairman of district committee № 33 in Krivoy Rog Alexander Marmo. Over a dozen young people poured brilliant green on him, threw flour, chanted “lustration” and left. It is noteworthy that Mamro is headmaster of school 82 and volunteered to work in an electoral commission for free 133.

In addition, an unwarranted search at a candidate’s relatives was recorded in Dnipropetrovsk.

Social networks actively support the “public lustrations”, with online groups created called “Deputat Bucket Challenge” (analogous to the famous Ice Bucket Challenge flash mob, where people douse themselves in ice water and give money to charity).

“Lustrators” went unpunished for a long time: Ministry of Internal Affairs officers witnessing such acts did not intervene in these acts of revenge. It was only in early October that law enforcement started to react: Kiev police spokeswoman Yulia Mustash reported that lawsuits could be filed against activists who threw MPs into dumpsters even, without the officials themselves filing charges, only using information in the media. A lawsuit was filed in Cherkassy on a charge of “hooliganism”. The Kiev Police Office detained one of the suspects for “involvement in pouring” red paint on deputy Pylypyshyn and inflicting light bodily injuries.

Lustrators have accused almost all the “dumpstered” deputies of corruption, bribery or sabotage of duties. The practice of throwing unwanted politicians into garbage bins is a sign of regression back to the wild Middle Ages, rather than how civilized or socially conscious Ukrainians are. A revival of such practices in the 21st century shows that society lacks a functional system of procedural and legal control over authorities. Courts are dysfunctional. A fight or a dumpster are the only escape in this situation allowing an expression of how people feel about officials.

Permitted hooliganism and public humiliation lay the foundation for new social models of behavior, including a policy of anything goes.

---

133. (Russian) Первый Криворожский. В Кривом Роге облили зеленкой председателя окружной комиссии. URL: http://1kr.ua/news-16988.html
and a lack of any authority, which may result in complete chaos and anarchy. If nothing changes, bus drivers, doctors and shop keepers will be lustrated, too. In this case, there can be no hope of a lawful state.

Violence during the electoral campaign in Ukraine remains unpunished, which stimulates lawlessness. If similar incidents continue, this will call into question just how democratic this election is. Besides all these complications in the political life of Ukraine, violence against opponents renders Ukrainian democracy illusive.

The Use of Administrative Resource

The new Kiev regime has been using administrative resource: the Communist Party and the Party of Regions are denied access to local TV channels and radio-stations, which is far from “transparent campaigning”.

There is information that many candidates who ran in majority constituencies were faced with questions of whether they had been “agreed” by superiors. If not, there were no guarantees they would be allowed into meetings with voters at schools, hospitals, etc. Therefore, it is hard to say there is less administrative resource now than, for instance, in the Yanukovich regime. Moreover, the Committee of Voters of Ukraine registered attempts to bribe voters in some constituencies.

Many oblasts registered instances of damage to and removal of the posters and billboards of some political forces, including the Opposition Bloc.

Bribing Voters

According to the OPORA civil network, a Mykolaiv candidate Nadezha Ivanova arranged a celebration for pensioners on October 1. After a free theatrical performance, “the audience” was given grocery baskets containing a kilo of sugar, pasta, buckwheat and rice plus the candidate’s advertising leaflets134.

---

134. (Russian) НикВести. В Николаеве от имени кандидата в нардепы одаривали пенсионеров гречкой и макаронами. URL: http://nikvesti.com/news/politics/59550
Deputy Dmitry Dobkin (brother of former ex-presidential candidate Mykhailo Dobkin), running for re-election as a self-nominated candidate in the Kharkiv Oblast, was caught paying a bribe to get re-elected to the Parliament. His grocery basket included buckwheat, tea, cans of food, condensed milk, vegetable oil and a signed card with Dobkin’s picture and a message saying “I wish you health”135. Such food rations from Dobkin’s Charity fund go to war veterans, pensioners and public servants.

Majority Vladimir Menzelintsev and Tatyana Domilovskaya (husband and wife), constituency candidates of the Strong Ukraine Party in the Odessa Oblast, gave kindergarten employees commemorative certificates, presents and flowers in celebration of their professional holiday136. Interestingly, Tatyana Domilovskaya is the director of the lucky kindergarten.

In Odessa, Dmitry Golubov, a candidate in the Suvorovsky Rayon, gave away sets of cheap Chinese bed linen in bags marked “Deeds are trusted. Dmitry Golubov” 137. The bags were given away on September 29 at around 5pm, in the Zvyezdna cinema, after an event dedicated to the famous singer Anna German, to which pensioners from the neighborhood had been invited. Given that the presents cost about 200 hryvnias each and there were approximately 300 pensioners in attendance, the candidate gave away about 60,000 hryvnias in 10 minutes.

Vyshhorod registered another instance of bribing voters. “Volunteers” visited pensioners and gave away people’s deputy candidate Yaroslav Moskalenko’s campaign leaflets and 200 hryvnias of “material help”138.

Nadezhda Ivanova, a people’s deputy candidate, arranged food gifts for pensioners in Nikolaevsk Academic Arts Russian Drama Theatre, at a meeting with voters.

137. Dmitry Golubov bribes voters (video): http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h8BkU01TKNw
People’s deputy candidate Vladimir Skorobogatov arranged free food baskets in the Kievsk district of Kharkiv. Another people’s deputy candidate, Vitaly Khomutynnik, also gave away food packages in Kharkiv, on Stadionny Proezd on 10/01. When asked where the food came from, activists replied it was “the Red Cross”.

A charity fund of Petro Poroshenko Bloc candidate in the Zaporizhia Oblast and incumbent deputy Alexander Volkov paid for passengers’ train tickets on the popular Tokmak-Molochansk route.

On October 2, 2014, assistants to candidate and incumbent deputy Ihor Yeremeev, running for re-election in Volyn, gave envelopes of money to several voters at a meeting with voters in a village. Other voters received money certificates of various denominations from the Volyn oblast charity fund Volyn Homeland (Yeremeev is its founder), with every certificate saying “with the support of Ihor Yeremeev”. In addition, the candidate himself freely admitted to the local community asking him to help with new windows for a local kindergarten. The Fund gave 20 thousand hryvnias for this purpose.

On October 10, 2014 representatives of Odessa people’s deputy candidate Serhiy Kivalov arranged generous tables with food of fruit, sweets, meat and wine at a meeting with voters in the Primorsky Rayon (constituency № 135).

The Committee of Voters of Ukraine estimated that majority constituency candidates were planning to spend 1-3 million dollars on the direct and indirect bribery of voters. Besides traditional food baskets and arranging entertainment events, the 2014 campaign used certain bribery innovations, including renovating military hospitals and providing housing for internally displaced people.

All these actions are violations of Clause 14 Article 74 of the Law of Ukraine on “Elections of People’s Deputies”. They can be interpreted as the indirect bribing of voters and can be punished accord-

---


140. (Russian) Зеркало недели. Активисты зафиксировали, как Кивалов подкупает избирателей. URL: http://zn.ua/VYBORY2014/aktivisty-zafiksirovali-kak-kivalov-podkupayet-izbirateley-155517_.html

ing to the Criminal Code of Ukraine. The law on elections says that parliamentary candidates are prohibited from conducting electoral campaigns that include providing money, goods (except goods bearing a visual image of the title, symbols or flag of the party, and if their total value does not exceed 3% of the minimum wage), services, work, securities, loans, lottery tickets, etc. for free or with a discount to voters, institutions, facilities or organizations.

**Access to the Media**

The situation with the media has worsened in Ukraine over the last few months. For instance, there has been a growing number of attacks on journalists, confiscation of their equipment and obstruction of TV broadcasts.

On August 19, the Minister of Internal Affairs of Ukraine Arsen Avakov signed a law on monitoring compliance with the ban on the broadcast of Russian TV channels, which Ukraine accuses of “propagandizing war and violence”. The list of banned channels includes the First Channel, RTR-Planeta, Rossiya 24, NTV-Mir, TVCI (TV Centr), Rossiya 1, NTV, TNT, Peterburg 5, Zvezda, REN-TV, Life News, Russia Today and RBK-TV.

The decision to ban Russian TV channels in Ukraine has been made over the last six months. In February, right after the regime change, the broadcasting of some Russian channels was stopped in the country (for instance, the First Channel Global, RTR-Planeta, Rossiya 24 and NTV-Mir).

The National TV and Radio Council initiatives totally banning the Russian media violate Article 15 of the Constitution of Ukraine, the Laws “On Television and Radio Broadcasting”, “On Print Media (Press) in Ukraine”, “On Information” designed to ensure media freedom in Ukraine and access for citizens to information. The people of Ukraine deserve to have access to different sources of information that reflects all opinions.

According to the Ukrainian Institute of Mass Information, 7 journalists were killed, 270 were beaten or attacked, and 120 instances of the obstruction of professional media activities and 122
censorship instances were registered over nine months in 2014 in Ukraine. For comparison, in 2013 not one journalist was killed or abducted in Ukraine. 97 media employees were beaten or attacked.

**Spoiler Candidates**

So-called spoiler candidates, with similar surnames and/or initials to those of real candidates, are one of the common techniques used to mislead voters.

Spoiler candidates, from spoiler parties not leading their own campaigns, are meant to confuse some voters and, in essence, take away some votes from certain candidates.

For instance, this was recorded in three out of the six constituencies in the Chernihiv Oblast. Thus, the director general of ASTRA LLC., formerly of the Party of Regions and a deputy of the local oblast council, Grigory Nikiforovich Bozhok, was running in constituency №207. He had to compete against a temporarily unemployed and unheard of man called Grigory Vladimirovich Bozhok. Presidential party candidate Dmitrienko Oleg Nikolaevich had to compete with a self-nominated candidate, a plumber, named Oleg Ivanovich Dmitrienko in constituency №210 in the Chernihiv Oblast. In the neighboring constituency №208, the mayor of Bakhmach city Pavel Shimko, running for Parliament from the Radical Party, had to compete with a candidate with an identical name (given name, surname, and patronymic).

Communist candidate Oksana Nikolaevna Kaletnik in constituency № 16 in Vinnytsia was found to have a political “clone” in Iryna Vasilievna Kaletnik, whose passport was issued on September 19, 2014.

Three candidates with almost identical names were registered in constituency № 217 in Kiev, with Vadim Stolyar, Vadim Stolar and another Vadim Stolyar running for election. In addition, three candidates with surname Levchenko were registered in constituency 223 and 2 candidates named Teryokhin in constituency 211.

---

Several candidates tried to register under the name Darth Vader in all the Kiev constituencies. Only their patronymics were different. Moreover, only some of them represented a party (the Internet Party of Ukraine), with the rest being self-nominated candidates.

**SUMMARY OF ELECTION RESULTS**

*Nationwide multi-mandate constituency*

After processing 100% of protocols:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Political Party</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Seats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The People’s Front</td>
<td>22.14</td>
<td>3488114</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Petro Poroshenko Bloc</td>
<td>21.82</td>
<td>3437521</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Self-Reliance</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>1729271</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Opposition Bloc</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>1486203</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Radical Party</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>1173131</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The Fatherland</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>894837</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>742022</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Communist Party</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>611923</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Strong Ukraine</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>491471</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Civil Position</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>489523</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Zastup</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>418301</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The Right Sector</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>284943</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The Solidarity of the Women of Ukraine</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>105094</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>67124</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The Internet Party</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>58197</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>The Party of Greens of Ukraine</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>39636</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Green Planet</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>37726</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Revival</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>31201</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>United Country</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>28145</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ukraine is One Country</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19838</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>New Politics</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>19222</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Power of People</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>17817</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ukraine of the Future</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>14168</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Strength and Honour</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>13549</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>The Ukrainian Civil Movement</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>13000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>The Bloc of Left Forces of Ukraine</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>12499</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>The Democratic Party</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>11826</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The Congress of Ukrainian Nationalists</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>8976</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>The Liberal Party</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>8523</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Single-Mandate Constituencies**

Total – 198 mandates.

- The Petro Poroshenko Bloc – 69
- The People’s Front – 18
- Freedom – 6
- The Opposition Bloc – 2
- Batkivshchyna (Fatherland) – 2
- Self Reliance – 1
- Strong Ukraine – 1
- Zastup – 1
- The Right Sector – 1
- Volia – 1
- Self-nominated candidates – 96
October 26 saw early elections to the Supreme Rada of Ukraine, in a proportional majority system (225 deputies on party lists and 225 in single-mandate constituencies) with a 5% election threshold. As a result, the Supreme Rada came to include parties combining the ideologies of Ukrainian nationalism, liberalism and anti-Russian sentiment, with the quality of parliamentary work and ability to compromise inevitably suffering. The radicalization and militarization of the Supreme Rada and its anti-Russian policy seem inevitable too, especially in regards to the Donbass and Russian-Ukrainian relations.

Due to the Crimea returning to Russia and the formation of the Donetsk and Luhansk People’s Republics in the east of Ukraine, only 198 deputies, instead of 225, could be elected in single-mandate constituencies. The Autonomous Republic of Crimea and Sevastopol used to have 12 constituencies, while the Donetsk Oblast and the Luhansk Oblast had nine and six constituencies respectively.

The Supreme Rada election was a stage in reforming the government that started with the political crisis in the country. Statements by Russian, Ukrainian and European political figures assessed the events in Ukraine as a revolution or coup d’état. Before the election, the transitional government had the task of solidifying the re-
sults of the revolution and electing a parliament that would continue the revolutionary reforms.

The changes in the Constitution of Ukraine after Yanukovich had been toppled made the parliament a more powerful branch of power, reducing presidential authority. On February 21, 2014, the Supreme Rada voted for the reinstatement of the 2004 Constitution\(^\text{143}\), with 386 deputies voting “for”, including 140 deputies of the Party of Regions, 89 from Batkivshchyna, 40 from UDAR, 35 from the Svoboda Party, 32 from the Communist Party and 50 non-party deputies. Based on the reinstated Constitution, a ruling coalition called European Choice was formed in parliament on February 27, 2014\(^\text{144}\). On the same day the coalition formed a government headed by A. Yatsenyuk. The returning to the 2004 Constitution implied a transition from the presidential-parliamentary to the parliamentary-presidential form of government, with a coalition of parliamentary factions, rather than the president, forming the government.

After the Euromaidan events, the country has been faced with the demonization of former and current officials, businessmen, members of the Communist Party and the Party of Regions, and other political and social forces that do not fit in with the new Ukrainian nationalist discourse.

The Supreme Rada consists of several groups: representatives of local elites who reached a consensus with the new regime; popular law enforcement officers; opposition media figures (sportsmen, reporters and celebrities who support the Euromaidan). People who are associated with the Ukrainian oligarchs Kolomoisky and Firtash, who have contacts in most parties, have been very successful in the new Rada.

Analyzing the last year of political life if Ukraine — since the beginning of the political crisis until the day of elections in the Supreme Rada, key trends of the new Ukrainian political system can be defined as:

\(^{143}\) (Russian) Интерфакс. Рада восстановила конституцию 2004 года. URL: http://www.interfax.ru/world/360285

\(^{144}\) (Russian) RUpor.info. В Верховной Раде создали новую правящую коалицию «Европейский выбор». URL: http://www.rupor.info/news-politika/2014/02/27/v-rade-sozdana-koaliciya/
1. **Militarization.** Candidates connected with the Army or directly with the ATO in the Donbass have taken leading positions on the lists of all parties. Therefore, khaki is the color of the new Parliament of Ukraine.

2. **Anti-Russian Sentiment.** Amid conflicting relations with Russia and the financial, economic and social crises, almost all participants shifted the responsibility for the acute situation in the country onto “the Eastern neighbor”. Participants in the electoral race very often competed for who was more subtle in blaming Russia or “the pro-Russian fifth column” for the woes of the new Ukraine, free from Yanukovich and his clan.

3. **The Oligarch Lobby.** Oligarchs have acted traditionally for Ukraine and promoted loyal candidates to the Supreme Rada for the political support of their activities.

Dnipropetrovsk oligarch Kolomoisky is considered to be connected with a number of candidates from the Petro Poroshenko Bloc, the People’s Front, the Right Sector, Self-Reliance and Serhiy Tihipko’s Strong Ukraine. Some sources say Kolomoisky was likely to find loyal candidates in the pro-presidential bloc from the Economic Development group, a union of former members of the Party of Regions who left the party during the Maidan events and formed a separate parliamentary group in the Rada led by Vitaly Khomutynnik. Moreover, Kolomoisky supports some heads of law enforcement institutions who became deputies.

Other oligarch act in a similar way: there are candidates known as the people of Serhiy Lyovochkin, Dmytro Firtash, Rinat Akhmetov and Valeriy Khoroshkovskyi in almost all party lists.

4. **Unipolarity.** The Parliament of Ukraine used to consider the difference between the views of people from the east and the west, with the Rada formally representing the interests of both sides of the country. Since Crimea seceded from Ukraine, the DPR
and LPR were formed and the political players of the southeast were crushed (the Party of Regions and the Communist Party), the new Parliament has become “unipolar”, representing largely the views on the future of the country of the political west.

5. Radicalization. The Svoboda nationalist party of Ukraine was the main sensation of the 2012 Rada election. A nationalist faction emerged in the Ukrainian Parliament for the first time and had a temporary monopoly on the nationalist ideology and supported an anti-Russian agenda that gradually became mainstream. Svoboda failed in the 2014 election, gaining only 4.71% of votes. However, seven members of the party, including the scandalous Andrei Ilienko, got into the Rada through single-mandate constituencies. Representatives of all parties (with the exception of the Opposition Bloc) directly or indirectly support Ukrainian nationalism in the new Parliament. The defeat of the Svoboda Party should not be regarded as the defeat of their ideology. On the contrary, Oleh Tyahnybok’s Party monopoly on radical nationalist and Russophobic discourse was successfully challenged and copied by other political players.

Svoboda became one of the parties that formed a coalition in the Supreme Rada in February 2014. Non-participation of UDAR and Batkivshchyna representatives in the election in those single-mandate constituencies where Svoboda won in 2010, was a condition of the interparty agreement. The Petro Poroshenko Bloc that included UDAR, which in essence dissolved itself, and Yulia Tymoshenko’s Party, fulfilled this agreement. This is why Oleh Tyahnybok’s party members won in single-mandate constituencies № 116, 119, 125, 152, 162, 163, 164, 189 and 215 in the west of Ukraine where Svoboda is most popular.

Svoboda remains quite influential in the west of Ukraine. It was one the most definitive structures of the Maidan, with its activists dying during the winter’s violence in Kiev. They also formed a battalion called Sych that took part in the ATO. All these apparent achievements in the eyes of a modern Ukrainian voter were negated by the fact that Svoboda lost its status as the only meaningful struc-
ture by positioning itself as representing nationalists. In the 2014 election, it had to compete with Oleh Lyashko’s party, Dmitri Yarosh’s Right Sector and the People’s Front of Arsenii Yatsenyuk and Alexandr Turchinov, in the increasingly radicalized Ukrainian electoral field. A successful Lviv entrepreneur and politician, Igor Krivetsky, closely connected with billionaire Dmytro Firtash, is said to be the main sponsor of the Party.

6. Ukrainization. Ukrainization is the result of the above-mentioned unipolarity and radicalization. The Parliament represents hardly any other visions, apart from the Maidan, of the country’s development, with the “counter-revolutionary” “Russian agenda” (the protection of the Russian language in Ukraine and the shared history and values of Russia and Ukraine) completely disappearing.

7. Populism. Maidan representatives, street leaders and nationalists in the Rada are bound to affect the level of political discussion in the Parliament. Real social and economic problems are going to become secondary, while populist statements and laws of an anti-Russian nature (Ukraine exiting the Commonwealth of Independent States, elimination of the federalization of the country and denying Russian the status of the second state language, persecution of former and current members of the Communist Party and the Party of Regions as representatives of the “fifth column of the Russian imperialism”) are going to become priority.

The Rada of Winners

The October 26 Rada election clarified only the Parliament structure, with questions of its future work and prospects left unanswered due to a number of unexpected results in the light of previous social research. The division of seats in the Rada is very important,
nevertheless, because its role has increased in the system of power of Ukraine.

The preliminary results were enough to show that there would be no monopoly, predicted by all opinion polls, in the Rada of the new ruling Bloc Poroshenko Bloc. This was largely due to the surprisingly good result of the People’s Front (over 22% of votes), not the best performance of the Presidential Bloc itself (2nd place, with less than 22%), and the failure of Svoboda, which narrowly missed the 5% threshold.

The militarist image of the electoral campaign of the People’s Front, its uncompromising rhetoric and the many famous figures on the party list, brought about the victory. The list included Prime Minister Arseniy Yatsenyuk, Speaker of the Rada Oleksandr Turchynov and other recognizable names, notably: reporter, activists and former head of the Anti-Corruption Bureau Tatyana Chernovol; Minister of Internal Affairs Arsen Avakov; politician and former Maidan commander Andriy Parubiy; one of the founding fathers of the Social-National Party of Ukraine (renamed Svoboda in 2004); commanders Yuriy Bereza, Andriy Teteruk and Evgeny Deydey of the Dnipr-1 Battalion, the Mirotvorets battalion and the Kiev-1 battalion respectively; military analyst Dmytro Tymchuk, popular with Internet users; and advisor to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Anton Gerashchenko. This large number of military commanders is set to lead to a leaning in the People’s Front faction towards the military lobby and resolving Ukraine’s territorial problems by force. The success of the party seems to open a lot of new opportunities for Ihor Kolomoisky, who has significant influence over some of the party’s members.

The idea about falsifications during the vote count resulting in the advantage of the People’s Front has become widespread in the Russian media and blogs. The Svoboda Party also talked about

---

146. (Russian) Новое Время. Результаты выборов в Раду: НВ сравнило данные ЦИК, экзит-поллов и соцопросов. URL: http://nvua.net/ukraine/Rezultaty-vyborov-v-Radu-NV-sravnilo-dannye-CIK-ekzit-pollov-i-sozoprosov-18225.html
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ballot rigging, thus explaining its failure, and organized protests against the CEC of Ukraine and the government. The need to compete on the nationalist stage with the Right Sector and partly with the Radical Party, People’s Front and other forces, was the objective reason for the failure of Oleh Tyahnybok’s party. The Svoboda Party also lost voters’ trust in its own home territory in the west of Ukraine: it gained few votes from the party lists and some well-known Svoboda members failed to get into the Rada from single-mandate constituencies. Ex-Governor of the Lviv Oblast Iryna Sekh lost in constituency № 119, and former president of the Ternopil Oblast Council and former Supreme Rada deputy Alexey Kaida failed in constituency № 163. The election results in single-mandate constituency № 116 symbolized changes in the allegiances of the region’s residents, with odious but popular until recently Iryna Farion suffering a painful defeat, gaining only 16.4 % of votes. Her rivals, Self-Reliance Party representative Iryna Podolyak and Radical Party representative Valery Veremchuk, gained 41% and 17.9 %. The end of tacit support for the party by the president’s administration played an important, if not key, role in Svoboda’s defeat. Until the political crisis and toppling of Yanukovich, the administration seemed to have been preparing the party, and Oleh Tyahnybok personally, as useful sparring partners for the presidential elections which were then due in 2015.

The success of the Self Reliance Union, led by Lviv mayor Andriy Sadovy, was one of the key surprises of the election. By intentionally excluding former Supreme Rada deputies from the party list, the coalition of the Self Reliance Union and Volya, under the name of the first of these two parties, raised its media attractiveness by involving a number of Donbass Battalion fighters led by its commander Semyon Semchenko. Ihor Kolomoisky’s media resources actively supported the Lviv mayor’s party as well. In addition,

149. (Russian) Новое Время. Почему проиграл Порошенко и кто получит "золотую акцию" в новой Раде. URL: http://nvua.net/publications/Pochemu-proigral-Poroshenko-i-kto-poluchit-zolotuyu-akciyu-v-novoy-Rade-17844.html
the Self Reliance Union, which is largely made up of Maidan activists, consolidated its support of the middle class, a major social pillar of the Ukrainian “revolution of dignity”. As a result, the party gained 11% of the votes. With the new power balance in the Rada, Andriy Sadovyi’s party is going to be an important or even decisive element in forming the ruling coalition. Even the union of the People’s Front and the Petro Poroshenko Bloc is not able to create a constitutional majority in the Rada and will have to approach other political forces, with the Self Reliance Party seeming the most compromising and acceptable for both leaders. Therefore, the Self Reliance Party’s members may be represented in the executive power, with new channels of influence on the situation in the country appearing for Ihor Kolomoisky.

Voters did not see a true clash of ideologies in the Rada election. The political forces largely united by an ideology – the Communists (which did not enter parliament at all) and Svoboda (its representation decreased from 38 seats to 9 (single-mandate constituencies)) were the main losers. The failure of the Communists and other left-wing forces is connected with the change in voter composition after Crimea’s secession and the alienation of part of the Donbass. The nationalists had to compete with other parties copying their slogans.

The relatively high results of the Opposition Bloc (9.43%) and the union of former members of the Party of Regions and other opponents of the new Kiev regime, were another surprise of the election. Head of the Research and Branding group, sociologist Evgeny Kopatko, commented on the discrepancy between the results and the preliminary opinion polls: “We could not calculate accurately the result for the Opposition Bloc, for it was hard to carry out polls in the Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts. But we understood that there is a hidden electorate there”. Taking 4th place under the party lists with 9.43% of votes, the Opposition Bloc gained additional seats.
through single-mandate constituencies. Head of the electoral office Sergey Larin said\textsuperscript{152}: “\textit{We expect about 30 single-mandate constituency deputies to enter the Opposition bloc faction in the Parliament. So we hope that our faction will have at least 50-60 deputies}”. However, the number of deputies is not enough to effectively oppose the joint forces of other deputies from the Maidan parties. If anything, the victory of the Opposition Bloc even amid aggressive counter-propaganda by leading media and violence against candidates in the five eastern regions — Dnipropetrovsk, Donetsk, Zaporizhia, Luhansk and Kharkiv, — is more evidence that political unity has not been reached in Ukraine, even after the toppling of Yanukovich.

In addition, the Batkivshchyna led by Yulia Tymoshenko and the Radical Party of her former colleague Oleh Lyahsko, entered the Supreme Rada. Gaining 5.7 \% and 7.4 \% of the votes respectively, they formed factions of about 20 deputies, which depend on the interest of self-nominated single-mandate constituency deputies in joining them. With this make-up, these forces are not going to have a significant independent influence on decision-making, but may be valuable allies when voices are needed for important decisions. Moreover, the deputies of these factions have a chance to propagate their views at the top parliamentary level of the country. The Radical Party faction includes commander of the Aidar Battalion Serhiy Melnychuk. His former subordinate Nadezhda Savchenko (who was detained in a pretrial detention facility in Russia in relation with the killing of Russian VGTRK journalists Igor Kornelyuk and Anton Voloshin), who headed the Batkivshchyna party list for populist purposes, also became a Rada deputy. Plus, Yulia Tymoshenko’s party intends\textsuperscript{153} to include Savchenko in the Ukrainian delegation to work in the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. This opens wide opportunities for further international anti-Russian agitation campaigning, which would prevent the establishment of guilt for the death of Russian citizens near Luhansk.


\textsuperscript{153} (Russian) BBC. Выборы для “Батькивщины” – без аплодисментов. URL: http://www.bbc.co.uk/ukrainian/ukraine_in_russian/2014/10/141027_ru_s_tymoshenko_election
Besides the above-mentioned Petro Poroshenko Bloc and the Svoboda Union, which did not gain as many votes as expected, the losers of the 2014 election include the Civil Position led by former Minister of Defense of Ukraine Anatoliy Hrytsenko, Serhiy Tihipko’s Strong Ukraine, The Communist Party, and Zastup, which failed to reach the 5% threshold although opinion polls suggested they were likely to get into Parliament. With Crimea and part of the Donbass leaving Ukraine, the Communists lost part of the electorate and became almost obsolete with their ideology. Serhiy Tihipko’s party could not defeat the Opposition Bloc because the rural electorate did not support the political force that had promised to pursue their interests, and preferred the better promoted parties. The Civil Position suffered the most painful defeat and their lack of support was due to a failed electoral campaign, which can be compared with the lower ratings of the Radical Party. The latter was the second most popular party after the Presidential Bloc only a few months before the election and lost support because of the media war between Ihor Kolomoisky and Oleh Lyashko.

As for the unexpectedly low results of the Petro Poroshenko Bloc, this may affect Russian-Ukrainian relations. Minister of Foreign Affairs Sergey Lavrov said in an interview\(^\text{154}\), “We will have someone to talk to in the Supreme Rada and Government, largely because the Petro Poroshenko Bloc is going to be the leading force in the Ukrainian Parliament anyway, and Petro Poroshenko is a partner of Russia and President Vladimir Putin in negotiating the Minsk peace agreements between the Kiev regime and the Luhansk and Donetsk rebels, mediated by Russia and the OSCE”. Those responsible for Russia’s foreign policy are obviously unhappy with the success of the People’s Front led by Yatsenyuk (whose statements Lavrov called “abominable”) and members of the Svoboda and Radical Party becoming MPs. The militarization of the Rada, and its abundance of parties that mostly use anti-Russian slogans and have difficulty cooperating with each other due to personal ambitions and different economic

\(^{154}\) (Russian) Известия. Сергей Лавров: «Нам будет с кем разговаривать в раде и правительстве». URL: http://izvestia.ru/news/578603
interests, are bound to negatively affect Parliament’s performance, ability to make constructive decision and cooperate with the government on internal policy, settlement of the Donbass conflict and relations with Russia.

Below is an analysis of the major political parties of Ukraine that managed to gain the 5% threshold in the 2014 parliamentary election and formed the ruling coalition.

**The Petro Poroshenko Bloc**

The Solidarity Party led by Petro Poroshenko was founded in 2001. The party used to be a part of Viktor Yushchenko’s Our Ukraine electoral bloc. On August 27, 2014, former Minister of Internal Affairs Yuriy Lutsenko was elected chairman of the party and the party was renamed the Petro Poroshenko Bloc. The party included Vitaly Klitschko’s UDAR party, according to “the memorandum of unification” signed on March 29, 2014.

A commander in the Ukrainian Air Force, Yuliy Mamchur, is among the top five members of the party. Before the Crimea referendum and its annexation by Russia, his name was often mentioned in the Ukrainian media. Mamchur’s unit arranged a number of protests\(^\text{155}\) to show their refusal to obey Crimean self-defense forces and to become part of the Russian Army after the referendum. Mamchur became a symbol of the confrontation between Russia and Ukraine. That is why he is a natural figure, from among the ranks of the ex-military, to be on the pro-presidential party list.

Leaders of the Mejlis of the Crimean Tatar People, Mustafa Dzhemilev and Refat Chubarov, who are also on the list of the Petro Poroshenko Bloc alongside Colonel Mamchur, are meant to demonstrate that the “Crimean question” that Poroshenko has promised to solve on many occasions before and since the election, is still relevant and his priority.

Mustafa Abduldzhemil Dzhemilev is a leader of the Crimean Tatar national movement. He was arrested several times for his anti-Soviet

---

\(^{155}\) (Russian) Украинская правда. Юлий Мамчур – герой из Бельбека. URL: http://life.pravda.com.ua/person/2014/03/7/156058/
activity and spent about 15 years in prison and exile. Dzhemilev has used these facts in competing for a place in the Supreme Rada as a member of different parties (the Our Ukraine bloc, the Batkivshchyna and now the Petro Poroshenko Bloc). He was a Rada deputy in the III, IV, V, VI and VII assemblies. During the spring 2014 crisis, Dzhemilev denounced Crimea’s entering Russia. On March 11, he said 156 that Russia risked being faced with the bloody Chechen conflicts again if “Crimea was annexed”. On March 14, meeting with representatives of The European External Action Service and NATO leaders in NATO headquarters, Dzhemilev called157 for bringing UN peacekeeping forces to Crimea and called on European diplomats and NATO representatives to ignore the referendum. On August 20, Petro Poroshenko appointed him Commissioner of the President on the Affairs of Crimean Tatars. His brief includes active participation in the work of international authorities on the Ukraine crisis. Dzhemilev is openly anti-Russian and calls Russia’s regime in Crimea an occupation. Billboards with Crimean Tatar leader Mustafa Dzhemilev appeared in the Czech Republic in autumn 2014 criticizing the country’s president Milos Zeman for his pro-Russian position in the Russian-Ukrainian conflict. The billboards said158: “I was imprisoned for 3 years after publicly opposing the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968. And today, the Czech president is asking for an acceptance of the Russian annexation of Crimea”.

Yuriy Lutsenko plays a big role in the pro-presidential party of power. He gained increasing support during the Euromaidan events. According to Lutsenko, on the night of January 10, 2014, he was beaten by Berkut officers during riots159 outside a court in Kiev and hospitalized with concussion. On April 25, Lutsenko called
on Ukrainians to vote for Petro Poroshenko at the presidential election on May 25\textsuperscript{160}, expressing his confidence in Poroshenko’s victory in the first round. On August 27, he was elected president of the Solidarity Party, being the only candidate.

Lutsenko has government service experience, which he needed to become the main coordinator of Poroshenko’s party. Lutsenko had been Minister of Internal Affairs from February 2005 until December 2006 and from December 2007 until January 2010 (in Yulia Timoshenko’s second government. He was considered a martyr even before the Euromaidan: on December 26, 2010, Lutsenko was arrested by Ukraine’s Prosecutor General Office on a charge of the embezzlement of an especially large amount of government money. He was found guilty and sentenced to four years in prison with confiscation of all his property on February 27, 2012. He was released in April 2013\textsuperscript{161}, according to Poroshenko’s act of pardon.

Olga Bogomolets, a distinguished Ukrainian doctor (member of the American Academy of Dermatology and the European Academy of Dermatology and Venereology, coordinator of the European association of dermatology in Eastern Europe, and member of the New York Academy of Sciences) was a non-party, self-nominated candidate in the 2014 presidential election in Ukraine. She is among the top three members of the Petro Poroshenko Bloc, which is nearly impossible for a doctor with no history of participation in the Euromaidan. However, Olga Bogomolets took an active part\textsuperscript{162} in organizing the Euromaidan protests\textsuperscript{163} in 2013-2014 by serving as coordinator of the medical service of the Euromaidan. She is the author of the Medical handbook of the Maidan, which she promoted from the stage of the Maidan in early December 2013, and which became a “Bible” for protesters. The book gives practical advice starting from the rules of behavior in cold conditions and ending

\textsuperscript{160}. (Russian) LB.ua. Луценко призвал голосовать за Порошенко. URL: http://lb.ua/news/2014/04/25/264480_lutsenko_prizval_ukraintsev.html

\textsuperscript{161}. (Russian) Glavred.info. Юрий Луценко вышел на свободу: все подробности. URL: http://glavred.info/politika/yuriy-lucenko-vyshel-na-svobodu-vse-podrobnosti-247389.html

\textsuperscript{162}. (Russian) Выступление на Майдане Ольги Богомолец 2014.02.21. (Video): http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TLsWGFvLrYY

\textsuperscript{163}. (Russian) Выступление Ольги Богомолец на Майдане 2014.02.26. (Video): http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=g-XxTrck51I
with instructions on what do in the event of a gas attack. A scandal involving her name broke out during the presidential race. Candidate Bogomolets asked for financial help from anyone who supported her to pay for her running for the position. It was revealed afterwards that she is the owner of several clinics and a lot of real estate. Without any real chance of winning, Bogomolets was considered\(^{164}\) a technological project of Poroshenko’s electoral office designed to “bite off” votes from Poroshenko’s main rival Yulia Tymoshenko.

Volodymyr Groysman, who has been rising through the ranks since 2002 and was elected mayor of Vinnytsia at 28, also plays an important role in Poroshenko’s team. In this position, he earned a reputation as the quite successful reformer of the local government system in Vinnytsia. However, his opponents say he was also good at “squeezing” utility companies and corruption schemes\(^ {165}\). Under the new regime, he became Deputy Prime Minister and for Regional Development, Construction, and Housing and Communal Services. As minister he has failed to show any results or intention to reform: service fees have continued to increase, with acute conditions threatening the heating season.

Maria Matios, a novelist and UDAR Party representative, is among the top ten on the list of the Petro Poroshenko Bloc. She became famous for comparing\(^ {166}\) in one of her works the obelisk on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Kiev to “a phallus”. She first entered politics after the 2012 parliamentary election when she became a people’s deputy for the UDAR Party. As a politician she did not prove herself at all, but she has been involved in a financial scandal\(^ {167}\). The Ministry of Economy earmarked 1.4 million hryvnias for printing books under Ukrainian Book Program, and many books considered classics did not appear on the official list, while Matios’s own books were given 205 thousand hryvnias. Her brother Anatoly Matios, former head of Lviv Oblast SSU and later Odessa

\(^{164}\) (Russian) Glavcom. Список Порошенко. URL: http://glavcom.ua/articles/22734.html


\(^{166}\) (Russian) Обозреватель. Азаров о Матиос: это трагедия для нас с вами. URL: http://obozrevatel.com/politics/86324-azarov-o-matios-eto-tragediya-dlya-nas-s-vami.htm

\(^{167}\) (Russian) Glavcom. Список Порошенко. URL: http://glavcom.ua/articles/22734.html
Oblast SSU, was appointed deputy prosecutor general and military prosecutor of Ukraine on August 26, 2014. He had been Deputy Head of the Government Accountability Office at the Presidential Administration of Ukraine from 2010 until 2012. This suggests that Firtash’s partner Serhiy Lyovochkin, who headed the Presidential Administration at that time, had lobbied Maria Matios.

Insulting symbols of the Great Patriotic War Victory, which are connected with the Soviet period of history, is considered reasonable for the current political elites of Ukraine. For instance, Roman (Zukhel) Zheleznov (information project of Ukrainian nationalists for agitation among Russian radicals), whilst a member of the Azov Battalion (headed by Ukrainian nationalist Andrei Byeletsky, Rada member for the People’s Front), announced on his social network page168 a victory monument profanation contest in Russia, Ukraine and Byelorussia.

Governor of the Odessa Oblast and Kolomoisky business partner Ihor Palytsia is among the top 100 on the electoral list of the Petro Poroshenko Bloc. He is known to be very close to the oligarch and is his protégé. One of Kolomoisky’s classmates, Vyacheslav Fridman, one of the founders of the Privat Group, is number 99 in the list. People’s deputy Oleksandr Shevchenko, another good friend of Kolomoisky’s, also ran for Parliament in constituency №88 in Ivano-Frankivsk. Before becoming a MP, he used to be director of the Bukovel ski resort owned by the billionaire. He only became famous for a fight with the odious head of the Radical Party Oleh Lyashko.

Another peculiarity of the Petro Poroshenko Bloc is the large number of representatives of regional elites and officials, who are former members of the Party of Regions, which has lost influence. Many of these former “regionals” helped to form the new coalition in February 2014, amid the Maidan protests. Many of the President’s long-time political associates (in the Solidarity Party) and business partners, as well as Vitaly Klitschko’s UDAR members (according to an agreed 30% of candidates from the Kievan mayor’s party), also belong to the pro-presidential bloc.

---
168. (Russian) Вконтакте. Роман Железнов о конкурсе батальона «Азов» – «Победобесие». URL: https://vk.com/wall180650766_5279
The Petro Poroshenko Bloc is a typical ruling party, exploiting popular militarist and anti-Russian slogans.

**The Fatherland (Batkivshchyna) All-Ukrainian Union**

The political party led by former Prime Minister Yulia Tymoshenko was in the Rada from 2002. In October 2011, Tymoshenko was convicted to seven years in prison for power abuse.

After Yanukovich was toppled and the 2004 Constitution had been reinstated, a ruling coalition including the Batkivshchyna, UDAR and Svoboda was formed. The coalition set up\(^{169}\) a coalition government headed by A. Yatsenyuk. On February 21, 2014, the new majority in the Rada decriminalized a number of Criminal Code and Criminal Procedure Code articles, including the article under which Tymoshenko was convicted. On February 22, 2014, the Rada passed a decision\(^{170}\) to release Tymoshenko immediately.

After being released, she quickly became involved in the political fight and exploited the Crimean and Donbass problems in the electoral campaign. For example, she initiated an emergency response team to work out solutions to national security threats. On April 15, 2014, Tymoshenko announced the creation of the National Resistance Movement\(^ {171}\), aimed at uniting the efforts of volunteer defenders of the country: mostly military experts, former secret service officers, and people with military experience. In May 2014, two battalions were formed based on the Resistance Movement: the 34th Batkivshchyna Battalion and the 42\(^{nd}\) Resistance Movement.

On August 30, 2014, Batkivshchyna attempted to initiate\(^ {172}\) a referendum on Ukraine joining NATO.

On August 26, 20 people left the political council of the Batkivshchyna, including O. Turchynov, A. Yatsenyuk, A. Avakov and A. Parubiy. According to Avakov\(^ {173}\), it happened because they failed to

\(^{169}\) (Russian) Vesti.ru. Яценюк стал премьером Украины. URL: http://www.vesti.ru/doc.html?id=1328825&tid=105474

\(^{170}\) (Russian) МИА «Россия сегодня». Юлия Тимошенко освобождена из тюрьмы. URL: http://ria.ru/world/20140222/996424939.html

\(^{171}\) (Russian) Интерфакс. Тимошенко объявила о создании «движения сопротивления». URL: http://www.interfax.ru/world/371813

\(^{172}\) (Russian) ФАКТЫ.ICTV. Тимошенко инициирует референдум о вступлении Украины в НАТО 26 октября. URL: http://fakty.ictv.ua/ru/index/read-news/id/1525472

\(^{173}\) (Russian) LB.ua. Аваков озвучил расхождения с «Батькivчиной». URL: http://lb.ua/news/2014/08/27/277342_avakov_ozvuchil_rashozhdieniya.html
agree with the party on a merger with several other political forces and to make Prime Minister A. Yatsenyuk number one in the party list.

To attract more voter support, Nadezhda Savchenko was put number one in the nationwide electoral list of the Batkivshchyna. Russia’s law enforcement filed a lawsuit against the pilot, who had become an adjuster in the volunteer Aidar Battalion, for being involved in the death of two Russian journalists, Igor Kornelyuk and Anton Voloshin. She was detained in Russia for the period of the trial and has become very popular in Ukraine due to a large-scale media campaign in her support. As a result, the themes of heroism and selflessness in the “war with Russia”, used as official propaganda in relation to the Savchenko case, helped Yulia Tymoshenko’s party.

From the point of view of electoral campaign technology, just as four years ago, the Batkivshchyna campaign was now based on the image of the leader of the party list who is persecuted by anti-Ukrainian forces, with the character of Tymoshenko, who had been released from prison, replaced by Nadezhda Savchenko, who was now under investigation in Russia.

Tymoshenko and the regime have been using the Savchenko case to pressurize Russia. On July 10, 2014, Ukraine’s Ministry of Justice appealed to the Council of Europe asking it to recognize Ukrainian servicewoman Savchenko as a hostage of Russia and demand her release.

As soon as July 15, the European Court of Human Rights initiated proceedings regarding the Savchenko case, which was given priority status.

The Batkivshchyna is using the theme of the military not only in the case of one suspect under Russian investigation. The party also helped to form the Batkivshchyna battalion, which contains volun-

---

175. (Russian) ИТАР-ТАСС. СКР: вина украинской военнослужащей Надежды Савченко подтверждается. URL: http://itar-tass.com/politika/1338087
teers from the Resistance Movement formed by Yulia Tymoshenko after the start of events in Crimea and the Donbass.

The Batkivshchyna was the author of the law “On ensuring the rights and liberties of citizens, and the legal regime in temporarily occupied territories”\(^1\), passed amid the Crimean crisis on April 15, 2014. The law recognized Crimea as a “temporarily occupied territory”.

The author of the bill, Batkivshchyna member Serhiy Sobolev, also wrote a law adopted on April 8, 2014, that increases terms of imprisonment for threatening the territorial integrity of Ukraine\(^2\). The law has also significantly increased terms of imprisonment for obstructing the military force of Ukraine, blocking transport communications and taking over transport enterprises.

Batkivshchyna remains an important element in the political system of Ukraine largely because of the strong and experienced parliamentarians in its ranks. Besides the above-mentioned Serhiy Sobolev, the party also includes Grigory Nemyrya, MP, chairman of Batkivshchyna and Tymoshenko’s deputy Prime Minister during her second term (2007-2010). Nemyrya is responsible for international questions in Tymoshenko’s team and is known as her “personal minister for foreign affairs”\(^3\) and “Batkivshchyna’s unofficial ambassador to the EU and US”.

The party gained 5.68% (894 837 votes) in the 2014 parliamentary election and reached the 5% threshold. In November 2014, the party joined the Petro Poroshenko Bloc, People’s Front, Self-Reliance and Radical Party in developing a coalition agreement.

**The People’s Front**

The People’s Front, created by the Prime Minister and Speaker of the previous Rada, who left the coalition with Tymoshenko, became a key hardliner as regards the Donbass and the continuation of military action.

---

2. (Russian) Новости Донбасса. Рада усилила ответственность за посягательство на территориальную целостность и госизмену. URL: [http://novosti.dn.ua/details/222141](http://novosti.dn.ua/details/222141)
Yatsenyuk and Turchynov’s party and connections are more militarized than any other party. The military council of the People’s Front has the most radical public figure in the country — head of the Social National Assembly and commander of the Azov special patrol police Andriy Biletskiy, who broke from the Right Sector together with his organization.

The People’s Front also includes famous law enforcement representatives, such as: commander of the Dnipr-1 Battalion Yuriy Bereza (the current Dnipropetrovsk authorities led by Kolomoisky took an active part in forming the Dnipro Battalion); commander of Artyemovsk Battalion Konstantin Mateychenko (head of the Artyemovsk regional administration); commander of the Chernihiv Battalion Roman Pytskiv; commander of the Myrotvorets Battalion Andriy Teteruk; commander of Kyiv-1 Battalion Yevhen Deydey; commander of the Zolotie Vorota Battalion Mykola Shvalya; deputy chief of the SSU Andrei Levus (who also was one of the Maidan Self-Defense commanders); well-known Maidan participant Mikhail Gavrilyuk; commander of a squadron in the Aidar Battalion Ihor Gladiv; commander of a special forces battalion in the Armed Forces of Ukraine Valentin Pikulin; and Mykola Semeniak, a famous Soviet army veteran who fought in Afghanistan. The party list also includes military expert Dmytro Tymchuk, who coordinates the Information Resistance Group and comments on the conflicts in Crimea and the Donbass.

Besides the leaders Yatsenyuk and Turchynov and the Dnepr-1 and Mirotvorets battalion commanders, the top ten candidates from the People’s Front party list include Andriy Parubiy and Serhiy Pashynskiy, who played the main organizational role on the Maidan, the Minister of Internal Affairs Arsen Avakov, and his advisor Anton Geraschenko.

According to some data, Yatsenyuk and Turchynov’s structure is financed by Dnipropetrovsk governor and one of the most influential oligarchs in Ukraine, Ihor Kolomoisky. The People’s Front
was a new political brand before the snap Rada election, so its leaders were faced with the task of promoting the party to the population as soon as possible. To this end, Kolomoisky’s media empire significantly helped the new political force, with the oligarch’s TV channels showing Yatsenyuk on prime time and inviting the taciturn Turchynov into the TV studio.

Kolomoisky’s electoral tactic is to support certain figures. He needs strong characters who are able to create movement around themselves. Most of his people took part in the election in majority constituencies in the Dnipropetrovsk Oblast either as self-nominated candidates, or as Petro Poroshenko Bloc candidates. Kolomoisky’s people also ran in the west of Ukraine — in the Ivano-Frankivsk, Lviv, and Volhynia Oblasts where his Privat Group has interests. His people started out in different parties and were represented in the electoral lists of the pro-regime Petro Poroshenko Bloc and the People’s Front, and even in Serhei Tihipko’s oppositionist Strong Ukraine. Radical Ukrainian nationalist Dmytro Yarosh, leader of the right Sector, also has ties with Kolomoisky. Privat Group associates did not even try to hide the fact that they supported\(^\text{183}\) Yarosh.

The People’s Front in the Supreme Rada pursues the hardline scenario of escalating the military confrontation, resolving the breakaway the Donbass problem militarily and aggravation of the conflict with Russia.

**The Radical Party of Oleh Lyashko**

Electoral support for the party of Oleh Lyashko, who took third place in presidential election, went down before the early parliamentary election compared with his maximum popularity in the summer.

Serhiy Melnychuk, commander of the Aidar Battalion was in third place on the party electoral list. In fourth place was the singer Zlata Ognevich, who refused to perform in Crimea after its secession. Yuri Shukhevych, son of the military leader of the Ukrainian

---

183. (Russian) INSIDER. Олигархи на выборах: «Корзина» Игоря Коломойского. URL: http://www.theinsider.ua/politics/5432283d9e7d3/
Insurgent Army Roman Shukhevych, was in fifth place. Other top members of the party include Artyom Vitko, commander of the Luhansk-1 Battalion, and Ihor Mosyichuk, former deputy commander of the Azov Battalion. These divisions and Lyashko himself became famous not only for taking part in military actions, but also a number of incidents showing how aggressive they are towards the local population\textsuperscript{184}, rebels\textsuperscript{185} and media representatives\textsuperscript{186}.

It is surprising that even liberal human rights organizations (Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch) openly condemned the activities of Lyashko’s battalions. Amnesty International reported on August 6, 2014 that it regarded the actions of Oleh Lyashko and his armed associates as flagrant violations of international legal standards and called on\textsuperscript{187} the authorities of Ukraine to put an end to the abuses and impunity. The international organization said the party leader Lyashko traveled in the company of muscular armed young men in military fatigues and with his ubiquitous camera to record his exploits: “His website makes for some grim viewing — Oleh Lyashko is shown entering private and public premises, always accompanied by armed men, and subsequently abducting individuals or forcing them to carry out his instructions”.

In Ukraine, such incidents only add to the popularity of the violent ATO. Oleh Lyashko’s personal popularity is based on the PR of his participation in the ATO, criticism of the authorities for corruption and insufficient cruelty towards the Donbass and Ihor Kolo-moisky. According to Ukrainian media, the leader of the Radical Party can so vehemently oppose the two most influential groups in Ukraine due to the financial and media support of the former head of Presidential Administration of Ukraine Serhiy Lyovochkin and

\begin{footnotes}
\item[185] (Russian) Human Rights Watch. Бессовестное молчание Киева. URL: http://www.hrw.org/ru/news/2014/05/08/bessovestnoe-molchanie-kieva
\item[186] (Russian) Следственный комитет Российской Федерации. Гражданке Украины Надежде Савченко предъявлено обвинение в пособничестве в убийстве журналистов ВГТРК. URL: http://www.sledcom.ru/actual/407115/
\end{footnotes}
oligarch Dmytro Firtash, who have been cooperating\footnote{188 (Russian) Украинская правда. Олигархия на выборах: группа Лёвочкина-Фирташ дружит с Кличко и ставит на округа. URL: http://www.pravda.com.ua/articles/2012/09/10/6972416} with Lyashko since at least the 2010 parliamentary election and at the same time maintain connections with the Petro Poroshenko Bloc through mutually beneficial relations\footnote{189 (Russian) Капитал. Досрочные выборы обновят Раду наполовину, но не снизят влияние олигархов на политику. URL: http://www.capital.ua/ru/publication/26114-mezhdu-mirom-i-voynoy-dosrochnye-vybory-obnovyat-radu-napolovinu-no-ne-snizyat-vliyanie-oligarkhov-na-politiku} with a part of it- the UDAR Party.

The Radical Party list is a major electoral intrigue. Lyashko said in an interview\footnote{190 (Ukrainian) Главком. Олег Ляшко: Якби ви знали, які мені тепер «бабки» пропонують. URL: http://glavcom.ua/articles/19904.html} that he was going to attract young people, without using connections, money or pulling strings, who could change the country. It was hard to believe Lyashko who himself was “a Lyovochkin project”. That is why it was not surprising that candidates who were directly or indirectly connected with Ukrainian oligarchs would be imposed on the party. Ihor Popov, former First Deputy Head of the National Agency of Ukraine on Civil Service, was as high as number six on the party list. Popov was also Deputy Head of the Presidential Secretariat under Yushchenko.

Oksana Korchynska, the spouse of Bratstvo’s odious leader Dmytro Korchynsky, was also elected on Lyashko’s list. Former TV anchor and currently Lyashko’s political spin-doctor Mark Gres is another party member. He does not hide that he voted against Ukraine’s independence in 1991, obstructed the growth of the Orange Revolution and voted for Yanukovich in 2010. Later, however, something shifted in his mind and he started to throw paving stones at Berkut officers. Activist of the Euromaidan, lawyer Artem Zapototsky is another top member of the party, who was seriously injured by a sniper on the Maidan and is now wheelchair-bound.

The Radical Party has a left wing represented by Denis Rusak, former Deputy President of the Socialist Party. Father Tkachuk of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, who would bless the Lyashko Battalion before it went into the ATO zone, represents the “church quota”.

\footnote{188 (Russian) Украинская правда. Олигархия на выборах: группа Лёвочкина-Фирташ дружит с Кличко и ставит на округа. URL: http://www.pravda.com.ua/articles/2012/09/10/6972416} \footnote{189 (Russian) Капитал. Досрочные выборы обновят Раду наполовину, но не снизят влияние олигархов на политику. URL: http://www.capital.ua/ru/publication/26114-mezhdu-mirom-i-voynoy-dosrochnye-vybory-obnovyat-radu-napolovinu-no-ne-snizyat-vliyanie-oligarkhov-na-politiku} \footnote{190 (Ukrainian) Главком. Олег Ляшко: Якби ви знали, які мені тепер «бабки» пропонують. URL: http://glavcom.ua/articles/19904.html}
The Radical Party ranks seem quite varied — a mixture of party activists, famous economists, former officials and military volunteers.

**Self-Reliance**

The Self-Reliance Political Party was registered on December 29, 2012. The name of the party is the same as the Self-Reliance civil union formed by Andriy Sadovy in October 2004. It identifies with an ideology of “Christian morality and common sense”.

The shared electoral list of the union of the Self-Reliance and Volia parties included the Donbass Battalion commander Semen Semchenko, the most popular commander of the volunteer battalions, and other representatives of the Donbass Battalion (commander of the information war group of the the Donbass volunteer battalion Pavel Kishkar and head of the Donbass Battalion charity fund Natalia Veselova). Another two dozen fighters of the Donbass Battalion ran in single-mandate constituencies.

Opinion polls estimated Self-Reliance’s electoral support at 2-3%. However, after military figures headed by Semenchenko joined the party, its popularity sharply increased. As a result, 32 party members were elected into the Rada by party lists.

Andriy Sadovy has been the mayor of Lviv since March 2006. In April 2008, he showed people opposing his activity his middle finger, from the balcony of Lvov city hall, during protests arranged by his rivals. Protesters accused Sadovy of bribery and the unreasonable growth of utility service fees and public transport fares. In 2008, Sadovy ordered a pension rise from the city budget for former participants of the Ukrainian Insurgence Army. On November 3, 2011, Sadovy demanded that his subordinates check if there were any posters or billboards in Russian and how legal they were.

The Party was set up largely for local elections due in 2015. The party is closely connected with Ihor Kolomoisky’s business structures.

---

191. (Russian) Главком. Сюрпризы списка Ляшко. Главный радикал ведет в Раду людей Левочкина, миллионеров и чиновников Януковича. URL: http://glavcom.ua/articles/22668.html

192. (Russian) Подробности. Во Львове решили разобраться с вывесками на русском языке. URL: http://podrobnosti.ua/power/2011/11/04/801865.html
Semen Semenchenko, born in Sevastopol, was a lieutenant commander in the Navy of Ukraine, used to be an entrepreneur before the war, and took part\textsuperscript{193} in arranging the Euromaidan in Donetsk. His close relatives live in Crimea and supported Crimea’s joining Russia and did not want to leave. He has spent half of his life in Crimea, the other half in the Donbass. His real name is Konstantin Hrishyn but he has already been given ID with his new name. In April 2014, Semenchenko formed the Donbass Battalion to confront armed formations of the Donetsk People’s Republic. On April 20, the Ministry of Defense of Ukraine permitted the Battalion to begin “work”. On June 29, 2014, he arrived in Kiev demanding that the ceasefire be stopped and martial law be introduced. On September 1, Semenchenko took off his balaclava in Dnipropetrovsk and the same day, A. Yatsenyuk and A. Avakov awarded him with the Order of Bohdan Khmelnitsky (third class). On October 2, Semenchenko was awarded the rank of podpolkovnik (equivalent of lieutenant colonel).

The professional military call Semenchenko’s battalion a commercial project, while members of the battalion view him as a PR person who does not know much about military business\textsuperscript{194} and blame him for excessive human losses\textsuperscript{195}.

\textsuperscript{193} (Russian) Українська правда. Командир батальона «Донбасс»: Сьогодні сепаратисти возьмуть столько, сколько ми йм дадим взятись. URL: http://www.pravda.com.ua/rus/articles/2014/05/30/7027556

\textsuperscript{194} (Russian) Обозреватель. «Из-за бездарного командования гибнут люди». URL: http://obozrevatel.com/crime/26813-iz-za-bezdarnogo-komandovaniya-gibnut-lyudi.htm

\textsuperscript{195} (Russian) Запрещенная пресс-конференция 4 сентября в УНИАН: бойцы Донбасса о комбате. Видео: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2vTQ_9MT6wl
The electoral campaign in the self-proclaimed DPR and LPR from mid-October to early November 2014 has become history. The June 2014 election in Syria is the only other similar example of elections amid ongoing warfare and unprecedented international pressure. However, Syria, with all the discontent of the West towards the Syrian leadership, is a worldwide recognized state. If anything, the electoral campaign and election itself, held in the midst of warfare in the republics that had proclaimed their own sovereignty just a few months before, are unique in world history.

Appointing the Election Day

It was revealed on September 23, 2014 that elections of heads of state and deputies of the self-proclaimed Luhansk and Donetsk People’s Republics were to be held on the same day, November 2.

“The elections (of deputies and the head of the Luhansk People’s Republic — Ed.) are to take place simultaneously with those in the Donetsk People’s Republic. November 2 has been agreed as a preliminary date”, the speaker of the People’s Council of the LPR Alexei Karyakin reported on September 23196.

---

196. (Russian) ИТАР-ТАСС: Выборы глав ЛНР и ДНР, а также депутатов местных парламентов могут пройти 2 ноября. URL: http://itar-tass.com/mezhdunarodnaya-panorama/1460763
In turn, the DPR’s Deputy Prime Minister Andrey Purgin confirmed that November 2 had been chosen as a preliminary date. “We do not have a law on elections yet, but we are expecting to develop and pass it by then”, he said.

Previously, Ukraine’s Supreme Rada had adopted a law on a special status of the Donbass, mentioning the holding elections in Luhansk and Donetsk Oblasts on December 7. However, the leadership of the self-proclaimed republics immediately stated that they would decide independently when to hold local elections.

The Unification of Novorossiya and Free Donbass

October 13 saw a press conference of members of the political council of Novorossiya party, Yevgeny Orlov and Miroslav Rudenko. There were two reasons for the press conference – the attempted assassination of Pavel Gubarev and the unification of Novorossiya and the Free Donbass Union197.

As for the assassination attempt, on October 12 at about 21.30 a car containing Pavel Gubarev and Yevgeny Orlov was shot at by unknown people in a black Audi G-7 near the Marinovka checkpoint. Orlov, who was behind the wheel, lost control of the car and crashed into an electricity pylon.

Gubarev suffered a brain injury, while Orlov escaped unscathed, with the bullets only entering the car. At the time of the conference, Gubarev was in hospital in Rostov-on-Don in a stable condition. The perpetrators fled the scene.

According to the investigators’ main version, the attack was perpetrated by a Ukrainian sabotage and reconnaissance force. Yevgeny Orlov assured reporters that Pavel had not been shot and expressed hopes that Pavel would be back to normal soon.

As for the unification of the political forces, Miroslav Rudenko reported that the CEC had refused to register the Novorossiya Party as a political and social movement because of its failure to comply with procedure and mistakes in the documents submitted, but

the party leaders were planning to correct the mistakes and finish the registration so that the movement could continue its political activity.

“Politics is the art of the possible. This is why when we were preparing to submit the list, we had many consultations with a number of social and political forces in the DPR, for instance with the Berkut group. As a result, together with this organization and other public figures of the Russian Spring, we have registered the public organization Free Donbass (Svobodny Donbass) presided over by Yevgeny Orlov. Our political force is taking part in the election of November 2 within an electoral bloc, the Free Donbass public organization”, M. Rudenko said.

He also pointed out that the Donetsk People’s Republic needed the elections to legitimize the regime and called on residents of the Donbass to vote on November 2.

Zakharchenko Receives a Candidate’s ID for the Election of the Head of the DPR

On October 13, at 10.00, Alexander Zakharchenko, the then Prime Minister of the DPR, received a candidate’s ID for the election of the head of the DPR198.

Zakharchenko was the first to submit documents to the DPR Central Electoral Commission to run for the head of the republic and was the first candidate to receive his ID.

By October 13, six people had applied for registration as candidates for the position of the DPR head. According to the head of the CEC Roman Lyagin, candidates Yuri Sivokonenko and Alexander Kofman were still gathering signatures, while the other three were being checked by the DPR police to see if their data were accurate.

The DPR head is elected through direct voting for a four-year term. It must be citizen over 30 years old who has been permanent-

---

ly residing in the DPR for over ten years. A candidate must collect 1000 signatures to run for the head of the DPR.

It had been previously revealed that Zakharchenko would be number one in the electoral list of the Donetsk Republic movement at the DPR parliamentary election. The list included 103 people. The top three candidates also included First Deputy Prime Minister of the DPR Andrei Purgin, and former chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the republic and co-chairman of the People’s Front of Novorussia Denis Pushilin.

Parliamentary elections in the DPR and LPR took place by proportional representation, with only registered organizations and unions entitled to take part in the elections. Candidates must be citizens over 21 years old who have been permanently residing in the republics for over five years. The electoral threshold was 5% of votes, and the plan was to elect 100 deputies. The parliaments are to be elected every four years.

First Campaign Billboards in Donetsk

On October 14, the first electoral billboards appeared in Donetsk. They were all dedicated to canvassing people to come to voting stations, with candidates’ leaflets and billboards to appear later.

According to the DPR CEC, as of October 14, there were 100 billboards in Donetsk199. It added that the authors of campaign materials were seeking to avoid any similarity to Ukrainian electoral materials. They wanted to stress a fundamental difference of the electoral process in the self-proclaimed republic.

The CEC also said that there would be more billboards in other cities of the republic and on important highways leading to Donetsk. Moreover, electoral campaigns of candidates for the head of the DPR and social and political unions running for Parliament were to start soon.

When asked what campaign means would be used, one candidate’s electoral office responded: “This election is no different.

199. (Russian) Актуальные комментарии: Предвыборная агитация в ДНР (ФOTO). URL: http://actualcomment.ru/predvybornaya_agitatsiya_v_dnr_foto.html
All forms of campaigning will be used, taking the warfare situation into account. There will be billboards, leaflets, papers and symbols at rallies and meetings with voters”.

Yuri Sivokonenko Submits his Signature Lists to the CEC

On October 15, Yuri Sivokonenko, running for the head of the DPR, submitted to the CEC lists with signatures of voters in his support and expressed hope for a positive decision on his registration200.

Yuri Sivokonenko, a deputy of the DPR Supreme Council and a Berkut veteran, submitted registration documents on October 8 to run for the position as a self-nominated candidate. His main task as the head of the state would be to revive the Donbass.

“I am for faith, the Russian language and a multi-national Donbass where people live in peace and harmony the way it used to be”, he said.

In addition, on October 15, signature lists of a public organization called the Berkut Union of Donbass Veterans, presided over by Yuri Sivokonenko, were submitted to the CEC.

Previously, a meeting of the DPR Supreme Council had decided that the CEC would submit to the Parliament all papers necessary for participation in the elections on October 16. It was also decided to move the deadline for the registration of candidates from public organizations, political parties and unions to October 24.

The Luhansk Economic Union Submits its Signature Lists to the CEC

On October 15, the lists of candidates of the Luhansk Economic Union (LEU) were submitted to the CEC of the Luhansk People’s Republic201.

---


201. (Russian) Информационное агентство Новороссии: Общественное движение “Луганский экономический союз” подало списки кандидатов в ЦИК ЛНР. URL: http://n-ria.ru/index.php?option=com_mtree&task=viewlink&link_id=1034
Head of the Trade Union Federation Oleg Akimov ran as a candidate for the position of the LPR head. He also led the list of candidates of the LEU for the People’s Council of the republic. Besides him, the top three candidates on the list included farmer Yuri Morozov and miner Vladimir Pakholyuk.

Answering journalists’ questions, president of the LEU and manager of a large grain mill Zinaida Naden, pointed out that the Union views the economic development, i.e. growth of industry, agriculture and business, of the region as its priority task. Oleg Akimov also stressed that the LEU sought to strengthen relations with the Russian Federation.

**Krasilnikov Withdraws His Candidacy**

On October 16, acting Minister of Agriculture of the DPR Alexey Krasilnikov, running for the head of the DPR, submitted an application to the CEC\(^\text{202}\) to withdraw his candidacy.

“I have made this decision after numerous meetings with employees in the industry. Farmers and other agricultural entrepreneurs need serious support from the Ministry. That is why I have decided to focus on this task”, Krasilnikov said. He called on his supporters to vote for candidate Alexander Zakharchenko, the Prime Minister of the DPR.

**Campaign Cars in Donetsk**

On October 16, campaign cars emerged in Donetsk supporting candidate A. Zakharchenko as a candidate for the head of the DPR\(^\text{203}\).

According to his electoral office, campaign cars are currently the most efficient means of campaigning, which was important because the republic was suffering from lack of communication between the government and the people.

\(^{202}\) (Russian) DPR official website: А. Красильников снял свою кандидатуру с предвыборной гонки. URL: http://dnr.today/news/a-krasilnikov-snyal-svoyu-kandidaturu-s-predvybornoj-gonki/

\(^{203}\) (Russian) Актуальные комментарии: На улицах Донецка появились агитмобили в поддержку Захарченко URL: http://actualcomment.ru/na_ulitsakh_donetska_poyavilis_agitmobili_v_podderzhku_zakharchenko.html
Zakharchenko’s electoral office also assured that, besides automobiles, all other means of campaign would be used too.

Gathering Signatures for Free Donbass

On October 16, at 13:00, the Free Donbass Union started to gather signatures in support of its candidates in Donetsk. The organizers planned to collect the necessary signatures by 17:00, but they managed to do it even sooner than that\(^{204}\). Activists of Free Donbass pointed out the high interest residents showed in the event.

“People willingly talk to our activists. No one has refused to read our manifesto yet or to take part in gathering signatures. The current election in general is marked by a high interest among residents in the participants in the election, and this is not only in the case of Free Donbass”, one of the organizers Sergey Kovalchuk said.

On October 15, a conference of the Free Donbass Civil Union took place in Donetsk, which approved the list of candidates for the People’s Council of the DPR. To become a participant in the electoral race, Free Donbass had to collect and submit to the CEC 1000 signatures of voters.

Official Press in the DPR

On October 17, two printed information sources from DPR official bodies emerged simultaneously, namely the Golos Naroda newspaper (Voice of the People) and the Vybor Donbassa (Choice of the Donbass) gazette of the Central Electoral Commission of the DPR\(^{205}\).

The Golos Naroda circulation was 70 000 copies, to be distributed around the entire territory of the republic. The newspaper publishes information on the state of affairs in the republic and important data for every resident of the DPR: news, interviews, current hotline

---

\(^{204}\) (Russian) Информационное агентство Новороссии: «Свободный Донбасс» проводит сбор подписей в поддержку республиканского списка кандидатов. URL: http://n-ria.ru/index.php?option=com_mtree&task=viewlink&link_id=1052

\(^{205}\) (Russian) Информационное агентство Новороссии: У официальных органов ДНР появились два печатных издания. URL: http://n-ria.ru/index.php?option=com_mtree&task=viewlink&link_id=1019
numbers, etc. The Golos Naroda editorial office invites everyone to participate in distributing the newspaper.

According to the DPR CEC, Vybor Donbassa has a circulation of 100,000 copies. The first issue of the bulletin published a full interview with President of the Central Electoral Commission Roman Lyagin, talking about the procedure and rules of the election due on November 2. The issue also contained CEC official documents, including the procedure for registering public organizations, political parties and unions, the procedure for registering lists of candidates, lists of authorized representatives, and other documents. The bulletin also publishes the main news related to the electoral process. The CEC said the second issue was on the way.

**Three Run for the Head of the DPR**

On October 17, head of the DPR CEC Roman Lyagin reported that three candidates would run for the head of the DPR. 206

“It is certain now that there will be three candidates on the ballots — Alexander Zakharchenko, Yuri Sivokonenko and Alexander Kofman”, Lyagin said.

According to him, two candidates were denied registration due to lack of signatures and one more candidate withdrew his candidacy.

Lyagin also reported denying registration for the Communist Party for the election of the DPR People’s Council.

“They failed to inform the CEC about holding a conference and none of their candidates had an accurate date in the lists”, the head of the CEC said.

Therefore, only two movements — the Donetsk Republic and Free Donbass were to take part in the election. 207

Residents of the Donetsk and Luhansk Oblasts who did not recognize the legitimacy of the February coup in Kiev proclaimed the “people’s republics” at meetings in early April. After the May referendums, the republics proclaimed their sovereignty and later established the Novorossiya Union.

---

206. (Russian) РИА Новости: Три кандидата будут участвовать в выборах главы ДНР. URL: http://ria.ru/world/20141017/1028797615.html#ixzz3MRNHiSTk

207. (Russian) РИА Новости: Центризбирком ДНР отказал компартии в регистрации на выборах. URL: http://ria.ru/world/20141017/1028798291.html#ixzz3MRNQwNvM
Kiev does not recognize the DPR and LPR and started a military operation against residents of the east of Ukraine in April. According to UN data, by October 8, over 3.6 thousand civilians had fallen victim to the conflict, with more than 8.7 thousand injured.

**Plotnitsky Collects Signatures**

On October 17, then head of the self-proclaimed LPR Igor Plotnitsky and the Mir Luganshchine Movement (Peace for the LPR) headed by him, submitted to the CEC all the collected signatures necessary for taking part in the elections for the head and parliament of the LPR. According to the law on elections of the LPR, at least 1000 signatures are required for registering a list of candidates. Igor Plotnitsky and his movement submitted 1500 signatures each. The Luhansk CEC was to check their validity by October 20.

How willingly people were giving their signatures to support us shows that the direction we have chosen is right”, the LPR media office cited Plotnitsky.

**Candidates for the Head of the LPR**

On October 18, the CEC of the Luhansk People’s Republic received documents from four candidates for the head of the republic, said head of the CEC Sergey Kozyakov at a weekly press conference on the preliminary results of preparation for the election due on November 2.

October 15 was the deadline for submitting documents to be registered as a candidate for the head of the LPR.

Current leader of the self-proclaimed LPR Igor Plotnitsky, businessman Viktor Penner, president of the Trade Union Federation Oleg Akimov, and commander of the Batman Battalion Alexander Bednov ran for the head of the LPR.

According to Kozyakov, 90 stationery and 5 mobile voting stations were organized for the Election Day in the LPR. Stations were to open at 8 am and close at 8 pm.
He stressed that Internet and mail voting mentioned previously were only of sociological importance and would not have any legal consequences.

Those citizens “who temporarily reside in the occupied territories, but would like to take part in the election” could vote within the territory of the LPR.

**The DPR CEC Website**

On October 19, the website of the Central Electoral Commission of the DPR (http://cikdnr.ru/) was launched.

The website was aimed at covering the activity of the CEC. The website offers different sections on the activity of the CEC and documents it has accepted. It regularly updates the news feed and provides the option of downloading the electronic version of the CEC newspaper. The Contacts section allows the reader to get in touch with the CEC employees.

**The Final List of Candidates for the Election in the LPR**

On October 20, head of the CEC of the LPR Sergey Kozyakov announced the final list of candidates registered to take part in the election for the head of the LPR and deputies of the Parliament\(^\text{210}\).

According to the Novorossiya press center, the CEC studied the documents submitted by the candidates and allowed four of the five of them to participate in the race for the head of the LPR: the then leader of the LPR Igor Plotnitsky, businessman Viktor Penner, president of the Trade Union Federation Oleg Akimov and the LPR’s Minister of Health Larisa Ayrapetyan. Militiaman Alexander Bednov was denied registration as a candidate.

As for public organizations running for Parliament, the CEC registered lists of three out of nine unions that submitted documents, namely Mir Luganshchine (Peace to the LPR), the Luhansk Economic Union and the People’s Union.

---

\(^{210}\) (Russian) Актуальные комментарии: К участию в выборах в ЛНР допущены 4 кандидата и 3 объединения. URL: http://actualcomment.ru/k_uchastiyu_v_vyborakh_v_lnr_dopushcheny_4_kandidata_i_3_obedineniya.html
Head of the LPR CEC explained that registration was denied largely due to violations in collecting signatures (the form of the signature lists was not correct or they were filled in improperly) as well as in the documents of authorized agents.

**Joint Statement by Plotnitsky, Mozgovoy and Kozitsyn**

On October 20, leader of the LPR Igor Plotnitsky, one of the most influential Donbass militiamen Alexey Mozgovoy and president of the Don Cossack Union Nikolay Kozitsyn made a statement on mutual understanding. The three leaders made a joint video address and said they were a “single fist” in the fight against the Kiev regime from now on.\(^{211}\)

Alexey Mozgovoy and Nikolay Kozitsyn, who do not hold any official positions in the LPR are, nevertheless, very influential in the republic. There has been information that they had been in conflict for a long time and criticized each other and the regime in the LPR. Mozgovoy opposed the elections insisting that they should be building Novorossiya, instead of separate republics. Kozitsyn tried to form a Cossack autonomy in the Luhansk Oblast that would be independent from the LPR. Moreover, the conflict seemed to get stronger before the elections.

However, Plotnitsky pointed out in the statement that the three leaders had come to an understanding that the republic had succeeded, and elections were necessary to legitimize it: “We are willing to interact with each other and, moreover, we understand that alone we will not be able to solve all the numerous tasks that our young republic is faced with. I am very grateful to Nikolay Ivanovich [Kozitsyn] and Alexey Borisovich [Mozgovoy] for this meeting. And I will reply to those who say the republic has different forces that they are completely wrong. We are united; we have one center and shared goals and tasks. I am grateful to them for being able to save their armies”.

According to Nikolay Kozitsyn, the participants had reached a full understanding. “Yes, there are some minor details, but they

\[^{211}\] (Russian) Информационное агентство Новороссии: Троиственный союз ради республики. URL: http://n-ria.ru/index.php?option=com_mtree&task=viewlink&link_id=1144
can be solved routinely along the way. What is important is that we have a 99.9% understanding. That is why I am sure that the young Luhansk People’s Republic will succeed legally as well”.

Alexey Mozgovoy repeated that he had always been and remained one of the main critics of the republic’s authorities – both previous and current. “I have always criticized and will keep criticizing the authorities no matter what. But we have to come to an understanding and think in the same way for one reason: we need to aggregate everything into a fist to protect the people. And if somebody does not like the fist, it is their problem. There will be peace and harmony, no more disarray”, he said.

“The time of individualist is over. Yes, we used to have different opinions on what the republic should look like. Nevertheless, we have always had a full understanding of the military question. We have supported each other, regardless of our views, and come out in a united front”, Igor Plotnitsky concluded the meeting.

According to the Head of the LPR, the leaders have come to the conclusion that power resides in the people who will play a leading part in all questions.

“A republic is first of all a territory where the people play a major role. Everything else can and should be resolved through negotiations”, Plotnitsky said.

**Printed Campaign Materials in the DPR**

On October 21, the DPR saw the first printed campaign materials. Besides using automobiles, candidates running for the head of the republic started to draw support through printed agitation materials212.

For instance, a newspaper emerged to inform residents of the Donetsk People’s Republic about A. Zakharchenko’s electoral program and passages from his interviews.

---

212. (Russian) Актуальные комментарии: В ДНР появилась предвыборная печатная агитация. URL: http://actualcomment.ru/v_dnr_poyavilas_predvybornaya_pechatnaya_agitatsiya.html
Plotnitsky’s Public Office

On October 21, leader of the LPR Igor Plotnitsky’s public office opened in Luhansk and a hotline was launched for citizens of the republic.213

Plotnitsky himself attended the opening and received people who came and talked to those calling the hotline.

According to the organizer of the office and hotline Natalia Chernykh, employees of the city council and government of the LPR are always on duty in the public office. They process people’s appeals and calls and pass them on daily to Plotnitsky with suggestions on how to solve certain problems.

Plotnitsky would like to use these means of feedback to stay in touch with citizens of the LPR and to address current problems of the republic.

The Electoral Process is Underway as Planned – Purgin

On October 22, Deputy Chairman of the People’s Council of the DPR Andrey Purgin reported, after a meeting of the Committee for the social support of the citizens of Novorossiya in the Council of the Federation of Russia, that preparations for the election in the DPR were underway as scheduled, despite difficulties and the worsening of the war situation. The republic’s leadership was addressing the issues relating to protecting internet voting from hackers and the safety of people in voting stations.214

Because of the warfare, a large number of the DPR’s electorate found itself outside the republic. The CEC considered and planned several voting options to allow the DPR’s displaced citizens to vote. “Three voting stations are being set up in Russia for refugees. We are also preparing a means for displaced citizens to vote online or by mail”, Purgin said. As regards new methods of counting votes

213. (Russian) Актуальные комментарии: В Луганске открылась общественная приёмная главы ЛНР. URL: http://actualcomment.ru/v_luganske_otkrylas_obshchestvennaya_priyemnaya_glavy_lnr.html
by the Internet or mail, there was an opinion that such votes would only be counted as opinion polls. “I can’t say for sure yet, the CEC has been handling this question. Yes, there are many problems there, they are afraid of hacking and DDOS-attacks. There may be difficulties with mail, too: Ukrpochta may put a spanner in the works. But this is being taken care of. As far as I know, a high stake has been placed on Internet voting. However, it is going to be held only in Russia, for refugees, because not everyone will be able to vote in the voting stations in Russia”, Purgin said.

He also reported that there will be mobile voting stations in the republic for people with disabilities. “Two people who are to be present at every station are the mobile brigades, and some escort is going to work with them.

Andrey Purgin was confident, “From an organizational point of view, the preparation for the election in the DPR is well underway as scheduled. But from the point of view of the atmosphere, the situation is heating up, of course, day by day. Ukraine is starting to work on disrupting the election. I think there will be some incidents and subversive acts by the Ukrainian side before November 2. And one can say that November 2 will see a climax in these events”.

The situation described by Purgin was likely to affect turnout: many voters were expected to be afraid of going to voting stations. According to Purgin, the republic’s leadership would do everything to ensure the safety of voters in the election: “It is in our hands to make sure people are not scared. I mean we need to change the situation. People must start to believe that they must take part in the election and elect a legitimate government”.

It was also revealed what the newly elected leadership would do after the election. “We have a long way to go. We will have to form local governments as well. I think the new Parliament will have many new tasks. Plus, the incumbent Parliament, unfortunately, has developed a small legal foundation, i.e. we have little to rely on. It is a barren field which a newly elected Parliament will have to work on. In other words, the first task of the new Parliament will be to create
a legal framework that the Donetsk People’s Republic will use in the future”, said Purgin.

**Plotnitsky Visits Kindergartens**

On October 22, the head of the LPR Igor Plotnitsky and the Minister of Culture, Science and Education Lesya Lapteva visited kindergartens №7 (Luhansk) and №21 (Ostraya Mogila). It is noteworthy that kindergartens are among the buildings most affected and damaged as a result of the war in the LPR. According to Lesya Lapteva, a third of kindergartens in the republic had been damaged significantly and required long renovation works.

For example, kindergarten №7 lacked water and heating, plus, the roof of the building was damaged. The facility could not function fully, with only 28 of 125 children being able to attend. According to the kindergarten manager, there were more than 150 children who wanted to attend it.

The leader of the republic promised to deal with the questions that prevent the kindergarten from functioning fully. He also assured that the employees would start to receive their salaries the following week.

The situation in kindergarten №21 was worse. In August, the city of Ostraya Mogila suffered heavy destruction from shelling, with the kindergarten damaged significantly. It had almost no windows, the roof had been destroyed, and therefore, there was no protection from water damage. The children have to attend different facilities. Igor Plotnitsky assured that the kindergarten could be renovated within 3-4 weeks, largely due to help from Russia.

Overall, 37 kindergartens out of 60 worked and accepted children in Luhansk although most of them had no water or power. According to teachers of the facilities, most of them were still working. According to the Minister of Culture, Science and Education, Lesya Lapteva, at that time 19 thousand children were attending kindergartens in the LPR, while 100 thousand more were attending educa-

---

tional facilities of all levels than before the war. Lesya Lapteva said there were going to be more because parents had already expressed their intention to take their children to kindergartens.

This means that residents of the Donbass were planning to return to and renovate their homes. “We are going to help them in this. We are doing everything gradually, as scheduled. Unfortunately, we cannot do everything at once. We are grateful to everyone who is helping, who is providing slate, glass, roofing felt and nails. This is the brotherly people of the Russian Federation. Thank you to them”, Plotnitsky said.

A Meeting with Cultural Professionals of the LPR

On October 22, leader of the LPR Igor Plotnitsky, Speaker of the People’s Council of the LPR Alexei Karyakin, and Minister of Culture, Science and Education Lesya Lapteva, held a meeting with cultural professionals of the region. The big hall of the LuspeKayev Luhansk Russian Drama Theater gathered almost all the creative intellectual elite of the region216.

Cultural workers largely talked about repair work on cultural facilities after the punitive operation. Thus, creative teams were reformed to start new performances and tours in the near future. The question of salaries was also raised. The leaders of the LPR said cultural workers and teachers would begin receiving their salaries the following week.

Employees of the Luhansk Ukrainian Music and Drama Theater asked if their team would survive given the region’s secession. In response, Igor Plotnitsky reminded them that the LPR has two official languages – Russian and Ukrainian – and that the republic was not denying its relationship with Ukraine. “We are not against Ukrainian culture – we are against the politics that resulted in such bad consequences”, he stressed.

216. (Russian) Восточный корреспондент: В самопровозглашённой ЛНР намерены развивать украинскую культуру. URL: http://www.eastkorr.net/obshchestvo/v-samoprovozglash-enoi-lnr-namereny-razvivat-ukrainskuyu-kulturu
The Electoral Manifesto of the Luhansk Economic Union

On October 23, the Luhansk Economic Union civil movement, that took part in the parliamentary election of the LPR, arranged a round table to present its economic program. The movement was represented by the top three of the electoral list — trade-unions leader Oleg Akimov, farmer Yuri Morozov and miner Yuri Pakholyuk, as well as president of the movement and director of the bread making concern Luhanskmlin, Zinaida Naden217.

The LEU was going to the election under the slogan of “Wealth to every house”. The manifesto was aimed at “creating a strong economic model in the independent Luhansk Republic and reviving its industrial, manufacturing and agricultural potential”. The leader of the list Oleg Akimov said, “Only a developed economy will allow the LPR to maintain its development as a strong and independent state and pursue an independent policy based on its national interests”.

October 7 saw a meeting of the LEU movement. The Luhansk Economic Union was set up by entrepreneurs of the city, with businessmen and manufacturers of the LPR its members. The organization plans to revive the economy of the Donbass.

Zinaida Naden is the president of this civil movement, while Yuri Morozov is the head of its central executive committee.

November 2, 2014 saw elections for the head of the LPR and deputies of the People’s Council. The head of the LPR is elected for four years. The first elections for the head of the LPR are appointed by the Supreme Council of the LPR. Elections for the head of the LPR are held in a single-mandate, republic-wide constituency.

A Round Table of the Civil Initiative of the Donbass

On October 23, a round table entitled “The November 2 Elections and a Strategic Vision of Prospects for the Donbass” took place in the Donetsk polytechnic university218.

The Civil Initiative of the Donbass initiated and organized the event. It was aimed at starting a public dialogue concerning the acute problems and challenges the Donbass has been faced with.

“It is a crime to be inactive when we can raise our voice for the peace cause and a ceasefire in the Donbass” — moderator Oleg Izmailov opened the event with these words. “We will continue our operations until long-lasting peace is reached and not only that, until we see the Donbass revival has started, which means both a peaceful life and the processes of the economic recovery of the Donbass”.

Besides the Donetsk journalist and leader of the Civil Initiative of the Donbass Oleg Izmailov, also taking part in the discussion were: Vitaly Leibin, editor-in-chief of the Russian Reporter newspaper, writer and scientist Vladislav Rusanov, political scientist Sergey Chepik, independent journalist Ramil Zamdykhanov, Nikolay Rogozin representing the Donetsk National University, lawyer Dmitry Neylo, political scientist Alyona Alexeeva and head of the Center of Liberal-Conservative Politics Alexander Kazakov.

The experts discussed questions concerning the situation in the Donbass and how the November 2 elections in the DPR and LPR could help the Donbass to overcome the crisis of war and return to normal life.

“The Donetsk People’s Republic is experiencing the era of its second formation — the first general elections. We understand that the elections are taking place amid warfare, when for most people it is important not to elect, but rather to earn some money and survive somehow. But we also understand that the elections are vital because it is only a defined leadership that enjoys popular trust that can start solving different problems, including, for instance, the problem of recognizing the diplomas of Donetsk universities”, Vitaly Leibin said.

He added that there were not many candidates to choose from in this election in the DPR, but “it is those public organizations and leaders that have made the largest contribution to the military suc-
cess and the on-going construction of the Donetsk People’s Republic that justly win”.

The Civil Initiative of the Donbass consists of like-minded people who seek one thing — full and unconditional peace in the Donbass, demilitarization of the region, the beginning of repair and renovation works in industry, agriculture, higher education and science. The organization advocates a special unique status for the region, at the very least in the form of a confederation.

The organization has appealed on many occasions to the heads of Ukraine and the DPR, and to the global community, calling for an immediate ceasefire.

**Zakharchenko’s Visit to Khartsyzk**

On October 24, Prime Minister of the DPR Alexander Zakharchenko and Ministry of Education Igor Kostenko visited the city of Khartsyzk. They met with residents of the city, visited school № 24 and the SILUR steel cable factory and took part in a wreath-laying ceremony at the Eternal flame.

In the SILUR factory, which was first on the agenda, Zakharchenko and Kostenko, as well as the city authorities and heads of the factory, inspected one of the facilities. Afterwards, the procession visited school 24 where Zakharchenko and Kostenko met with students and teachers. They were shown a short film on heroism. The visit ended with a wreath-laying ceremony at the Eternal flame.

**The Manifesto of the Mir Luganshchine Civil Movement**

There is probably not a single person in the Donbass who would not think or say that peace in the world in the most important thing. Leaders of the Luhansk People’s Republic understand this, too, and are doing their best so that Peace comes to our region.

---


220. (Russian) Антимайдан: О программе общественного движения «Мир Луганщине». URL: http://antimaydan.info/2014/10/za_mir_i_poryadok_172623.html
Peace, prosperity and social guarantees are the main goals of the Mir Luganshchine Civil Movement, which put forward a list of candidates running for the People’s Council of the LPR in the election due on November 2. The top three on the list are the current head of the LPR Igor Plotnitsky, Prime Minister Gennady Tsypkalov and Speaker of the People’s Council of the LPR Alexei Karyakin.

“The residents of our Republic decided their fate at the referendum on May 11 and voted for freedom and state independence”, says the preamble of the manifesto entitled “Peace to All — Order to Everybody”. In response to this honest and open expression of the will of the people, the republic has suffered military aggression by the illegitimate Kiev regime. We have led a fair war, fighting off the threat to our land and defending our rights. At the moment, when most of the Republic has managed to reach peace, the residents are faced with the question of creating a young state”.

Mir Luganshchine views the independence of the LPR, building a democratic state and the democratic rule of law as its main tasks. The manifesto’s social orientation is the main feature distinguishing it from the manifesto of the Luhansk Economic Union, which focuses on mostly industrial recovery and development.

Both movements share one major goal: strengthening ties with Russia. Mir Luganshchine seeks to create a union with the Russian Federation with developed social, political, economic, social and cultural bilateral relations. These are not idle dreams. Igor Plotnitsky said in an interview: “Russian business shows enormous interest in our region. There are so many people who would like to take part in the recovery of our economy, destroyed by the war, and to invest here that we have a choice — who offers the best conditions. Trust me, we are not isolated”.

The LPR is not going to isolate itself from Ukraine. The Mir Luganshchine manifesto stresses, “We are for equal cooperation with all countries, including Ukraine”.

As for concrete priority measures, the movement calls for an immediate recovery of the social infrastructure ruined by the war-
fare, immediate formation of working teams for social facilities, and a start on their work as soon as possible.

The priority social tasks include helping those who need it. During the punitive operation of the Kiev regime, thousands of residents of the republic lost their families, their houses are destroyed and the Ukrainian regime put people not on the verge of survival, but on the verge of death. To help people, Mir Luganshchine proposes the creation of a special republican fund to help families of dead military personnel of the LPR, citizens of the republic whose relatives dies during the shelling, and those whose property was damaged.

Concentrating on social tasks, the Mir Luganshchine manifesto also pays some attention to economic problems. For instance, it proposes such a mechanism as private-state partnership. Cooperation between business structures and the government has been successful in many countries, and people in the LPR hope it will work in the republic, too.

To implement its program, Mir Luganshchine put forward its candidates for deputies of the People’s Council of the LPR and intends to put forward its candidates for local councils in the future. Like the Luhansk Economic Union, the Mir Luganshchine Movement thinks it is important to create efficient communication platforms to develop a dialogue between the government and the people.

The Mir Luganshchine Movement, as its name implies, seeks a ceasefire. However, this is not to say that it is willing to sacrifice the LPR’s independence. Leader of the movement Igor Plotnitsky says: “If they want to distract us with talks about peace, they are severely mistaken. We, Slavs, wait for the first slap, we do not attack first. We show reverence for agreements. But we punish severely those who violate them”.

“The Mir Luganshchine Civil Movement is designed to bring back peace to our motherland. We understand peace as not only life without shooting and loss, but also as a functional, strong and developed state where people live in peace and harmony”, the conclusion of the manifesto says.
The Opinion Poll in Luhansk

On October 24, sociologists of the Institute of History, International Relations and Social and Political Sciences of Luhansk National University carried out an opinion poll on the elections in the Luhansk People’s Republic due on November 2. According to the data collected, 52% of the surveyed were determined to vote, while 40% had not decided yet. Turnout was expected at 70-75%.

As for the leaders in the electoral campaign, current head of the republic Igor Plotnitsky had the highest chance of winning by a wide margin, with over 40% of respondents determined to vote for him. Second would be leader of the LEU Oleg Akimov, who was expected to gain 15%. Other candidates were unlikely to gain more than the margin of error.

The parliamentary election was expected to bring about similar results. The Mir Luganshchine Civil Movement headed by Plotnitsky was expected to gain over 50%, while the Luhansk Economic Union over 20% of votes.

Press Conference of the CEC of the DPR

October 24 saw a press conference of the head of the CEC Roman Lyagin concerning the elections to Parliament and the head of the DPR, both due on November 2.

The press conference said that distant voting through the Internet had been agreed on and was being tested. The system was to be launched on October 29. To vote online, one would have to complete a number of procedures, including sending scans of ID with personal data and registration to confirm one’s identity. The commission would review all the documents to issue permission to vote online. Detailed information of the procedure was to be announced later on the official website of the CEC.

364 + 3 voting stations were expected to open. People with disabilities, and hospital patients and militiamen in areas of permanent dislocation with DPR registration, would also be able to vote. Every citizen of the former Donetsk Oblast has the right to vote,
despite the fact that the place where they live may be controlled by the Ukrainian side.

3 voting stations were to open in the territory of Russia. Refugees were expected to be taken to the stations.

Exit poll results were to be announced regularly after 8.30 am on November 2.

Potential monitors from many countries, including Ghana, had already applied. The European Union also showed interest in the elections in the DPR. However, all applications were being processed, with no officially registered monitors yet.

Moreover, the CEC pointed out that the first batch of ballots of over 2 million copies had already been printed.

A Meeting between Lyagin and the Chairmen of the Territorial Electoral Commissions

On the morning of October 25, head of the CEC of the DPR Roman Lyagin held a working meeting with all the presidents of the territorial electoral commissions of the republic. The meeting discussed certain questions related to the elections due on November 222.

“There will be more meetings like this before the election day. Our task is to hold the elections meticulously. That is why my colleagues and I are going to communicate with each other often and, hopefully, this dialogue will be productive”, Lyagin said. He added that the heads of the territorial electoral commissions received all the relevant documents (instructions, forms, etc.) and were given answers to their questions during the meeting.

Plotnitsky visits Lutugino

On October 25, head of the Luhansk People’s Republic Igor Plotnitsky visited the Lutugino region.

The visit involved inspecting an elevator in Zheleznodorozhnaya Street, going to the Diamant farm in the village of Chelyuskin,

---

and delivering humanitarian aid from the republic’s authorities to a care facility for orphans in the village of Belorechenka.

According to Plotnitsky, both control over repair work and creating conditions for the LPR to come back to a peaceful life as soon as possible are his main goals²²³.

**National Unity Day of the Donbass**

The celebration of the National Unity Day of the Donbass on October 26 in Donetsk, organized by the Free Donbass civil union, gathered about 700 people²²⁴.

The park of wrought iron statues in the center of Donetsk was full of the songs of different peoples, with creative teams performing national dances.

Despite the slightly cold and windy weather, the residents of Donetsk were able to enjoy the various national cuisines of the peoples living in the DPR.

The Free Donbass union, which organized the event and was to take part in the parliamentary election on November 2, said the celebration was aimed at uniting the residents of Donetsk of different ethnicities and reminding them about the importance of interethnic concord.

This was the second holiday in in close succession in the DPR: Flag Day was celebrated a week earlier.

**“The Party of War” Has Won in Ukraine — Zakharchenko**

“The party of war” won the Supreme Rada election of October 26, and the DPR has not ruled out resuming military action, Prime Minister of the self-proclaimed republic A. Zakharchenko told journalists²²⁵.

---

²²⁴. (Russian) RT на русском: В Донецке отмечают День народного единства свободного Донбасса. URL: http://russian.rt.com/article/56318
²²⁵. (Russian) РИА Новости: Премьер ДНР: на выборах в украинскую Раду победила «партия войны». URL: http://ria.ru/world/20141026/1030245703.html#ixzz3MRkagOZP
According to the preliminary results of the election, “the party of war”, rather than “the party of peace” won. Yatsenyuk, Turchynov, Lyashko and Poroshenko himself – all these figures have been advocating the military campaign against us”, Zakharchenko said.

In his opinion, “If anything, America is behind them and it is interested in military action at Russia’s borders, therefore, the war will go on”.

“We expect that there will be a harsh policy against us. Kiev has used the Ceasefire we have been discussing since September 5 (the start of negotiations in Minsk – Ed.) to regroup the troops, to resupply and to receive new arms. Kiev itself says that new tank factories work three shifts. It means they are getting ready for something. Well, we are ready, too”, Zakharchenko pointed out.

The “I Have Made My Choice!” Campaign

October 26 saw a memorial event in Donetsk called “I have made my choice”. The campaign was aimed at paying tribute to those who died.

People informed each other about the event with text messages saying “Light a candle in your window on October 26 at 19:00 and pay tribute to those who died. A candle is a prayer for each of them. Tell everyone and send this text to your friends. Don’t be indifferent!”

All those interested joined the campaign at 7 pm and lit a candle. Drivers stopped and honked their horns to pay tribute to the memory of victims.

“A lit candle is a symbol of our mourning. This is not a commercial or political campaign. We, the participants in the campaign, are all different. We are united by personal involvement in others’ woes”, organizers said.

According to UN data of October 21, the number of victims of the military conflict in the east of Ukraine had reached 3,724 people.
Plotnitsky Doubts the Legitimacy of the Election in Ukraine

During a working visit to the village of Roskoshnoye on October 27, head of the LPR I. Plotnitsky talked to journalists and expressed doubts in the legitimacy of the election in Ukraine the day before.226

“If they consider our occupied territories part of Ukraine, this raises a question — can the election be viewed as legitimate? For it turns out that a part of the “country” is not participating in the election”, Plotnitsky said.

In his opinion, the record low turnout for this election in Ukraine was a true indicator of the support in the occupied territory for the current regime. The head of the republic was sure that the turnout would be high at the upcoming elections in the republic. Plotnitsky expected it to be much higher than 50%.

Iosif Kobzon in Donetsk

People’s Artist of the USSR Iosif Kobzon arrived in the Donbass on Monday, October 27, as planned, to give away humanitarian aid and give concerts on Donetsk and Luhansk.227

Kobzon was given ovations in Makiivka, near Donetsk. The artist visited hospital №2, where he talked with doctors and patients and sang his favorite song “Donetsk, Donetsk! city of coal, city of roses!”

At the meeting, Kobzon said he was not afraid of possible sanctions by the West and Kiev due to his violation of ban from entering Ukraine. “I’ve been told: Ukraine will not let you enter. Well, that is not the Ukraine I love and know. The Donbass is my Ukraine. I am going to visit my motherland and I don’t care about the rest”, he explained, adding that crossing the border was no problem.

Kobzon gave the Endocrinology Center in Makiivka 2.5 thousand packages of insulin.

---

226. (Russian) Новороссия: Плотницкий сомневается в легитимности украинских выборов. URL: http://novorossia.su/ru/node/8701
227. (Russian) NEWSru.com: Кобзон дал концерт на Донбассе, спев хором с лидером сепаратистов. URL: http://www.newsru.com/world/27oct2014/kobzon_2.html
He also visited school №8 and sang the song “I love you, life!” for the teachers and students. The artist was also reported to have given away humanitarian aid there.

Kobzon and the Academic Ensemble of Song and Dance of the Ministry of Internal Affairs gave a performance to a sold-out hall of the Opera Theater in Donetsk, RIA Novosti reported. A live broadcast was arranged on a big screen on the façade of the theater for those who did not manage to buy tickets.

Kobzon performed his hits from over the years and new songs. At the end of the show, he invited the rebel leader Alexander Zakharchenko to the stage and they sang together “I love you, life!” Previously, the media office of the self-proclaimed DPR had announced that Kobzon would sing the anthem of the republic, which he wrote himself.

The singer was also reported to visit the Savur-Mogila height to give tribute to the memory of those who died — bloody fighting on this highest point of the Donbass took place both during the Great Patriotic War and the current military confrontation between Kiev and rebels. The laying of the foundation of a projected monument to the victims of the war was planned, and Kobzon is due to participate in it.

The day before, Markiyan Lubkivsky, an advisor to the head of the Security Service of Ukraine, said that the authorities were going to publish a list of several dozen Russian artists who would be prohibited from entering Ukraine due to their political position, with actor Ivan Okhlobystin and singer Iosif Kobzon among them. The singer reacted quite vehemently — he said that he did not need permission to enter his motherland and called the SSU employee a “scumbag” in an emotional speech.

The singer asked Russian reporters to send Lubkivsky a message from him to first reach “Kobzon’s level” in Ukraine. “I am going to my motherland, to the Donbass where I was born and where my “umbilical cord is buried”, where I have been awarded three Miner’s Glory Medals of all classes and three Miner’s Valour Medals. I am a People’s Artist of Ukraine and some scumbag like this SSU
employee should not even dare to hint that I should not visit my motherland”, Kobzon said, and added he did “not care what they (Ukraine’s authorities) came up with when drunk”.

Iosif Kobzon is an honorary citizen of Donetsk, Slavyansk, Makiivka, Kramatorsk, Artyomovsk, Gorlovka and other cities of the Donetsk Oblast. He was born in 1937 in Chasiv Yar in the Donetsk Oblast. In early September, deputies of Dnipropetrovsk City Council revoked Kobzon’s title of honorary citizen of Dnipropetrovsk, which he was granted in 1995. Commenting on this decision, the artist pointed out that he expected this from deputies and he was happy it happened because he was “ashamed of being an honorary citizen of Kolomoisky’s city”, meaning the oligarch Kolomoisky.

The Elections Will Contribute to the Legitimation of the Authorities – Russia’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs

On October 28, Russia’s Minister of Foreign Affairs Sergey Lavrov said that the elections in the DPR and LPR were in accordance with the Minsk Agreements and would contribute to legitimation of the local authorities228.

“We believe that this is a major direction of the Minsk Agreements. We expect the elections to take place as scheduled. We hope that expression of the people’s will be free and no one from the outside will try to disrupt them”, Lavrov said.

Lavrov stressed that the elections were important for legitimization of the leadership of the DPR and LPR.

“The elections which will take place in the proclaimed LPR and DPR will be important for legitimating power” he said.

Previously, Ukraine had called on the authorities of Russia to talk the rebels out of holding local elections. The EU refused to recognize the results of the elections in the DPR and LPR because, according to European officials, they “violated the letter and spirit” of the Minsk Agreements.

228. (Russian) Интерфакс: Россия признает результаты выборов в ЛНР и ДНР. URL: http://www.interfax.ru/world/404170
Campaign Videos in Donetsk

On October 28, campaign videos of Zakharchenko and the Donetsk Republic and Free Donbass Civil Movements appeared in the DPR\textsuperscript{229}.

Citizens of the republic themselves took part in the campaign videos of Zakharchenko. There were four videos, involving: the chief medical officer of the republic’s oncological center, Anastasia Bannikova, an actress in the Donetsk Theater, and commander of the Varyag Division Alexander Matyushin. They all addressed the audience and called for supporting A. Zakharchenko in the election on 2 November.

In the videos of the Donetsk Republic and Free Donbass, leaders and the rank and file members of the movements introduced to the voters the key ideas of the manifestos and call for participation in the election.

Iosif Kobzon in Luhansks

October 28 saw a Iosif Kobzon concert in The Lenin Palace of Culture in Luhansk. The concert hall of over a thousand seats was sold-out. The Academic Ensemble of Song and Dance of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, directed by People’s Artist of Russia Viktor Eliseev, which came with Kobzon, performed in the first section of the concert. Iosif Kobzon gave a solo performance in the second part\textsuperscript{230}.

He did not deliver a speech, but the very order of the songs sounded like a political declaration: the unofficial anthem of the Donbass “The Dark burial mounds are asleep”, “I love you, Russia” and “Sevastopol waltz”. The audience understood the symbols and gave the singer ovations.

Head of the LPR I. Plotnitsky, who sang the song “Hope” with the artist, addressed the audience: “I have two associations

\textsuperscript{229} (Russian) Пресс-центр «Новороссия»: В ДНР появились агитационные ролики Захарченко. URL: http://vostok-ua.ru/news/v-dnr-poyavilis-agitatsionnye-roliki-zakharchenko/

\textsuperscript{230} (Russian) Пресс-центр «Новороссия»: В Луганске прошёл концерт Иосифа Кобзона. URL: http://vostok-ua.ru/news/v-luganske-proshol-kontsert-iosifa-kobzona/
with the Soviet time — the Kremlin Clock and Kobzon... I am sure the Kremlin Clock is now counting down the last minutes of our separation with our brother people”.

Speaker of the People’s Council of the LPR Alexei Karyakin thanked Iosif Kobzon on behalf of all the citizens of the republic and said, “I think everybody understands now that Russians don’t start wars, but they do finish them”.

The First Day of the Early Election in the LPR

October 29 saw the first mobile early voting in the LPR. Mobile voting stations were working in Sverdlovsk and neighboring villages. The mobile stations had been set up in accordance with the decision of the CEC for voting in distant and sparsely populated areas. They went from village to village and arranged voting in village councils²³¹.

The election took place in the villages of Medvezhanka and Volodarsky. Journalists who monitored the voting witnessed a high turnout and voter interest. Judging by the number of people who came, most residents of these villages participated in the election.

Overall, the LPR organized five mobile voting stations that worked until October 31.

In the meanwhile, early distance voting via the Internet started in the Donetsk People’s Republic. It was available even for those citizens of the DPR who were outside its territory. Registration and voting was arranged through the website of the DPR CEC. The website experienced an overflow of visitors and was unavailable for users on several occasions, but IT specialists managed to fix the problems quickly.

The LPR Ministry of Internal Affairs Will Ensure Safety on Election Day

The LPR Ministry of Internal Affairs distributed a flyer to citizens of the LPR²³².

²³². (Russian) Актуальные комментарии: МВД ЛНР обещает обеспечить безопасность выборов 2 ноября. URL: http://actualcomment.ru/mvd_lnr_obeshchaet_obespechit_bezopasnost_vyborov_2_noyabrya.html
The flyer said that the information war in the Ukrainian media was gaining momentum, hence the reports of a “hair-trigger situation” in the LPR to the extent of a possible terrorist act on the Election Day.

The Ministry of Internal Affairs of the LPR regarded the reports as provocation without any grounds. “All necessary safety measures have been taken to ensure law and order in the LPR”, the ministry assured.

In addition, the ministry pointed out that in case the situation at the border was suddenly aggravated, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Ministry of Defense were “ready to protect the borders and give an adequate response to an aggressor”.

“We will prevent any disruption of the elections for the head of the LPR and the People’s Council, and will ensure the safety of all residents of the LPR”, the ministry stressed.

**The DPR Must Enter the Customs Union – Sivokonenko**

Candidate for the head of the DPR Yuri Sivokonenko was in favour of the republic entering the Customs Union, he said on October 30.

“I understand that, of course, that we are closely connected to Ukraine in terms of the economy, but in my heart and soul I am for integration, including with the Customs Union, ”, he explained.

Sivokonenko saw the recovery of the economy of the self-proclaimed republic in economic cooperation with Byelorussia and Russia.

Moreover, the candidate pointed out that he was for a peace treaty with Ukraine as soon as possible. He said, “The people who came to power in Kiev are not committed to a peaceful resolution to the conflict”.

According to Sivokonenko, he defined his political views as “close to the left wing”. It hurts to see ruined schools and kindergartens.

---

233. (Russian) ИТАР-ТАСС: Кандидат на пост главы ДНР Сивоконенко выступает за вхождение республики в Таможенный союз. URL: http://itar-tass.com/mezhdunarodnaya-panorama/1543951
The first thing I will do if I win is take care of social facilities and strengthen the DPR’s defense capabilities”, Sivokonenko added.

The DPR Says No to Election Silence

The DPR would not have election silence the day before the election due on Sunday, the head of the DPR CEC Roman Lyagin announced on 31 October.234 “There will be no election silence. Any candidate will be able to spread information concerning their manifesto, including tomorrow”, Lyagin said. He explained that the DPR’s laws had no rule about election silence and, therefore, it would not take place.

“We have printed over 3 million ballots. Voters will also be able to vote via the Internet from any place on the planet”, Lyagin added.

The EU Will Not Recognize the Elections in the Donbass – Merkel

Chancellor of Germany Angela Merkel said that the EU would not recognize the results of the “so-called elections” due on November 2 in the self-proclaimed republics of the Donbass.235

According to Merkel’s spokesperson Georg Steiner, during a phone conference with the presidents of Russia, France and Ukraine, Merkel made it clear that the European Union would not recognize the elections “the separatists” were planning to hold on November 2. She added that the scheduled elections violated the Minsk Agreements, and for the world community to recognize the elections, they would have to meet Ukrainian laws.

The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe also expressed its concerns with the elections unauthorized by Kiev. President of the Parliamentary Assembly Anne Brasseur made a statement and criticized the decision of the authorities of the self-proclaimed DPR and LPR to have elections. She added they would not be rec-

ognized. “I am sorry to hear about the decision of the self-appointed authorities of the so-called Donetsk and Luhansk People’s Republics to hold a “parliamentary election” and a “presidential election” on November 2, 2014. They violate the Minsk Protocol signed on September 5 and will prevent the implementation of the peace agreements. They are illegitimate and the Assembly will not recognize them”.

Moreover, the President of the Parliamentary Assembly called on the authorities of the DPR and LPR to hold local elections in accordance with Ukraine’s laws. Brasseur addressed the authorities of Russia and called for the fulfillment of their obligations under the Minsk agreements and not recognizing the results of the elections in the DPR and LPR “that may disrupt the peace-making process and stability in the region”.

In addition, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon called for not holding the elections in the east of Ukraine.

The LPR CEC: Early Elections in the Republic Are Going Smoothly With a High Turnout

Head of the CEC of the LPR Sergey Kozyakov said on October 31 that the early elections in the republic were going smoothly with a high turnout.

The election has been going smoothly. There are only some preliminary results in the areas where our mobile groups have been working. Sverdlovsk is reported to have seen a 90% turnout, while Bryansk is said to have had so many people that there were not enough ballot papers. Let’s hope to God it will be the same throughout the republic”, the head of the CEC said.

He pointed out that no provocation had been reported, but voters had reported in some locations that they had been sent the wrong addresses of voting stations.

---

236. (Russian) Информационный портал Донецкой народной республики: ЦИК ЛНР: Досрочное голосование в республике проходит спокойно и при высокой явке. URL: http://dnrepublika.info/cik-lnr-dosrochnoe-golosovanie-v-respublike-prokhodit-spokojno-i-pri-vysokojj-yavke/
Russia Vetoes the UN Resolution
Condemning the Donbass Elections

Russia vetoed the statements of the President of the UN Security
Council condemning the elections in the Donbass\textsuperscript{237}.

The Ukrainian Ministry of Foreign Affairs said\textsuperscript{238} that, by doing
so, Russia showed it did not want to or was not ready to comply with
the Minsk agreements. The comment pointed out that the statement
of the President of the UN Security Council affirmed the sovereign-
ty, independence and territorial integrity of Ukraine and called for
implementing fully the Minsk agreements. The UN Security Coun-
cil supported Ukraine’s effort to fulfill the signed agreements. It in-
volved, among other things, the “Law of Ukraine on a special pro-
cedure for local self-government in certain parts of the Donetsk and
Luhansk Oblasts”, passed by the Supreme Rada scheduling the local
election for December 7, 2014.

\textsuperscript{237} (Russian) Украина.ру: Россия заблокировала решение ООН о непризнании выборов
в республиках Новороссии. URL: http://ukraina.ru/news/20141101/1011043624.html

\textsuperscript{238} (Ukrainian) Урядовий портал: Коментар МЗС щодо блокування Росією проекту заяви
Голови РБ ООН для преси стосовно так званих виборів 2 листопада. URL: http://www.kmu.gov.
ua/control/uk/publish/article?art_id=247722980&cat_id=244277212
November 2, 2014 saw parliamentary elections and the election of the head of state in the self-proclaimed Donetsk and Luhansk Republics. The voting took place in the most unfavorable conditions — shelling, humanitarian problems and lack of well-qualified professionals. Despite this, the elections in the young republics had been initially planned to be as democratic, transparent and equal as possible amid the warfare.

The electoral campaigns in the DPR and LPR drew a lot of attention from both local and foreign media. 320 journalists, including from Europe and the US, had been accredited by the DPR CEC by Election Day. The chairmen of the CEC held press conferences regularly, once a week for the media. Briefings were arranged for all the media representatives who were also allowed to accompany candidates during their trips to the regions. The Election Day, November 2, saw several briefings, including on the results of exit-polls. An electronic screen also worked in the CEC of the DPR.

The turnout was the maximum possible amid the warfare. Thousands of people lined up in front of voting stations in the LPR from early morning until late at night. Although the DPR had four times more voting stations, there were queues during the day. As a result, over a million people took part in the elections in the DPR, while over 700 thousand people voted in the LPR.
THE ELECTIONS IN THE DPR

November 2, 2014 saw both parliamentary elections and the election of the head of state in the self-proclaimed DPR. The authorities of the DPR control almost 50% of the former Donetsk Oblast, where live 56% of the population of the region. According to the CEC of the DPR, about 3,198,000 voters were due to take part in the elections. This is the number of people in the Donetsk Oblast who voted in the May 11 referendum on the state independence of the republic. According to the electoral laws of the republic, citizens over 16 years old could take part in the elections.

The DPR planned to open over 360 stationary polling places. Special voting stations were to open in areas with concentrations of displaced troops. Five polling stations were also to open in temporary refugee settlements in Russia: in Rostov-on-Don, Voronezh and Belgorod. For voters who live on the territories of the former Donetsk Oblast that are controlled by the Ukraine, early election and online voting on the CEC website were arranged.

There was no threshold for the election of the head of the DPR. The CEC of the DPR would have considered the elections invalid if no list of candidates had gained more than 5% of the votes or if all the lists together had received less than 50% of the votes of the people who came to the voting stations.

According to the constitution of the DPR, the head of the republic is elected on the basis of universal, equal and direct suffrage, by secret ballot, for four years and cannot remain in the position for more than two successive terms. The candidate who receives a simple majority of votes is considered elected. In case of an equal number of votes, the candidate who was registered sooner is considered the winner.

Any citizen of the DPR who is at least 30 years old and has lived permanently on its territory for at least 10 years directly before the election can be elected head of the republic.

The head of the DPR is the top-ranking official, head of the executive branch and the commander-in-chief of the armed forces.
of the DPR. He/she forms the Council of Ministers and makes decisions on their dismissal, imposes states of emergency and martial law, signs or vetoes bills and grants pardons.

Three candidates ran for the head of the DPR: the then Prime Minister of the DPR A. Zakharchenko, deputy of the Supreme Council of the DPR Y. Sivokonenko, and deputy President of the Parliament of Novorossiya A. Kofman.

The People’s Council of the DPR consists of 100 deputies elected for a four year term. Elections are held only by proportional representation (according to party lists, without single-mandate constituencies). The threshold is 5% of votes.

Any citizen at least 21 years old permanently residing in the DPR (Donetsk Oblast) for more than 5 years immediately prior to the election can be elected as a deputy of the People’s Council.

Two political movements ran for the People’s Council: the Donetsk Republic (the top three on the list were A. Zakharchenko, A. Purgin, and D. Pushilin) and the Free Donbass (the top three were A. Malkov, M. Rudenko, and E. Shaftner). Both movements said creating conditions for a decent life for residents of the region and “building a people’s economy of the Donbass without the participation of oligarchs” were their priority tasks.

**Journalists**

The constitution and laws of the DPR grant journalists certain rights for full-scale media coverage of the voting process. The laws of the republic guarantee unimpeded access for the media to all public events related with elections. At the same time, since the voting took place amid martial law, special media-tours were arranged for reasons of safety. Journalists and international monitors accredited to take part in the media-tours were given instructions on the morning of November 2 (at Pushkin Blvd. 7b). They were provided with transport, and they left to follow their itineraries. The DPR ensured their safety. Media representatives could stay in polling stations,

---

239. (Russian) TACC: Выборы в Донецкой народной республике. Досье. URL: http://itartass.com/info/1547349
communicate with voters and members of the commissions, and attend press conferences in the CEC\textsuperscript{240}.

**The Elimination of Ballot Stuffing**

The self-proclaimed Donetsk People’s Republic developed a scheme to eliminate ballot stuffing, according to media citing a member of the Presidential Human Rights Council of Russia Alexander Brod, who came to Donetsk with a group of international monitors from Latvia, Poland, France, Great Britain and Mali\textsuperscript{241}.

“Today (November 2 – Ed.), we consulted with leaders of the Donetsk People’s Republic, DPR Ombudsman Darya Morozova and the heads of the CEC of the DPR. Among other things, we asked the question of how people would be included in the voter registration lists”, A. Brod said.

“They assured us that voter registration lists had been checked but residents of the DPR can vote at any polling station. However, the fact of a person’s vote will be put into a computer base, which will eliminate voter fraud”, he added.

**The Prime Minister of the DPR Votes**

Voting stations opened at 8:00 in the DPR. The Prime Minister and candidate for the position of head of the DPR Alexander Zakharchenko, was one of the first to vote at station №125 in school №1. He came to vote with his spouse. He had replaced his habitual camouflage fatigues with a grey suit\textsuperscript{242}.

Since it turned out at the voting station that Zakharchenko and his wife were registered to vote at a different polling station, an employee of the electoral commission asked them to fill in special forms to be allowed to vote at the station they had come to (the procedure is required by the laws of the DPR).


\textsuperscript{241} (Russian) BaltInfo: Повторное голосование на выборах в ДНР исключено. URL: http://www.baltinfo.ru/2014/11/02/Povtornoe-golosovanie-na-vyborakh-v-DNR-isklyucheno-459239

\textsuperscript{242} (Russian) РИА Новости: Александр Захарченко проголосовал на выборах в ДНР. URL: http://ria.ru/world/20141102/1031374090.html
“I voted for peace and the future of our republic”, Zakharchenko said.

He added that he expected Kiev to recognize the DPR. “They will recognize us, will return our land without a fight and we will have normal diplomatic relations”, Zakharchenko responded to reporters. “Negotiations with Kiev are going to continue, of course”, he said.

According to him, he expected that the new head of the DPR would “reconstruct industry” and that voter turnout would be “a hundred percent”.

After voting, Zakharchenko visited one of the neighborhoods of Donetsk that had suffered shelling. He went to Stratonavtov Street, located along the border with the territory of the airport where heavy fighting between the DPR Army and Ukraine’s law enforcement forces was taking place.

Zakharchenko inspected ruined block apartments and assessed the scale of damage to communications: gas, water and power grids243.

**The First Press Conference of the CEC of the DPR**

November 2, 9:00 am, saw the first press conference of President of the CEC of the DPR Roman Lyagin244.

According to Lyagin, almost all voting stations in the republic had opened, with the exception of stations in the cities of Zhdanovka and Kirovskoye and some other locations of the Shakhtersky region. They did not open due to heavy fighting in those territories. Voters from the locations were to be driven to neighboring voting stations. Overall, according to the head of the CEC, 350 polling places opened in the DPR, with 118 of them in Donetsk.

R. Lyagin reported on the results of absentee voting that took place October 29 to 31 via mail and the Internet. Overall, 47,857 vot-

---


ers took place in the absentee voting, with 42,950 people preferring Internet voting and the other 4,907 people voting by mail.

R. Lyagin said that the website of the DPR CEC was still being attacked by hackers that CEC specialists were being successfully repelling.

According to the head of the CEC, monitors at voting stations recorded a high turnout.

There were 1,148,953 people in the voter registration lists on November 2.

R. Lyagin stressed that almost all buses of the DPR were being used to help people get to voting stations.

**Voting By Mail and the Internet**
47,800 people voted by mail and the Internet, head of the CEC Roman Lyagin reported on November 2\textsuperscript{245}.

“47,857 took part in absentee voting. 42,000 of them voted via the internet, while 5,000 more voted by mail”, Lyagin said.

Internet voting had been arranged for citizens who live outside the DPR. It ended on the night of October 31. In addition, three polling places worked in refugee settlements in Russia, opening on the morning of November 2.

Since the election was announced, the CEC website has suffered mass DDoS-attacks\textsuperscript{246}.

“The site is still being attacked. This began the moment Internet voting began. So far we are coping with it successfully” he said.

**The Vice-Speaker of the Parliament of Novorossiya Votes**
Candidate for the position of head of the Donetsk People’s Republic, Vice-Speaker of the Parliament of Novorossiya Alexander Kofman voted in Donetsk at the same polling station where A. Zakharchenko had previously voted.

\textsuperscript{245} (Russian) РИА Новости Украина: На выборах в "ДНР" дистанционно проголосовало 48 тыс. человек – Лягин. URL: http://rian.com.ua/politics/20141102/359040463.html

\textsuperscript{246} (Russian) ТАСС: Сайт ЦИК ДНР продолжают атаковать хакеры. URL: http://tass.ru/mezhdunarodnaya-panorama/1548204
A. Kofman arrived at the voting station at 11:00. The station was full of voters: over a hundred citizens were queuing to receive ballots. That is why the candidate had to wait in line.

When he finally voted, he said he came to vote “for Novorossiya and a better life”\(^{247}\).

At 37, Kofman was the youngest participant in the race. When registering as a candidate, Kofman defined his priority as: “Establishing statehood, developing and expanding Novorossiya”. His manifesto focused on building a new state, reconstructing what had been destroyed and creating a new infrastructure and institutions. Kofman’s priority was to build government institutions and simultaneously form a legal framework. His electoral slogan was: “Help and expand”. His other priority was humanitarian aid to those in need and getting the republic’s economy out of a very deep crisis.

At the moment Kofman voted, exit polls suggested Prime Minister A. Zakharchenko and the Donetsk Republic movement was leading\(^{248}\).

**Voting in Gorlovka and Snezhnoye**

By 11.00, over 24 thousand voters had taken part in the elections in Gorlovka, which had significantly suffered from the shelling. The polling stations had queues of up to hundreds of people.

Despite the cold weather and snow, a lot of people were lined up in front of voting stations. According to head of the electoral commission Vera Gribtsova, by 13.30, 1,647 people had voted at school № 88. “The elections are taking place smoothly, without any provocations. Nobody will put the Donbass on its knees. People have come to have their say”, she said\(^{249}\).

According to an exit-poll at the same time, A. Zakharchenko and the Donetsk Republic were leading by a wide margin.


\(^{248}\). (Russian) РИА Новости: Exit poll: Захарченко лидирует на выборах главы ДНР, он набирает 81%. URL: http://ria.ru/world/20141102/1031461085.html

\(^{249}\). (Russian) ВКонтакте: Паблик «Выборы 2 ноября»: https://vk.com/wall-78648999-offset=60
Overall, 43 polling stations had been set up in Gorlovka. Live music played and concerts took place at many of them on Election Day\(^{250}\).

According to Irina Kartashyova, the head of electoral commission № 504 in the city of Snezhnoye, voting at the polling station started on time and the turnout seemed to be very high. Over 400 people had voted by 11.00. Mobile voting stations had also been arranged. By 11 am the mobile stations had visited medical facilities so that medical staff could vote quickly without leaving their professional duties\(^{251}\).

The Institute of Public Opinion had arranged exit-polls at the voting stations. According to the Institute’s employee Irina Zosenko, most of the people surveyed had voted for Prime Minister A. Zakharchenko and the Donetsk Republic movement.

In addition, international monitors from Latvia, the Czech Republic, Serbia and Montenegro visited the polling place and noted the high turnout and good organization of the voting process.

**The Call-Center of the DPR CEC**

The call-center of the DPR CEC started work at 7:00 on Election Day and closed after the vote count finished\(^ {252}\). 20 operators worked in it, each of them having several phone numbers.

According to the legal office of the DPR CEC, the call-center had two key tasks: ensuring maximum opportunities to vote for all citizens and preventing possible falsifications. The legal office said that amid the warfare in the DPR, many citizens had to vote outside of their places of registration. Everyone who found themselves in this situation had to fill in a form about changing their polling station, after which members of a territorial electoral commission phoned the call-center to report a citizen’s wish to vote outside of their place of registration. The call-center excluded the citizen from the territo-

\(^{250}\) (Russian) ВКонтакте: Паблик «Выборы 2 ноября»: https://vk.com/wall-78648999?offset=40
\(^{251}\) (Russian) ВКонтакте: Паблик «Выборы 2 ноября»: http://vk.com/wall249900111_43?w=wall-78648999_748
rrial registration list and informed the commission of the voting sta-
tion where the citizen wanted to vote. According to the legal office, 
this procedure eliminated ballot stuffing.

The call-center tested the call-center procedure on November 1 
by calling all the territorial commissions and inspecting all the equip-
ment.

According to the employees of the call-center, they received no 
complaints from citizens of the republic and no information of dis-
ruptions of the electoral process.

**Voting in Yenakievo and the Novoazovsky Rayon**

The official website of the Government and People’s Council 
of the DPR reported253 “A usual morning of a November Sunday 
starting with the sensation of a holiday. Residents of Yenakievo, 
Donetsk, Gorlovka, all villages, towns and cities united by the gen-
eral name of the DPR, must put an end to the dispute that started 
on May 11. Today must finally clarify the question of us being a new 
state situated between Ukraine and Russia. The day started with 
an unusually large inflow of voters to polling stations. Despite all 
the hardships and deprivations, the people of the Donbass have once 
again shown remarkable resilience and unity”.

Yenakievo, hometown of the fourth President of Ukraine V. Yanu-
kovich, played its part. The chairmen of the electoral commissions 
themselves had not expected such a high turnout. “By 8 am when 
the polling station opened, there was already a line of people”, presi-
dent of territorial electoral commission № 238 Galina Yatsenko re-
ponded to a question about the turnout.

Additional desks and more volunteers had to be used at polling 
station № 247 in the city of Yunokommunarovsk so that all the voters 
could take part in the elections without having to wait in lines. A lo-
cal entrepreneur gave up part of his shop to be used as voting station.
52,608 people, or 54% of the total number of residents of the city, 
had voted by 16.00. When asked who they had voted for, residents
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новой республике — мнение жителей Енакиево. URL: http://dnr.today/news/da-novoj-respublike-
mnenie-zhitelej-enakievo/
of Yenakievo replied simply: “For a new, fair republic. For peace without fascists”.

437 people had voted by 12-00 at one of the polling stations in the village of Sedovo of the Novoazovsky Rayon, visited by international monitors from Great Britain, France, the US, Spain, Italy and Abkhazia. Around 3,000 people were expected to have voted by that night. According to the monitors, turnout was not just satisfactory, but rather high. They also pointed out the good organization of the voting process.

Exit-polls were also organized near voting stations. They suggested that A. Zakharchenko and the Donetsk Republic movement were leading.

**Ukrainian Subversive Groups**

Two subversive groups trying to disrupt the elections in the DPR were neutralized on November 2 near Donetsk, head of the DPR CEC R. Lyagin reported at a press conference254.

“Subversive groups are operating in the DPR. We have neutralized two of them. The first one was revealed and neutralized in Makiivka. They were driving a Renault. The other one was found in Yelanovka in a VAZ vehicle. They were armed with grenade launchers and heavy machine guns”, Lyagin said.

The head of the CEC added that Ukraine’s authorities had been actively trying to disrupt the voting process by blocking roads leading to the former Donetsk Oblast. “Ukrainian law enforcement has blocked all the roads leading to the DPR”, Lyagin reported.

The day before, Kiev armed forces had blocked roads into the self-proclaimed republic from the east and west. According to the Ministry of Information and Communication of the DPR, roads were blocked on November 1 at 17:30 (Moscow time) “to prevent all interested parties from participating in the elections on November 2”.

“Ukraine is impeding the free movement of the citizens of the DPR to vote, Ukrainian forces have blocked all roads leading to us. This complicates the free movement of the citizens of the DPR

---

254. (Russian) ТАСС: Под Донецком обезврежены две диверсионные группы, которые пытались сорвать выборы в ДНР. URL: http://tass.ru/mezhdunarodnaya-panorama/1548417
and lowers the turnout. Nevertheless, we are happy with the result”, the head of the CEC said.

According to him, “warfare was taking place in some locations” and the working hours of voting stations in these places might be reduced.

Lyagin said that the Internet voting had finished on October 31 at midnight. “I also voted online because now I don’t have the chance to vote at my polling station, which is quite far”, he said.

The Elections in Donetsk
Continue with a Massive Street Party

A concert started on a big stage set up on Lenin Square in Donetsk at 16.00 and finished late at night.

“This is a true holiday!” “Today is a special day!” citizens who came to the concert said. Solo artists and bands from Donetsk and folk ensembles performed. Russian rock-band 7B also played for the residents of Donetsk, and other surprises awaited them. Public transport worked longer that day255.

A similar concert also took place in the LPR.

The Elections in Donetsk Airport and Ilovaysk

Almost 1.5 thousand people voted at the most dangerous voting station in Donetsk, № 145, near the airport, the control of which was being brutally fought for.

“Our station is located in the part of the city that is life-threatening almost round the clock. Despite this, people came to vote from the moment the station opened”, the territorial electoral commission said. It added that without considering absentee voting, 1,450 people had already voted there. “Moreover, we have absentee ballot boxes already almost full of ballots, which we collected from the handicapped we visited at home and militiamen where they serve”, a commission member added256.

255. (Russian) ВКонтакте: Паблик «Выборы 2 ноября». URL: https://vk.com/wall-78648999-?offset=0
256. (Russian) ТАСС: На избирательном участке вблизи донецкого аэропорта проголосовали 1,5 тысячи человек. URL: http://tass.ru/mezhdunarodnaya-panorama/1548520
Voters also actively participated in the elections in neighboring station № 146, also located in a war zone. “The peak of activity was reached before 11:00. People know that there is usually no shooting before 11 o’clock; that’s why they came to vote at this time”, head of the territorial electoral commission Alexander Mogilny reported. He said most of the voters were elderly, but there were also people who had just turned 16 and had not received their ID yet. “According to the law, we are allowed to let such voters vote only if they come with their parents to confirm their age”, Mogilny explained.

Nadezhda Bushueva, the head of territorial commission № 539 in Ilovaysk, where heavy fighting, won by the militia, took place in August-September, said that “there has never been such hype among people at elections: over 65% had voted in our territorial electoral commission as at 14:00, with more than 2.5 thousand ballots handed out”. She said “it is a victory”257.

Kofman Votes
Candidate for the position of head of the self-proclaimed DPR Alexander Kofman voted at voting station №1 at 17:30. It was the station where another candidate, A. Zakharchenko, had voted earlier the same day.

Alexander Kofman arrived at the polling station when it was already overcrowded with voters. Over a hundred citizens were standing in queues to receive their ballot papers, so the candidate for the head of the DPR had to wait his turn. Dropping his ballot paper into the box, he said that he had come give his vote for “a better life”.

The DPR CEC Announces the First Results
Yet another press conference of head of the CEC R. Lyagin took place at 21.00. He said no disruptions or fraud had been recorded. “The elections have exceeded all our expectations”, he reported. Initial results were as follows: A. Zakharchenko had gained 81.37%,
A. Kofman – 9.73%, and Y. Sivokonenko – 9%. As for public movements: the Donetsk Republic was leading with 65.11%, while Free Donbass had gained 34.89%.

A monitor from the Russian Federation, politician Leonid Slutsky, took the floor afterwards: “Six monitor-deputies of the Russian State Duma, from the LDPR, KPRF, Rodina (Motherland), United Russia and Spravedlivaya Rossiya (A Just Russia), attended the elections. The elections were run comprehensively and the commissions worked professionally. 10-15% of voters had voted during the first hour after the stations had been opened, which is an outstanding result. Security had also been organized at a very high level”.

International monitors also spoke at the press-conference. They said the elections have been democratic and in accordance with international standards.

50% of Ballots Processed

According to head of the CEC R. Lyagin, more than 50% of ballots had been processed as at 23:00.

“It is safe to say that Alexander Zakharchenko is the leader, with over 70% of the votes as at the moment. Alexander Kofman is in second place, while Yuri Sivokonenko is in third place by a small margin”, he said.

“The Donetsk Republic is leading among the public movements, with 60% of the votes. 25% of voters supported Free Donbass”, Lyagin added.

According to the Central Electoral Commission, about 8-9% of ballots were spoilt. More than a million voters took place in the elections, with 104,540 voting by mail or the Internet.

The DPR Announces the Election Results

Head of the DPR CEC R. Lyagin held a press conference on November 3 at 11:30 to announce the results of the elections in the DPR\textsuperscript{258}.

According to the CEC, Prime Minister A. Zakharchenko won the election for the head of the Republic, with 765,340 votes. A. Kofman gained 111,024 votes, while 93,280 residents of the DPR supported Y. Sivokonenko.

The Parliament of the country would be formed by representatives of two political movements, of which the Donetsk Republic gained 662,752 votes, while 306,892 people voted for Free Donbass.

In total, 353 territorial commissions worked on Election Day. 1,012,682 people were on the voter lists as at the end of voting. The territorial electoral commissions had received 1,379,677 ballots. 104,540 people took part in absentee voting and 761,075 ballots had been used in polling stations. 98,477 ballots were sent via the Internet. 43,039 ballots were considered invalid, while 969,644 ballots were recognized valid.

“Based on the above information, the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic has decided to consider Alexander Vladimirovich Zakharchenko elected as Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic”, the president of the CEC said. According to R. Lyagin, no irregularities that could significantly affect the results of the elections had been recorded by international monitors, accredited journalists, or members of the territorial electoral commissions.

**The Lawsuit against the Republic**

The Security Service of Ukraine filed a lawsuit on November 2 against the elections in the self-proclaimed Donetsk and Luhansk Republics, the SSU page on Facebook announced.

“A lawsuit has been filed for a possible offence under Clause 1 of Article 109 of the Criminal Code of Ukraine (an act in furtherance of violent change to or overthrow of a constitutional form of government, or of a takeover of government power)”, the message said.

Later, DPR Prime Minister A. Zakharchenko stated that in response to the message, the republic’s authorities were going to file a lawsuit for genocide. “We are not afraid of shelling, let alone a lawsuit. We do not care what Kiev is filing against us. They are frustrated
by their powerlessness. This is ridiculous. We have made our choice, we are going along our path and are not going to stray from it”, Zakharchenko said.

**Alexander Zakharchenko is Sworn in as Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic**

November 4 saw the inauguration of Alexander Zakharchenko, who gained over 75% of the votes, in the Music and Drama Theater of Donetsk. He was presented with his ID to thunderous applause and was formally sworn in on the Bible.

“Assuming office, I swear to abide by the laws of the republic, respect the rights of its every resident, and work for the good of the people of the Donbass”, Zakharchenko said and was officially sworn in as Head of the DPR.

Afterwards, President of the Supreme Council Boris Litvinov delivered a congratulatory speech and presented him with the symbol of the Donetsk region- a ribbon in the colors of the Republic. “Today’s event is an important milestone in the formation of the state. It is both an honor and a responsibility. I wish Alexander Vladimirovich decisiveness in making decisions”, Litvinov said.

Alexey Zhuravlev, a deputy in the State Duma, chairman of the Rodina party, delivered a speech as well. He noted that Russians do not leave their own behind. “The Head of the Republic is faced with the hard task of opening a new page in history. The state has to be rebuilt from scratch”, the deputy said.

Speaker of the parliament of South Ossetia Anatoly Bibilov, who was a monitor at the elections, also congratulated A. Zakharchenko on his inauguration and wished him luck and patience. The event continued with a gala concert.

---
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THE ELECTIONS IN THE LPR

November 2, 2014 saw elections for the head and deputies of the People’s Council of the self-proclaimed Luhansk People’s Republic.

On Election Day, the territory of the republic consisted of six regions (partially) and 11 cities, where more than 60% of the population of the former Luhansk Oblast lived (the overall population of the oblast was 2,228,000 people, according to Ukraine’s official statistics as at September 1, 2014).

Citizens over 18 years old could take part in the voting. More than 100 polling stations were to open on Election Day. Five were also set up in temporary refugee settlements in Russia: in Rostov, Voronezh and Belgorod. For voters who live in the territories of the former Luhansk Oblast, which are controlled by Ukraine, early voting and online voting on the LPR CEC website were arranged.

There was no threshold for the election of the head of the LPR. The CEC of the LPR would consider the elections invalid if no list of candidates gained more than 5% of the vote, or if all the lists together had received less than 50% of votes of the people who came to the voting stations.

According to the constitution of the LPR, the head of the republic is elected on the basis of universal, equal and direct suffrage by secret ballot, for four years, and cannot remain in the position for more than two successive terms. The candidate who receives the simple majority of votes is considered elected.

Any citizen of the LPR who is at least 30 years old and has lived permanently on its territory for at least 10 years directly before the election can be elected head of the republic.

The head of the LPR is the top-ranking official, head of the executive branch and the commander-in-chief of the armed forces of the LPR. He / she forms the Council of Ministers and makes decisions on their dismissal, imposes states of emergency and martial law, signs or vetoes bills and grants pardons.
Four candidates ran for the head of the LPR: the then leader of the LPR Igor Plotnitsky, businessman Viktor Penner, president of the Trade Union Federation Oleg Akimov and the LPR’s Minister of Health Larisa Ayrapetyan.

The People’s Council of the LPR consists of 50 deputies elected for a four year term. Elections are held only by proportional representation (according to party lists, without single-mandate constituencies).

Three political movements ran for the People’s Council of the LPR – Mir Luganshchine, the Luhansk Economic Union and the People’s Union. The movements adopted slogans connected with economic recovery, popular rule and social justice261.

**Plans after the Results of the Elections**

The Central Electoral Commission of the self-proclaimed Luhansk People’s Republic intended to draw preliminary results of the elections for the Head of the LPR the day after the voting, and final results on November 4, the head of the CEC Sergey Kozyakov said at a press conference on Friday October 31262.

“I think we will announce the preliminary results on the 3rd, and the final ones when the vote count is over: around the night of the 3rd or on the 4th depending on how smoothly everything goes”, he said.

He pointed out that the vote count would be done manually due to the extraordinary conditions of the elections. Kozyakov noted that absentee voting started on Thursday. The head of the CEC added that it was too early to talk about a possible date for the inauguration of the Head of the Republic.

US Secretary of State John Kerry had previously announced that the US and the world community would not recognize the elections in the DPR and LPR because they violated the Minsk agreements. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia stressed that artificial interpretations of the agreements impeded the restoration of peace in Ukraine.

---
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Plotnitsky Votes

Head of the Republic Igor Plotnitsky and his spouse voted at about 9:30 (Moscow time) at the voting station in the Luspekayev Luhansk Russian Drama Theater\(^{263}\).

“I voted for a free people, a peaceful life, love, faith, and peace in Luganshchina”, Plotnitsky said. He said he was going to follow the electoral process and possible complaints from polling stations. “We are going to address all complaints so that we have normal, free elections”, he pointed out.

The First Press Conference of the LPR CEC

The first press conference of the president of the LPR Central Electoral Commission on Election Day started an hour late because there had been problems with communication throughout the republic and there were difficulties receiving information from the voting stations\(^{264}\).

According to the LPR CEC as at 10:30, the elections were going as scheduled without any irregularities or provocations. 102 stations, including four mobile ones and three voting stations in temporary refugee settlements in Russia, had opened. “Residents of occupied territories” took part in the voting in some polling stations.

High voter turnout was recorded at all stations, with long lines of people who wanted to vote. For instance, during the first two hours, 8.25% of voters voted in Luhansk, 11.5% in Krasnodon and the Krasnodon region, 10.31% in the Lutugino Rayon, 13.8% in Bryanka, 7.81% in Krasniy Luch, 12.3% in Rovenky, 14.1% in Stakhanov, 12.7% in Alchevsk, 8.5% in Sverdlovsk, 11.3% in Kirovsk, 18.6% in Antratsyt, and 15.6% in the Perevalsk Rayon.

Queues in Voting Stations

Some polling stations in the LPR saw long lines of voters. Thus, the line at a station in Alchevsk had reached 500-600 people as at 13:00 (Moscow time).
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Almost a hundred people lined up to vote at station №28 in the village of Kamenny Brod.

However, there were queues not only in the villages. There were a lot of people in the center of Luhansk at the voting station in the Luspekayev Luhansk Russian Drama Theater, where Head of the LPR I. Plotnitsky had voted in the morning.

**Turnout as at 14:00**

President of the LPR Central Electoral Commission Sergey Kozyakov announced the most recent data on the elections for the head and to the People’s Council of the republic. 307,910 people, over 30% of the expected number of voters, voted in the first half of the day in the LPR.

As at 2 pm, the highest voter turnout had been registered in Lutugino, with more than half of the residents (52.32%, or 28,340 people) already having voted. The city of Antratsyt with a turnout of 46.18% (26,895 people) was in second place. Krasnodon with 40.85% of residents who had voted (22,468 people) was in third place.

Turnout in other cities made up about one third of the total number of voters: 30.61% (108,679 people) in Luhansk, 32.85% (12,483 people) in Bryanka, 36.18% (28,889 people) in Stakhanov, 22.13% (14,818 people) in Sverdlovsk, 27.18% (7,893 people) in Kirovsk, 20.46% (24,965 people) in Krasniy Luch, 31.25% (20,124 people) in Rovenky, 36.1% (7,999 people) in Perevalsk.

Pervomaysk had the lowest turnout registered as at 2 pm, with only 7.81% of the electorate having voted (4,357 people).

The LPR CEC did not have data on voting in Alchevsk because there had been communication disruptions and it was impossible to get in touch with the voting stations there.

Sergey Kozyakov also added that 30 foreign observers, including from Europe and the US, monitored the elections, while OSCE monitors failed to come. This surprised the European representa-
Luhansk Voting and Celebrating

An open air concert took place on Election Day, November 2, on Theater Square of Luhansk. Local artists and Russian stars, including popular singer Vika Tsyganova, performed to support Luhansk residents.

Thousands gathered on the square. People came and left because it had turned cold in Luhansk and snowed from time to time. Young and old people, families with children, they all came to the square before and after voting at their polling stations. Some saved their places in the very long queues at voting stations and went to the concert. Mobile field kitchens had been arranged with hot tea and food so that people could keep warm.

The Russian singer was very grateful to the residents of Luhansk: “I came to see you with faith, hope and love. Everything will be all-right. I wish you peace, Luhansk. Luhansk is a wonderful city”. People greeted her with ovations. Many danced on the square and sang when they heard familiar songs.

“We are very happy that we have been able to come to the concert. My mum has been standing in line at the voting station for an hour and a half already, and I decided to use the opportunity to see and listen to Vika Tsyganova”, Luhansk resident Nadezhda said.

Pensioner Lidya Andreevna said she would go to the polling station at night when the queues were shorter. “I hope the lines will be shorter. I decided to come here, to the square, during the day and listen to the concert”.

A family of three came from the outskirts of the city: “We have already voted. We had to wait in line for a long time. We decided, despite the snow, to come to the square and listen to the concert”.

Young people said they came to confirm the choice they had made on May 11: “There is no way back. The only thing we would like is that so they will stop hating us for our choice. We didn’t start a war when the Maidan began. We just observed. Of course, we did
not like what was going on. And it’s not only about Yanukovich. It is about the nationalists who came to power. Ukraine has forgotten that it is a multinational country. And they started to say that “Ukrainians rule” here. This is when the East rebelled. The people who live here – Russians, Ukrainians, Jews and other ethnicities that live here all rebelled. We have all made our choice”.267.

**Turnout Exceeds 50%**

President of the LPR CEC Sergey Kozyakov reported at another press conference that over half of voters registered by the CEC had voted as at 16.00. The CEC relied on the May voter registration lists and, with many people having left the republic during intense military actions, the real turnout was likely to be much higher268.

The Lutugino Rayon (66%), Antratsyt (58%) and Krasnodon (52%) were the leaders in the number of people who had voted. Sverdlovsk (27%), Alchevsk (35.5%) and Kirovsk (38%) showed results lower than average. Turnout in the capital of the LPR, Luhansk, was about 40% as at 4 pm. Moreover, there were still long lines of people at almost all voting stations.

Polling stations were likely to not be able to accept all voters due to the large number of people wishing to vote. That is why the LPR CEC decided to extend the voting until 22.00.

**Meeting Democratic Standards – Observers’ Opinion**

The international monitors of the elections in the Luhansk People’s Republic held a press conference and reported that the elections were going in accordance with all democratic principles and procedures and without irregularities269.

A monitor from Germany, Manuel Ochsenreiter, said: “Our mission is to monitor the elections to see if they are carried out in accordance with international democratic norms”. According to him, amid

---
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quite a complicated situation due to the warfare, people voted with enthusiasm, standing sometimes for hours, despite the cold weather. He added, “I observed the voting process and can say that it fitted completely with generally accepted democratic electoral standards. I talked to ordinary people and those in charge of the elections. Most importantly, people are sure in their choice and are fully aware of it. And for them, these are not just elections, but an opportunity to express their opinion”.

Ochsenreiter said the elections were well organized and no provocations or violations had been registered. He added that the monitors were told that a week before the elections, the Ukrainian authorities had tried to intimidate people — there were leaflets stuck on house walls, and rumors of danger at polling stations. The German monitor added it was important people did not feel threatened and took part in the voting.

Serbian observer Vladimir Krshlyanin also said that the elections followed democratic standards. He was very impressed by the organization and people’s decisiveness, and said it was a new stage in the democratic development of the country.

US Senior Attorney Frank Abernathy agreed with his colleagues: “Firstly, I believe the elections followed international standards for democratic elections. I was very impressed with the enthusiasm and the vigor with which the people went to the polls to express their opinion”. He added he did not see any intimidation. The monitor pointed out that the authorities of the republic may not have been prepared for so many people to vote but they were ready for fair elections. “The elections have been conducted properly”.

When asked if the elections in the Luhansk Republic were similar to elections in the US, Abernathy replied that the major difference was that American elections take place on Tuesdays, while in the Donbass they were on a Sunday. He added that elections must be voluntary, without coercion, in any democratic country, and the elections in the LPR were no different.
Poroshenko’s Theory that the Elections Took Place “at Gunpoint” is a Lie — Plotnitsky

Head of the LPR Igor Plotnitsky accused Ukraine’s President Petro Poroshenko of lying when he said that the elections in the republic took place “under the barrels of tanks and machine guns”270.

In particular, Poroshenko stated that the elections of the head of state and deputies of the People’s Council were held “under the barrels of tanks and machine guns”. In addition, Ukraine’s President said an adequate reaction would follow the violations of the Ukrainian laws. Poroshenko added that the DPR and LPR elections were “a contradiction of the Minsk Protocol”.

“Poroshenko’s theory that the elections in the Luhansk Republic were allegedly held at gunpoint is a blatant lie. It is just low. Poroshenko himself came to power as a result of the violent pro-Bandera February coup in Kiev, which was anti-constitutional and bloody. He shouldn’t be unfairly shifting the blame”, Igor Plotnitsky replied.

The Preliminary Results of the LPR Elections

President of the Central Electoral Commission of the Luhansk People’s Republic Sergey Kozyakov announced the preliminary results of the elections at a press conference. He said that the CEC decided to prolong the voting until 22:00 at many (about two-thirds) voting stations and even until 23:00 at some stations due to the large number of people who wanted to vote. All polling stations were closed by midnight. The total number of people who voted reached 698,941, or 68.7% of registered voters (1,027,012 people)271.

The CEC president announced that Igor Plotnitsky with 63.2% of the votes was leading by a wide margin based on the processed data from those voting stations that had closed by 20:00 (27.8% of the total number of stations). Oleg Akimov had gained 16%, Viktor Penner 10.3%, and Larisa Ayrapetyan 9%.

---
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Of the movements running for the People’s Council, Mir Luganshchine (69.2%) and Luhansk Economic Union (24.7%) were certain to get into Parliament. The People’s Council had gained 4.96% and had not reached the 5% threshold yet.

**The Winners are Announced in the LPR**

Prime Minister Igor Plotnitsky won the elections for the head of state, chairman of the CEC of the LPR S. Kozyakov announced\(^{272}\).

“Candidate Igor Plotnitsky gained 63.4% of votes, or the support of 440,613 voters, with 100% of ballots processed”, he said.

Previously, head of the DPR CEC R. Lyagin had announced the victory of Prime Minister A. Zakharchenko who received over 50% of votes in the election for the head of the DPR.

“Alexander Zakharchenko won the election for the head of the DPR, with 765,340 votes. 111,024 voted for Kofman and 93,280 for Sivokonenko. Thus the DPR CEC considers that Alexander Zakharchenko is the elected head of the DPR” confirmed the head of the DPR CEC. The elections for the head of state and the parliamentary elections in the self-proclaimed Luhansk and Donetsk People’s Republics took place on November 2, 2014. Preliminary results suggested that Zakharchenko had won in the DPR, while Plotnitsky was elected in the LPR.

President of Ukraine Petro Poroshenko said he did not recognize the elections because they contradicted the Minsk agreements\(^{273}\).

“The Minsk Protocol provides for early local elections in some areas of the Donbass, based exclusively on the laws of Ukraine. That is why the flagrant violation of the international agreements has threatened the peace process. Ukraine will offer an adequate response to this challenge”, the Ukrainian Head of the State stated. Poroshenko stressed that the procedure was not recognized by “leading countries of the world” and international organizations. The Ministry of For-
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eign Affairs of Russia claimed the elections in the DPR and LPR were “valid”.

**Plotnitsky is Sworn in as Head of State**

The Luhansk People’s Republic saw the first inauguration of a head of state in its history. Igor Plotnitsky was recognized head of the LPR based on the results of the November 2 election.

Deputies of the People’s Council, members of the Council of Ministers, heads of towns and regions, representatives of the militia, Cossacks, trade-unions, the clergy, public movements and heads of enterprises attended the ceremony. After the CEC decision had been announced, Igor Plotnitsky swore the official oath of allegiance to the people of the republic. The head of the young republic was presented with the symbol of the head of the LPR and his ID.

Addressing the citizens of the LPR, Igor Plotnitsky reminded everyone that the history of the LPR started with the protests of the residents of the Donbass against the coup d’état and illegal actions in Kiev in the winter and spring of 2014. “People demanded law and order be restored. However, the former opposition, which took over power in Kiev, replied with insults and threats... We understood that our republic and the Nazi regime have different paths to walk, and so we held the referendum”, the elected Head of the LPR said.

Not wanting to accept the outcome of the referendum, the Kiev regime started the war in the territory of the Donbass, killing almost a thousand and a half residents of the Luhansk Republic. But the people did not give up and they created their own state. Igor Plotnitsky valued highly the results of the November 2 election and thanked the people who expressed their will. “Now the LPR has executive and legislative authorities elected in accordance with all democratic norms and principles. The kilometer-long lines at voting stations on a chilly day from early morning until late at night proved conspicuously that we are doing the right thing. Our goal is simple and clear. It is true democracy, i.e. popular rule. It is free people in their motherland”, Plotnitsky said.

He also appealed to other countries, proposing the prevention of the spread of the ideas of Nazism that had swept through modern
Ukraine and the avoidance of accusing peaceful civilians of terrorism. “I would like to remind the US that they themselves were not recognized by their own metropolitan country at the end of the 18th century. From the point of view of Great Britain, the US were separatists and terrorists. They should not forget about that and attach labels to us”, the Head of the LPR said.

The Statement of the Donetsk and Luhansk People’s Republics in the Wake of the November 2 Elections

The elections of the Head of State and deputies of the People’s Council took place in the Donetsk and Luhansk People’s Republic on November 2.

The high turnout proved to the entire world that the people of the Donbass are united and seek to defend their freedom and right to a peaceful and decent life.

The elections proved that the people cannot be frightened.

The elections took place in accordance with the Minsk agreements at the time and according procedures agreed by representatives of the Republics, Russia and Ukraine.

However, Ukraine violated the agreements by distorting the agreed version of the Law on the special status of the Donbass. Since the Law intentionally did not specify the areas to which the special status applied, the Law failed to come into effect. It is in essence null and void. It must be developed further, or annulled as a meaningless law aimed only at confusing the global community.

The elections took place despite all these tricks and ploys of the Kiev authorities. They went very successful. Our people endowed themselves with a special status.

Kiev will have to take into account the opinion of the people of the Donbass, like it or not. And no political or legal tricks will work.

No laws of Ukraine passed unilaterally, without the agreement of the newly elected authorities of the DPR and the LPR, will be effective in our territory.

However, we are open to continued dialogue. But the dialogue must be equal.
Let us remind you that in Minsk on September 1, representatives of the LPR and DPR officially gave the Kiev authorities their Negotiating Positions with conditions for a resolution to the conflict. First of all, we demanded that “Ukraine should recognize the special status of the territories controlled by the People’s Republics” and that “Ukraine should create conditions (firstly, ending the ATO) for free ELECTIONS of heads and deputies of the People’s Republics based on the principles of INDEPENDENT POPULAR self-government” (point 7 of the Negotiating Positions). If Ukraine met our demands, we committed ourselves (in accordance with point 8 of the Negotiating Positions) to “putting maximum effort into maintaining peace, preserving the SINGLE economic, cultural and political space of Ukraine and all the space of the Russian-Ukrainian civilization”.

We confirm our commitment. And we remind the Kiev authorities that they accepted our conditions. So they must also fulfill them completely.

We draw Kiev’s attention to the fact of the violation of the ceasefire. The National Guard continues to shell our cities and villages. Ukrainian law enforcement is building up heavy equipment and artillery in close proximity to residential buildings and enterprises.

Ukraine stopped paying pensions and salaries to innocent citizens. The fault appears to be only that they live on the territory of the People’s Republics.

We call on Kiev to comply with the peace plan and to stop military and political pressure on the Donbass.

At the same time, we guarantee that if Kiev displays reason, the elected heads of state will be ready to resume dialogue. We are willing to follow the spirit of the Minsk negotiations based on points 7 and 8 of the Negotiating Positions. We will be willing to resume the whole complex of connections with the regions of Ukraine. With the government, enterprises and organizations of Ukraine. We are ready to provide coal to Ukrainian regions for the heating season. We need to cooperate in the spheres of energy, agriculture, transport, communications and export-oriented industries. Our economy will remain in the hryvnia zone if Kiev stops the financial blockade.
And of course, we are ready to do anything to maintain peace. This is all in the interest of the people. All people, no matter which side of the dividing line they live on.

Peace, a functional economy, the reconstruction of houses, roads, mines and factories ruined by the Ukrainian Army – these are our voters’ orders. And we are going to fulfill these orders.

We once again appeal to the sensibility of the Kiev authorities. And call for them to fulfill their commitments.
Do not violate the ceasefire.
Do not kill peaceful civilians.
Recognize the special status of the Donbass in practice by an effective, rather than a fictitious, legal act.

The elections that took place will accelerate the peace-making process and lead to full-scale political decisions to remove accumulated disagreements.

First Deputy Prime Minister of the Donetsk People’s Republic A. Purgin
Speaker of the People’s Council of the Luhansk People’s Republic A. Karyakin

VOTING OUTSIDE THE REPUBLICS

The elections of the head of state and deputies of the Parliament of the DPR and LPR took place on November 2 in three Russian regions bordering the Donbass, namely the Belgorod, Voronezh and Rostov Oblasts. The largest numbers of refugees from the self-proclaimed republics are concentrated here.

The Rostov Oblast
Voting stations for the elections of the head of state and deputies of the People’s Council of the DPR and LPR opened on November 2 in the Krasny Desant guest house of the village with the same name in the Rostov Oblast.

Even before they were opened people had lined up in front of the polling stations, which had been arranged in two rooms next to each other.

“We are happy with the turnout as at this moment. People have voted and keep coming. It is actually not very good when there are too many people. I assess the turnout to be good so far”, the head of the electoral commission of the LPR said.

As at 11.22 Moscow time, over 300 were reported to have voted over 1.5 hours. People who were not on the voter registration lists could also vote.

“We made lists in temporary settlements with those people who wanted to vote. Some data came from the republics. If they had information about potential voters in the Rostov Oblast, we added them to the lists. Those who were not on the lists but wanted to vote only needed to produce a passport with Luhansk registration”, head of the LPR territorial electoral commission Elena Kravchenko said.

International monitors pointed out that the elections at two voting stations in the Rostov Oblast went smoothly and without irregularities. “These are not the first elections we have monitored. My colleague from Serbia and I have been here for about an hour. Everything has been fine so far. I have already talked to some citizens. You can tell they are well informed and know the voting procedure. People tell their stories and are very grateful for the opportunity to vote”, Adrienn Szaniszló, assistant to the president of the Party for a Better Hungary, said.

According to her, her colleagues and she could see the preparation for the elections on November 1. They were planning to stay for the vote count.

The Voronezh Oblast

One stationary and 32 mobile voting stations opened at 08:00 (Moscow time) in the Voronezh Oblast for the LPR and DPR elections.

According to Lyudmila Neskreba, a member of the territorial commission, the head of the Civil Union of People of the Donbass
in the Voronezh Oblast, about 2 thousand people were expected to vote in a stationary polling station in the village of Somovo in the Voronezh Oblast.

“We are expecting about 2 thousand voters”, said Neskreba. She added that mobile voting stations were to work in all areas of the Voronezh Oblast. In some areas, members of the mobile commissions were to visit refugees from the Donbass who wanted to vote. Moreover, she said, international observers were also monitoring the elections.

According to the Civil Union of People of the Donbass, around 20 thousand citizens of the self-proclaimed DPR and LPR were staying in the region as at November 2.

The Belgorod Oblast

Turnout in the Belgorod Oblast was over 25% (as at 10:00 Moscow time).

“As at 10:00 Moscow time, 25% of voters of the DPR and 33% of the LPR voted here. We tentatively expect a turnout of 70%”, head of the territorial electoral commission Anna Nuzhnaya explained.

She said that 7.5 thousand voters were registered on the territory of the Belgorod Oblast. Only a small fraction of them was temporarily staying in Stary Oskol where the territorial voting commission was working.

Other voters would be able to vote at mobile polling stations that opened in the Stary Oskol City District and on the territory of the municipalities in the Belgorod Oblast.

The station in Stary Oskol opened at 8:00 Moscow time. No irregularities were registered. By the time the territorial commission opened, people were already lined up at the polling station275.
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CHAPTER 7.
International Monitors of the Elections in Novorossiya

About 300 observers from Greece, Austria, Italy, Germany, France, Russia, Hungary, Slovakia, the Czech Republic, Israel, Belgium, Serbia, Montenegro, Bulgaria, South Ossetia and the US monitored the elections in the LPR and DPR. International observers visited polling stations in Snezhnoye, Khartsyzk, Telnmanovo, Novoazovsk, Makiivka, Savur-Mogila, Gorlovka, Yasinovatoye and others, monitored the elections and talked to voters.

Well-known International Monitors:
- **Fabrizio Bertot**, Italian member of the European Parliament, Forza Italia!
- **Frank Creyelman**, parliamentarian from Belgium, Vlaams Belang
- **Anatoly Bibilov**, Speaker of the South-Ossetian Parliament
- **Frank Abernathy**, EFS Investment Partners LLC, US-Ukraine Observer magazine publisher, US
- **Alexander Brod**, member of the Presidential Human Rights and Civil Society Council of Russia
- **Michail Bryachak**, a State Duma deputy, A Just Russia
- **Alexey Didenko**, deputy of the Russian Duma, Liberal Democratic Party
• Nikolay Kolomeitsev, deputy of the Russian Duma, Communist Party;
• Stevica Dedjanski, President of the Centre for Development of International Cooperation, Serbia;
• Vladimir Djukanovic, MP, Serbian Progressive Party, Serbia;
• Fabrice Beaur, Parti communautaire national-européen, Belgium;
• Vladimir Krshlyanin, member of the Serbian People’s Alliance, Serbia;
• Jaroslav Doubrava, member of the European Parliament, Severočeši.cz, the Czech Republic;
• Márton Gyöngyösi, MP, Jobbik, deputy chairman of the Committee of Foreign Affairs, Hungary;
• Gábor Gyóni, researcher at Budapest University (Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem), Hungary;
• Georgios Lambroulis, deputy of the Greek Parliament, Communist Party;
• Viliam Longauer, secretary of the Union of Fighters against Fascism, Slovakia;
• Max Lurie, journalist, editor-in-chief at Cursor Info, Israel;
• Lucio Malan, member of the Italian Senate, Forza Italia!;
• Alessandro Musolino, Forza Italia!;
• Manuel Ochsenreiter, journalist, editor-in-chief of Zuerst! magazine, Germany;
• Oleg Pakholkov, member of the Russian Duma, A Just Russia;
• Vladimir Rodin, Communist member of the Russian Duma;
• Leonid Slutsky, member of the Russian Duma, Liberal Democratic Party, Chairman of the Duma Committee on the Commonwealth of Independent States;
• Slobodan Samardzija, Serbia;
• Jean-Luc Schaffhauser, deputy of the European Parliament, Rassemblement bleu Marine, France;
• Georgi Singalevich, journalist, member of the Ataka Party, Bulgaria;
• Ewald Stadler, deputy of the European Parliament, the Reform Conservatives (Die Reformkonservativen), Austria;
• Adrienn Szaniszló, Jobbik, Hungary;
• Magdalena Tasheva, MP from the Ataka Party, Bulgaria;
• Srđa Trifković, journalist from the US;
• Alexander Janev, journalist from Bulgaria;
• Mateusz Piskorski, director of the European Centre for Geopolitical Analysis, member of the Polish Sejm (2001-2005), Self-Defence Party (Samoobrona Rzeczpospolitej Polskiej), Poland;
• Jan Rychetsky, deputy editor-in-chief, Parliamentary Library Internet Portal, the Czech Republic;
• Slobodan Samardžija, journalist at Politika newspaper, Serbia;
• Patrick Lammer, assistant to the chairman of the Reform Conservatives, Austria;
• Marie Baeten, translator, Slavonic scholar, Belgium;
• Evgeni Velkov, Bulgaria;
• Alexander Yushchenko, Communist Party deputy in the Russian Duma;
• Ladislav Zemánek, deputy chairman of the Ne Bruselu – Národní demokracie Party, the Czech Republic;
• Georgios Manganas, translator, Greece;
• Alexey Zhuravlev, deputy of the Russian Duma, chairman of the Rodina Party;
• Sotirios Zarianopoulos, deputy of the European Parliament, Communist Party of Greece;
• Branimir Blažić, deputy of the People’s Assembly (Narodna skupština), Serbian Progressive Party;
• Radojica Živković, MP of Montenegro, New Serbian Democracy Party;
THE OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONITORS

Magdalena Tasheva,
Member of the Parliament of Bulgaria, Ataka Party

“Only elections can bring long-awaited peace in the Donbass. Without voting it is impossible to bring peace to this land. We hope the elections will be conducted smoothly, honestly, openly and in accordance with international standards. Despite the difficult conditions of the elections, their legitimacy exclusively depends on how they are held, how the votes are counted, and if the elections comply with international standards. The people of the Donbass should know that they chose the heads of the republics and other authorities.”

“People are coming to vote with such enthusiasm and the atmosphere is calm. We have not registered any violations so far, although Election Day has not finished yet. To recognize the elections or not is a matter of politics. Western Europe will probably not recognize the new realities for long. The world should recognize the new balance of power, that it has become multipolar, polycentric”.

“The elections were held in accordance with all standards of international law and democratic norms. Firstly, not a single shot was heard, although we know that the atmosphere is tense here. Secondly, people came to polling stations without any pressure. We were very surprised that it turned out to be not just elections, but a holiday for all the people. Let me congratulate the people of the Donbass! My congratulations to the winner of the election of the Head of the Republic and his competitors. If the West is not going to recognize these elections, it does not mean that the country does not have any right to exist. These are two different things. We hope that when we go back to our countries, at least my colleagues and I are going to put forward a draft resolution on recognizing the elections.”

---
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in Bulgaria’s Parliament. This is what we did after the referendum in Crimea. I am sure that we will have convincing arguments and we will see how the Bulgarian Parliament will vote. Most importantly, the Donbass held the elections as the antithesis of war. From this day, you can already start an internal life in the country as one people, one nation”.”278

Georgi Singalevich, journalist, member of the Ataka Party, Bulgaria

“We would like to see if the elections will be democratic and legitimate. Hopefully, they will. There are big expectations from these elections to bring peace and stability in the Donbass and to form a legitimate regime in Novorossiya”.279

“The elections in the Donetsk People’s Republic are being conducted without violation and in accordance with generally accepted international standards. It appears that the turnout is going to be very high, which is a guarantee of legitimacy and the legality of the authorities that will be elected. For instance, in my country, Bulgaria, turnout is often less than 50%, so many people question if the regime is legitimate. We feel the lack of democracy and it is also obvious at the European Union level. For it is not the people who choose the EU government, but it addresses important questions for Bulgaria and the other countries of the EU. But here, in the DPR, everything is different. The people are choosing the head of state and members of the People’s Council. There is more democracy in the DPR than in a European country where few voters come to polling stations”.280
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**Frank Creyelman,**
parliamentarian from Belgium (Vlaams Belang)

“The elections in Donetsk are taking place without violation, the atmosphere is very open. We have visited one station in Donetsk and another in Makiivka. Everywhere we have been the elections are well-organized in accordance with the rules. We have not registered any irregularities. We have seen many people, the atmosphere is very open. I think that we will see a similar situation at other stations we are going to visit today. I have monitored many elections in the former Soviet Union — in Saint Petersburg, Kaliningrad, etc. and I can say that the elections in Donetsk will be successful. I hope so”.

**Alessandro Musolino,**
Forza Italia!

“The Western media is biased in covering political processes in the east of Ukraine. Freedom and democracy are not something to respect only when it is in our interests. The future of this land is entirely in the hands of the people of DPR and LPR”.

“I am happy to see that many people, including young people, are taking part in the voting. The atmosphere here is very positive, which is also very good for democracy. We hope that Kiev, Brussels, Moscow and Washington will all reach an understanding that people of the Donbass have expressed their own opinion today. It deserves respect”.

“I express my gratitude to the authorities of the republic for their invitation to be an observer of the elections. And I am amazed by what I have seen. I see something completely opposite to what our media say. However, the main problem is ensuring the safety of the elections. But I wasn’t afraid of coming to the Donbass. Donetsk is a very beautiful city”.

---
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Alexander Yushchenko,
Communist Party deputy in the Russian Duma

“I have visited about eight stations in Telmanovo and Starobeshevo and I noted a high voter turnout. Over 200 people had voted in Starobeshevo by 10:00 Moscow time while over 700 people out of 2.5 thousand had voted in Telmanovo. People are tired of the war and view the elections as a step towards a peaceful life. We are in constant contact with other observers who see similar trends in the elections. Transparent ballot boxes are installed everywhere I have been. People vote calmly, employees of the territorial electoral commissions are performing their duties at a high level”.

Anatoly Bibilov,
Speaker of the South-Ossetian Parliament

“We have visited several stations in Donetsk, including at the location that was hit by a Tochka-U missile. People vote very willingly, even in ruined neighborhoods. The work of the territorial commission is organized at a very high level. Transparent ballot boxes are installed everywhere and all conditions for a secret ballot are met. I have not noticed any irregularities. I can confirm what I have seen with my own eyes. Stations opened as scheduled. What is most pleasant is people’s enthusiasm. People are coming, and when we talk we see they do want to vote. People who came to the polling stations were very optimistic. People expect the elections to bring peace and confidence in the future. People are coming to vote for their future”.

“The voting is organized at a quite high level. People are happy to vote. We don’t see any violations. Even if military actions resume, people will not refuse to participate in the elections because they are anxious to express their will”.
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Max Lurie, journalist, editor-in-chief at Cursor Info, Israel

“Together with other international observers I’ve visited several polling stations in Donetsk. I want to note people’s big interest in the elections: people have queued at polling stations. In general, the work of the district election commissions is organized well. There were no violations at the stations I visited. My colleagues from other countries also pointed out they have not seen any irregularities so far”.

Srđa Trifković, monitor from the US

“How democratic were the elections in Ukraine last Sunday when about 40% of voters who had previously voted for the Party of Regions were deprived of the right to vote? I think what is happening today clearly shows the sentiments of the people in Donetsk and the Donetsk Oblast. I don’t know if the voting can be called democratic, in that pure democracy does not exist, but I am sure the elections are no less democratic than the Ukrainian elections that took place last weekend”.

Jean-Luc Schaffhauser, deputy of the European Parliament, France

“I want to point out that there was a huge number of people who wanted to vote at the stations. They were very motivated. At every station I have visited, there were lists of candidates for the position of the head of state and lists of public movements. The voting was truly secret. Voting ballots were given only with a passport shown, and those who came to vote not to the local station where they were registered, had to fill in a form, after which the information that they wanted to vote at a different polling station was sent to the CEC. And only then could the commission confirm that those people could

---
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vote. This way, ballot stuffing was eliminated. Amid a pretty difficult situation, these elections were transparent, democratic and fully reflected the will of the people of the DPR”.290

Lucio Malan, 
member of the Italian Senate

“The lack of a single voter registration list did not affect the legitimacy of the elections in the DPR. I have not registered any irregularities and the voting followed all the international standards. Yes, it’s true, there were no voter lists, but the organizers solved the situation in such a way that that people voted in accordance with their residential registration”.291

“I feel sorry that I was blacklisted, as I previously had observed elections in Ukraine several times. I only monitor the election process. If I saw violations, I would report them. My duty is to protect the rights of the people”.292

“The standards of the elections in the DPR deserve respect, there was no coercion to vote”.293

Ewald Stadler, 
deputy of the European Parliament, 
the Reform Conservatives, Austria

“I decided to come and see with my own eyes everything that is going on in your region, rather than believe what they write in the newspapers and show on TV. We see more propaganda than truth. People who live in the Donbass have the right to self-determination and the coming elections are a very important step. People should use their right to self-determination even amid such difficult circumstances. I am very surprised that the OSCE has not sent their monitors to the elections. It is also true of some other organizations.
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Moreover, we often witness that the OSCE fails to perform its responsibilities. It is necessary to create an alternative organization — an Association for security and cooperation in Europe. Now is a good time for many countries to be independent from the US”. 294

“People have the right to self-determination. They have the right to decide their future themselves. And they have a fundamental right to elect their own representatives. No one pressures my opinion and I paid for the trip myself”. 295

“Some people had to wait over an hour to be able to vote. I have been a monitor many times. Look at voting stations in European countries, they are empty, and if someone has to wait more than five minutes, they turn around and leave. Most people who came to vote here were in a good mood”. 296

I am very surprised and a little angry that the OSCE will not monitor the elections. Such an attitude to the elections in the east of Ukraine is very biased. Unfortunately, they do not pay attention to our reports. Monitoring these elections is one of the key tasks of this organization. Instead, the OSCE has in essence taken sides in this conflict and pursues the policy of the US against Russia. But this conflict is a good example of how different the opinions of European governments and the public are”. 297

“The high turnout can be viewed as the aspiration of the people of the DPR to show the determination to defend their independence from Kiev. I see absolutely clearly that people here want Europeans to understand that the government of Ukraine has brought a civil war to this region. Let me tell the government in Kiev: they have lost the hearts of the people here, in Donetsk. After this war, they won’t return their hearts”. 298
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“I believe it is wrong that the EU countries are refusing to recognize the results of the elections in the DPR. A similar situation happened with Kosovo, but the referendum there had been recognized long before it was held. The opinions of international organizations and the leadership of countries can differ. The EU is making a mistake”.

Jaroslav Doubrava, 
member of the European Parliament, 
the Czech Republic

“The international monitors were very pleased with the elections. No serious irregularities were registered. I am in Luhansk on my own private initiative. I am not an official representative of my country. With my colleagues from the international monitoring mission I have visited 15 polling stations and no irregularities in the elections have been revealed. Also, we were impressed by the enormous voter turnout. I am watching these elections with envy: people wait in queues here in front of polling stations for several hours to vote”.

Frank Abernathy, 
monitor from the US

“I believe the elections in the LPR followed the international standards for democratic elections. When monitoring, we paid attention to whether the elections complied with democratic standards and the freedom of choice. It is safe to say that the answers to these questions are positive”.

“I hope that the participation of international observers will contribute to recognizing these elections as more democratic and open. Because our main task here is to make sure everything is transparent and open. We are responsible for that. People have the right to self-determination, which is fulfilled through elections. People should
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decide who governs them and how they should choose their future. Therefore, the people’s right to hold elections should be respected and supported. It is vital for the world community to know that the elections in the Donetsk and Luhansk Republics followed all international standards. However, international monitors are unlikely to contribute to the recognition of the elections in the DPR and LPR as legitimate, as the US and European countries are marching to their own tune. In this situation, it is more important that our participation in the elections is a guarantee of their legitimacy for the people of the Donbass”.  

Leonid Slutsky,
Chairman of the Russian Duma Committee on the Commonwealth of Independent States

“The elections in the DPR were held in accordance with the norms of the European electoral system. Despite very complicated conditions, the elections were held comprehensively. The local electoral commissions worked at a very high level, in spite of the huge number of people. At some stations, 10 to 15% of the voters came to vote during the first hour of their work. Doctors worked at every polling station, security was well-organized. On the whole, the elections fully complied with European electoral policy”.  

“The elections for the head of state and MPs of the Donetsk and Luhansk People’s Republics open a new page in the history of the Donbass. The elections are well-organized, despite the situation in the region, people are coming to vote with smiling faces, understanding that they are opening a new page in the history of the Donbass with their own hands”.  
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**Stevica Dedjanski,**
Director of the Centre for Development of International Cooperation, Serbia

“Everything is going properly. We have not noticed any irregularities so far. We see how grateful people who come to polling stations are that they have an opportunity to vote. Such expression of will cannot be prohibited”.  

“We see how grateful people who come to polling stations are that they have an opportunity to vote. Such expression of will cannot be prohibited”.  

“The elections should show they can be held peacefully”.

---

**Adrienn Szaniszló,**
Jobbik Party, Hungary

“Kiev is unlikely to recognize the elections. The situation today is that the West has double standards: they have their own opinion on what democracy is. And if somebody has a different opinion, it is not recognized. Such elections are necessary to bring peace to these territories”.  

“I have not seen any violations at the polling stations. Everything was organized very well, and it is a miracle that they managed to do it so well in these conditions”.

---
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**Manuel Ochsenreiter,**
journalist, editor-in-chief of Zuerst! magazine, Germany

“We have just visited a polling station that was filled to capacity. My first impression is that people are showing huge interest in the elections. There are the elderly and families with children – it is a very good sign. I have not seen any violations so far. The elections are taking place in a calm atmosphere. Security and safety measures have left a favorable impression”. 310

**Vladimir Krshlyanin,**
member of the Serbian People’s Alliance, Serbia

“Participation in the elections in the Donbass is an opportunity to express solidarity and exchange experiences because similar sad events took place in our former Yugoslavia. I am sure the people of the DPR and LPR have the determination to conduct democratic procedures. Hopefully, they will take place without any difficulties. The participation of foreign observers is very important in these elections as people from other countries have a unique opportunity to see with their own eyes what the people of the Donbass are actually fighting for, that it is the genuine will of people, rather than a Moscow trick. Participation of monitors from EU countries is very important because some forces challenge everything happening in the DPR and LPR. Some do it intentionally, others out of mere ignorance. But we must fight for the truth. I hope that my colleagues from the EU will spread truthful information about what is happening”. 311

**Márton Gyöngyösi,**
MP, Jobbik party, Deputy Chairman of the Committee of Foreign Affairs, Hungary

“Hungary fears that without the public support of the elections in Novorossiya, the armed conflict there may spill over the borders
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of the Donbass all the way to Zakarpattia. We have been following the events in Ukraine and Novorossia for a long time. It is very important for Hungary because we share borders with Ukraine, with 100,000 Hungarians living in Zakarpattia. We know that warfare is going on in the southeast of Ukraine and we fear that it will spread to Zakarpattia and our compatriots may suffer. Ukraine’s government has never given Ukrainian Hungarians the same rights it has given its own people. For instance, we were very upset when the Kiev regime annulled the law on the languages of national minorities. Our conclusion is that the chauvinism thriving is Ukraine is the major threat. It is horrifying that the government supported by the West is shooting at its own citizens. The fact that people in the southeast want to decide their own destiny should be accepted and supported. In this regard, double standards, this Western hypocrisy, are glaring: they staunchly defend democracy and human rights, but when it comes to Ukraine, they forget about everything. There is a lot of news about Novorossiya in Hungary, but unfortunately, it all comes from Western media, so we don’t see what is really going on. Kiev and some Western countries, of course, will not recognize these elections. It is very likely that as soon as on Monday, Western media will show how many irregularities there were during the elections and in what a mess they were held. It is very hard to hold elections amid warfare. But there is no other way now and something must be done. This is an emergency and the elections are necessary because a way out of this absurd situation, with the government killing its own citizens, must be found. Only some Western experts are sure today that Ukraine must stay united. But it is no longer possible”.  

Georgios Lambroulis,
deputy of the Greek Parliament, Communist Party

“For me as an independent monitor, the question of whether the elections should be recognized is not very important. It is not a question of whether the results will be recognized by the world community. We were invited by the Central Electoral Commis-
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sion, and we accepted the invitation and came here as observers. We should respect any decision of any people if we want to talk about recognition in a broad sense. Nowadays, the notion of the “world community” is understood narrowly and unequivocally. What do we mean when we say “the world community”? The US and the EU? Today, it is understood very narrowly, so to speak. For the world community is all the countries of the world. The legitimacy of elections should be primarily recognized by the populations of the territory where the voting takes place. The legitimacy of the elections in Novorossiya depends on who assess the procedure. We believe that it is the people who legitimize these elections. This is our position. We haven’t come here to further legitimize the elections. If people vote and express their opinion, this should be taken into account. It is not our business to judge if the elections are legal. I can’t say if the elections in Novorossiya will be open and transparent. This is what we would like to see. But we don’t make any assumptions because we are trying to stay independent. I can’t tell the people of the Donbass what they should do. But I think all people should fight against both Western and Eastern interests. The Donbass should first of all seek to pursue their own interests and form a people’s government.”

---
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The rebels in the Luhansk and Donetsk Oblasts arranged referendums that resulted in proclaiming the Luhansk People’s Republic and Donetsk People’s Republic in 2014. There are plans to establish an independent state of Novorossiya based on these people’s republics.

In this regard, it is interesting to analyze the ongoing process of the emergence of such new countries as East Timor, Montenegro, Kosovo, Abkhazia, South Ossetia and South Sudan.

**EAST TIMOR, OR TIMOR-LESTE**

Decolonization in Portuguese Timor started in 1974 after the authoritarian regime had fallen in Portugal.

On November 28, 1975, East Timor was declared independent. However, 9 days later, it was invaded and occupied by Indonesia and was soon declared Indonesia’s 27th province.

The invasion, followed by repression, was perpetrated with the support of the US, which provided arms to, and trained divisions of, the Indonesian Komando Pasukan Khusus (Kopassus) Special Forces.

Set up in 1970, the Timorese Social Democratic Association, later renamed the Revolutionary Front for an Independent East Timor
(better known as Fretilin), fought for national liberation and demanded immediate independence.

The Timorese, crossing over to the guerilla war in the hard-to-reach eastern regions, continued their armed resistance. Despite vastly outnumbering the opponent, the 32,000 strong Indonesian Army had lost 10 thousand troops by the end of 1976, in fights against worse-equipped and less-experienced Timorese guerrillas. According to some estimates, the Indonesians controlled not more than 20% of the invaded territory. The “swift victorious war” that the Jakarta generals had hoped for did not happen. Full-scale military action did not stop until 1980. And even after the declared “normalization” in the 1980s, Indonesian commanders admitted that Timorese rebels, called “gangs of peace-breakers” in official documents, remained “in all locations, villages as well as cities”.

Indonesian rule was marked by violence and brutality. Over 27 years of occupation, conflict-related deaths reached 100 to 250 thousand people (with an overall population of 600,000 people at the time of the invasion), and nearly as many became refugees.

What let the Indonesian dictator occupy an independent state and start the physical elimination of its people? The same thing that, ten years before the invasion, had let him exterminate a huge number of political opponents, mostly Communists, within his own country — the silence of the “world community” and the green light from the US for repression. The fact that the socialist North had won the Vietnam War had brought about a paranoid fear in the American establishment: the threat of the spread of Communism in Asia was like a domino effect and pushed the US ruling elites towards an aggressive opposition to any more or less radical national liberation movement in the region.

The Chinese People’s Republic paid lip service to the left-wing irredentist Fretilin party advocating East Timor’s independence, which was enough for Washington to proclaim the Timorese national liberation movement Communist and authorize reprisals against them through a proxy war by the Indonesian military.
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It speaks volumes that Indonesian dictator Suharto met President G. Ford and Secretary of State H. Kissinger in Jakarta on the day of the invasion. The latter, a Nobel Peace Prize winner, advised the dictator to “act fast” regarding East Timor.\footnote{Noam Chomsky. An Island Lies Bleeding // The Guardian, July 5, 1994. URL: http://www.chomsky.info/articles/19940705.htm}

As early as half a year before this event, on July 5, 1975, the same trio of gentlemen met at Camp David; it was exactly two months after the Communists had won in Vietnam. Back then, Suharto said in relation to Timor, that all supporters of independence were “under Communist influence”. Calling the East Timorese freedom fighters a “left-wing extremist threat”, the heads of state agreed that they were fully satisfied with the Cambodian Khmer Rouge as an opposition to “Soviet-Vietnamese expansionism”.\footnote{As a result of repression by the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia under Pol Pot, 1 to 3 million people were killed, according to different estimates – it is impossible to give an accurate figure due to lack of a census. The Khmer Rouge regime is one of the most violent in human history because of the ratio of people killed to total population.}

The genocide perpetrated by the Indonesian Army in Timor would have been impossible without a permanent flow of arms worth over a billion dollars from “Western democracies” – Great Britain, France, Australia and, of course, the US. 90% of the arms used by the Indonesian forces during the invasion had been produced in the US; the Americans trained the odious Kopassus death squads using their rich experience of training ultra-right officers and paramilitaries in Central America.\footnote{And US representative Daniel Patrick Moynihan successfully blocked attempts to introduce sanctions against the aggressor in the UN Security Council (naturally, the Security Council unilaterally called on Jakarta to withdraw troops from East Timor, but Jakarta could keep troops there indefinitely calling for independence).}

\footnote{Noam Chomsky. Why Americans Should Care about East Timor // Mother Jones, August 26, 1999.URL: http://www.motherjones.com/news/special_reports/east_timor/comment/chomsky.html}
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them “volunteers”). However, as soon as a year later, the US prevented attempts of smaller countries like Guinea-Bissau and Iceland from initiating steps to ensure the self-determination of the people of Timor Leste. This is why, although the UN General Assembly passed a resolution proposed by Algeria, Guyana, Cuba and Senegal not recognizing the occupation of East Timor, international organizations did nothing more than merely condemn the violation of international law by the Suharto junta.

In addition, an important ally of the US in the region, Australia (represented by Prime Ministers E.G. Whitlam and J. M. Fraser), also supported the Indonesian aggression: Whitlam said in 1974 at a meeting with Suharto that an independent Portuguese Timor would be an unsustainable entity and a potential threat to stability in the region. After Indonesia took over East Timor, Australia was the only country to officially recognize (after 1978) the annexation. Finally, Australians impeded the activities of the Timorese liberation movement abroad — for instance, they closed an independent radio-station in Darwin, thereby depriving the Fretilin guerrillas of their only line of communication with the outside world.

The genocide started in the very first days of what the multi-ethnic population of the island regarded as the “Java occupation”. On the second day Dili, the capital of East Timor, was taken (December 8, 1975), after which the nationalist Indonesian military shot 500 Chinese, although this ethnic group, being the foundation of the city’s commercial bourgeoisie, mostly did not support the Fretilin. Closer to the end of the occupation, nearly the entire 20,000 strong Chinese diaspora in Timor had been exterminated by the “race warriors” of the Indonesian junta.

In June 1976, the Army massacred a refugee camp in the West Timor city of Lamaknan: troops burned a settlement of almost 6,000 men, women and children and shot everyone who tried to escape the fire trap. Suharto’s troops were especially violent towards «carriers of the Marxist virus” — entire families whose houses were found to contain Fretilin Party flags were executed on site.
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Overall, the Indonesian occupation killed, tortured or reduced to death from starvation 150,000 to 250,000 people (1/5 to 1/3 of the population), and nearly as many became refugees. 80% of houses were destroyed. People were forced into “strategic villages”, the politically correct name for Indonesian concentration camps inspired by a similar experience of dictators from Southern Vietnam. In their free time, the population of the strategic villages of Timor was forced to study Bahasa Indonesia (the new official language based on Malaysian) and was taught to respect the national symbols of the new Suharto regime. Exploitation of natural and human resources in East Timor reached levels unprecedented even during Portuguese rule. Being part of Indonesia was a new version of colonialism in every sense of this word for the Timorese: the local economy was fully demolished and industry was nipped in the bud. Even food and medicine were delivered to the island exclusively from Indonesia.

25 years of resistance to the occupation were the only thing that helped the Timorese to survive amid the genocide by the pro-Western authoritarian regime of Suharto that “civilized countries” so rarely talked about. Left-wing rebels from the Armed Forces for the National Liberation of East Timor (or Falintil, the armed wing of the Fretilin) played a key role in the resistance. It largely consisted of peasants reduced by the Indonesian authorities to a life on the verge of survival. Student and youth movements and the local Catholic Church also played an important role in the fight for freedom of East Timor.

The world may have never discovered the scale of the murders, if it had not been for heroism of two independent left-wing American journalists – Allan Nairn and Amy Goodman. Goodman is now an anchor at the Democracy Now! radio station. Goodman and Nairn risked their lives to try to stop the reprisals. They managed to record a shooting and barely avoided an execution by Indonesian authorities.\footnote{Noam Chomsky. East Timor Questions & Answers http://www.chomsky.info/articles/199910-02.htm}
Very few people tried to protect the people of East Timor, although those few do include world-renowned linguist Noam Chomsky, who has never concealed his radical left wing and anarchist views and has harshly criticized US foreign policy, and left-wing historian Benedict Anderson (brother of another famous Marxist historian Perry Anderson) who was prohibited from entering Indonesia.

In 1996, the Nobel Committee finally paid attention to the Timorese fighters for independence and awarded two activists who had discovered the truth about the crimes perpetrated by the Indonesian occupation forces with the Peace Prize they had previously given to Kissinger. Jose Manuel Ramush-Orta, “Minister of Foreign Affairs in exile” and representative of the Fretilin at the UN, and Bishop Carlos Filipe Ximenes Belo, who protested against the massacres and hid members of the underground resistance. The bishop was enemy number 1 for Suharto’s new order, just like Desmond Tutu for the apartheid regime or Óscar Romero for El Salvador’s junta.

A sign of the times was that, in 1997 when visiting Indonesia as the President of the Republic of South Africa, Nelson Mandela met with not only Suharto, but also Xanana Gusmão, who was imprisoned five years earlier.320

Amid growing international attention to the problem of East Timor, the US maintained its strong reactionary position, continuing to turn a blind eye to the genocide and ongoing violations of human rights on the island.

It was only after Suharto’s dictatorship had fallen in 1998 that large-scale popular protests and the pressure of the world community forced new President Habibie to agree to a broad autonomy and a special status for East Timor. However, Jakarta also made it clear that independence was out of the question.

A UN-supervised referendum on the self-determination of East Timor was held on August 30, 1999, when 78.5% of the population voted for independence from Indonesia. The voting was conducted in an atmosphere of intimidation and terror. Pro-Indonesian police

---

320. Xanana Gusmão was elected commander of the Falintil and national political commissar of the Fretilin Central Committee. Convicted to 20 years in prison. The first President of independent East Timor 2002-2007.
unleashed blatant terror that resulted in the killing of nearly 2,000 people, including international monitors and children, with up to 300,000 becoming refugees, half of whom had practically become prisoners by the end of the year. In addition, according to UN estimates, 750,000 out of 880,000 residents of East Timor left their homes. It was only the presence of UN forces from 17 countries, which started to arrive on the island on September 12, 1999 and numbered 9,900, that stopped the bloodshed. On the other hand, the new East Timor leadership became fully dependent on foreign support.

As a result, a UN peacekeeping task force was introduced and managed to establish some kind of law and order in the country. Indonesia recognized the results of the referendum and the independence of East Timor. The last Indonesian troops left the country on October 30, 1999.

The United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) was established on February 23, 2000, initially for three months. When the term was over, its mandate was extended. The transitional administration was aimed at facilitating the establishment of national government structures and an administrative and judicial system, and preparing for elections for self-government bodies. The UNTAET governed the country until 2002.

On May 20, 2002, East Timor was officially declared a sovereign state.

**MONTENEGRO**

Montenegro was part of Yugoslavia and later Serbia and Montenegro from 1918 until 2006.

On March 1, 1992, at a referendum, Montenegro voted for remaining part of Yugoslavia. 95.96% of voters supported joining a renewed Yugoslavia (overall 66 % of the citizens of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia residing in Montenegro). Albanians, Bosnians and Croats living in the Republic boycotted the referendum.
From April 27, 1992 to June 3, 2006, Montenegro was part of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which became the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro on February 4, 2003 года.

At the end of the 1990-s, Montenegro’s leader Milo Đukanović, a onetime close associate of Slobodan Milošević, now became his bitter foe, which immediately drew the support of the international community and Serbian opposition to him. Initially Đukanović demanded that Milošević guarantee Montenegro the right to an independent foreign policy, but later he started to seek full independence. It was the European Union that prevented Montenegro from obtaining full independence at that time.

However, years later, the enormous pressure of the European Union and Javier Solana’s active position encouraged the formation of the state union of Serbia and Montenegro. According to the Constitutional Charter of the new state, parliamentary elections were due in February 2005 and, in 2006, the republics of the state union were allowed to hold a referendum on independence. However, the elections did not take place — the Montenegrin President of Serbia and Montenegro Svetozar Marović failed to appoint a date due to a lack of legal framework.

As a result, from the start of March 2005, after their mandates expired, the deputies of the Union’s Parliament, Ministers and the President himself became private individuals, from a legal perspective. At a about the same time, Đukanović and Montenegro’s President Filip Vujanović put forward a new plan to transform the State Union into a union of independent states.

The Serbian authorities did not have a united opinion in this regard: while Prime Minister Vojislav Koštunica rejected the idea, Serbian President Boris Tadić said it could be considered.

The Constitutional Charter of Serbia and Montenegro, passed on February 4, 2003 by the parliament of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, provided for the procedure of secession from the state union. Article 60 required at least three years from the Charter’s ratification before one of the republics could secede from the State Union. In addition, a country leaving the Union would forsake all rights to
any political and legal continuity, and could not be a legal successor of the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro. This meant that a state seceding from the Union (Montenegro in this case), when applying for membership of an international organization (for instance, the UN), must be recognized by the international community, while the other (Serbia in this context) would become the legal successor of the State Union.

According to the Constitution of Montenegro, only a nationwide referendum could change the country’s status. President Filip Vujanović put forward to parliament a bill on referendums, which was unanimously passed into law on March 2, 2006 [5].

The law on referendums obliged the Parliament to respect the results of the expression of the people’s will. The results of the referendum were to be announced within 15 days, while the decision made at the referendum was to be implemented within 60 days. Serbia’s leadership said it would respect the result of the referendum and would not undermine Montenegro’s sovereignty.

Negotiations between Montenegro’s authorities and the opposition on the conditions of the referendum started in early 2006. Initially, the opposition, which was against the independence of Montenegro, categorically refused to discuss the mere idea of a referendum. The EU offered to be a mediator. EU special representative Miroslav Lajčák was put in charge of the mediation mission. During further negotiations, the opposition accepted the referendum and agreed with the ruling coalition on the conditions. Nevertheless, disagreement remained over the main question — the majority required for a decision to be made.

According to Montenegro’s law on referendums, 50% plus one voice with a compulsory 50% turnout was required. The opposition demanded that both the population of Montenegro and Montenegrins living in Serbia participate in the referendum. In these circumstances, Miroslav Lajčák suggested his formula: the EU would recognize Montenegro’s independence if 55% of voters supported the idea. The formula provoked a very negative reaction in Montenegro. Prime Minister Milo Đukanović warned that it threatened Montenegro’s stability.
One question was put to the referendum:

- Do you want the Republic of Montenegro to be an independent state with full international and legal sovereignty?

Advocates of independence focused on Montenegro’s history and the rights of its ethnic minorities. Montenegro had been recognized as an independent state as long ago as 1878 at the Congress of Berlin. The country’s independence was annulled in 1918 when Montenegro’s assembly decided to join Serbia in the wake of World War I. Supporters of independence promised all ethnic minorities that they would observe all their rights in an independent Montenegro. Milo Đukanović was the leader of the advocates of independence.

The opposition forces that were for maintaining the union of Serbia and Montenegro united into the Bloc for Love and counted on EU support (the EU advised Montenegro’s authorities not to hurry with the decision on secession) and focused on extensive ties with Serbia. Supporters of the union claimed that the ruling elite advocating independence was trying to turn Montenegro into a “private property” and safe haven for criminals. Moreover, the “unionists” said historical connections with Serbia could not be severed because 73% of the citizens of Montenegro had close relatives in Serbia. The unionists were led by Predrag Bulatović.

The referendum took place on May 21, 2006. The voting ended at 21:00 local time. According to initial data the turnout was 86.7% of all registered voters.

55.6% voted for the independence of the Republic of Montenegro and its secession from the state union of Serbia and Montenegro, while 44.5% participants in the referendum supported the Union.

As a result, the number of votes in favor of independence turned out to be enough, although the required threshold was overcome by a small margin of 2,000 votes.

European monitors said the referendum was free and fair.

Independence was proclaimed on June 3, 2006 and recognized by Serbia on June 15. Montenegro entered the UN on June 28.

Serbia’s President Boris Tadić recognized the referendum on Montenegro’s independence immediately after the results were
announced. Prime Minister of Serbia Vojislav Koštunica, who opposed Montenegrin independence, recognized the referendum only at the end of the week.

Prime Minister of self-proclaimed Kosovo Agim Çuku said, “This is the last act of the historic liquidation of Yugoslavia... This year, Kosovo will follow in Montenegro’s footsteps”.

KOSOVO

In ancient times, the territory of Kosovo was inhabited by Illyrian tribes. In the 6th century, Slavs settled there partly assimilating and partly forcing out the Romanized population.

The 13th century saw the formation of a strong Serbian state, the Serbian Kingdom, in the Balkans. The city of Peć in the north of Kosovo became the seat of the Serbian Archbishopric. Gradually Kosovo became the religious, political and cultural center of Serbia. A plethora of monasteries and churches were founded here, while the cities of Pristina and Prizren hosted palaces of Serbian kings.

In the 1389 Battle of Kosovo, troops led by Prince Lazar were defeated and the country accepted Turkish suzerainty. Nevertheless, the Battle of Kosovo became a symbol of Serbian national unity and the fight for independence.

The entire territory of Kosovo was conquered by the Turks in 1454. The conquest, and the demolition of traditional land relations and trade ties, new taxation and the enslavement of peasants, resulted in economic decay, with a number of locations being abandoned. This started the first mass emigration of Serbs from Kosovo. The local aristocracy forced out by Muslims, including Slavs which had converted to Islam. This brought about ethnic and religious oppression.

After long years of fight, the people lost hope of ever gaining independence, which led to the 1690 Great Serb Exodus: the Peć Patriarch of Kosovo called for crossing the Danube and thousands of Serbian families left Kosovo and settled in the territory of the Austrian monarchy.
Albanians started to move onto the land of Kosovo left by a significant number of Serbs. The Albanians managed to integrate better into the social and political structure of the Ottoman Empire, and converted to Islam.

The colonization of Kosovo’s plains by Albanians resulted in the Serbian-Albanian confrontation.

In the 18th century, the center of the Serbian national liberation movement shifted to Northern Serbia. In 1766, the Peć Patriarchate was liquidated and the generally successful policy of the Hellenization of the Orthodox Church resulted in it losing its leading role in the fight for independence.

At the beginning of the 19th century, northern areas of Serbia saw the formation of the Serbian Principality, with its center in Belgrade, which achieved a broad autonomy, while Kosovo and other regions of Old Serbia remained under Ottoman rule.

The decaying national movement in Kosovo in the 19th century was accompanied by the emergence and rapid development of the Albanian liberation movement. The proportion of the Albanian population in Kosovo kept growing and had exceeded 50% by the mid-19th century.

Kosovo became one of the centers of Albanian enlightenment and the fight for the unification of all lands inhabited by Albanians into a single autonomous entity within the Ottoman Empire.

The turn of the 19th-20th century saw a spike in violence by Albanians against the Kosovo Serbs.

As a result of the 1912-1913 Balkan wars, a large part of Kosovo became a part of Serbia. The independent Albanian state was formed at the same time. The fact that over half of ethnic Albanians were left outside of Albania led to the escalation of the Albanian-Slavic confrontation in the region. Moreover, territorial changes started a new round of ethnic migrations: Serbs from other regions began to move to Kosovo, which was encouraged by the government of Serbia, while part of the Albanian population emigrated from the country.

Within Yugoslavia, the Albanian question remained important. Albanian nationalists unleashed a guerrilla war to get Kosovo to join
Albania, while the government encouraged the colonization of Kosovo by Montenegrin peasants. Several thousand Albanians left Kosovo during the inter-war period.

During the Second World War, a large part of Kosovo was integrated into the Albanian protectorate of Italy. During the Italian occupation, Albanian armed formations started a fight to force the Serbs out of Kosovo. According to Serbian estimates, 10 to 40 thousand Serbs were killed, while 70 to 100 thousand people had to leave the region.

In 1944, largely due to the effort of Kosovo guerrillas, the region was freed and once more became part of Yugoslavia. According to the 1946 Constitution of the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia, the autonomous region of Kosovo and Metohija was established within the Socialist Republic of Serbia.

Josip Broz Tito, hoping for Albania to join Yugoslavia, encouraged the Albanians to settle in Kosovo and, on the contrary, limited opportunities for Serbians to return. Although Kosovo fell behind other regions of Yugoslavia in terms of economic development, the standard of living there was much higher than in neighboring Albania, which contributed to a growing number of refugees from there.

Despite the gradual expansion of the Kosovo autonomy, Albanians increasingly sought independence and were oriented towards Enver Hoxha’s regime in neighboring Albania.

Throughout 1968, the region saw a wave of actions perpetrated by Albanian radicals.

In 1981, Kosovo saw large-scale student manifestations demanding full republican status for Kosovo within Yugoslavia. The protests degenerated into bloody clashes and were suppressed by federal forces. The Serbian-Albanian confrontation reached a new level: Serbs were discriminated against by local authorities, ethnic clashes became more common, the Albanian national movement radicalized, while anti-Albanian sentiment grew among Serbs.

Serbian-Albanian antagonism escalated after Slobodan Milošević came to power in Yugoslavia in 1988. He used nationalist rhetoric and
managed to gain wide popularity among the Serbs amid the growing disintegration of Yugoslavia. In 1989, Serbia held a referendum that passed a new constitution that radically reduced the autonomy of the regions. Kosovo Albanians boycotted the referendum. As a result of the referendum, the parliament in Kosovo was dissolved, national radio and TV stations stopped broadcasting in Albanian, Albanians were dismissed from government structures and education in Albanian was stopped in some educational facilities. This resulted in mass strikes, protests and ethnic clashes. In 1990, a state of emergency was introduced in Kosovo. Separatist aspirations grew among Albanians. On September 22, 1991, an independent republic of Kosovo was proclaimed that held an unauthorized (among the Albanian population) referendum on independence, and presidential elections. Ibrahim Rugova was elected president. On October 22, 1991, Albania recognized the independence of the Republic of Kosovo.

Separatist armed groups were formed and were united into the Kosovo Liberation Army in 1996. A guerrilla-terrorist war broke out in the region that claimed the lives of hundreds of peaceful civilians, officials and the military of Yugoslavia. Initially, only the police fought against the separatists, but in 1998, the Yugoslavian army joined military operations. The war brought about mass repressions, the killing of peaceful civilians and ethnic cleansing on both sides of the conflict. Albanian insurgents destroyed many cultural monuments to orthodox culture. In 1999, NATO intervened in the military action: Yugoslavian cities and military facilities suffered large-scale bombing. About half a million of people, mostly Albanians, became homeless. As a result, the Serbian government was forced to agree to the introduction of NATO KFOR troops into Kosovo and the UN Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo, which was based on Security Council Resolution No.1244, passed on June 10, 1999.

The world community initially tried to implement a “standards before status” policy towards Kosovo, that required first reaching a consensus between all political forces and ethnic groups, and only then could be followed by defining the status of the region. This policy, however, failed to bring Serbs back to Kosovo and to stop
In October 2005, the UN Security Council voted for the beginning of negotiations on Kosovo’s status. On January 31, 2006, a meeting of the Contact Group on the Future of Kosovo, at the level of ministers of foreign affairs (Russia, the US, Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, the EU and NATO), passed a statement that “the character of the Kosovo problem, shaped by the disintegration of Yugoslavia and consequent conflicts, ethnic cleansing and the events of 1999, and the extended period of international administration under UNSCR 1244, must be fully taken into account in settling Kosovo’s status”. The ministers agreed that all possible efforts were to be made to achieve a negotiated settlement by the end of 2006. Russia and Serbia were against defining a specific deadline for the settlement. Three main principles of negotiations were agreed on: no return of Kosovo to Serbian rule, no partition of Kosovo, and no union of Kosovo with any other country. Former President of Finland Martti Ahtisaari was appointed head of the international mediators, charged with organizing Kosovo status negotiations.

On February 17, 2008, Kosovo’s Parliament unilaterally adopted a declaration of the independence of Kosovo. On December 1, 2009, the International Court of Justice in the Hague started hearings on the legality of the unilateral declaration of independence. On July 22, 2010, the UN International Court of Justice recognized the legality of the Kosovo authorities’ decision to self-declare independence from Serbia.

108 member countries of the UN recognize Kosovo’s independence.

**SOUTH SUDAN**

When European countries started the colonization of Africa, South Sudan was not a state entity in the modern sense of the word. The Arabs had failed to integrate this region over centuries. Some progress was achieved under the Ottoman rule in Egypt when
in 1820-1821 Muhammad Ali, independent of the Sublime Porte, started the active colonization of the region.

At the time of Anglo-Egyptian Sudan (1898-1955), Great Britain tried to contain Islamic and Arabic influence on South Sudan and introduced separate administrations of the North and the South of Sudan. In 1922, Great Britain even passed a law introducing visas for the Sudanese population to limit movement between the two regions. At the same time, South Sudan was Christianized. In 1956, the Republic of Sudan was proclaimed joining both Sudans, with Khartoum as the capital. Politicians from the North dominated the administration of the Republic and tried to Arabize and Islamize the South.

The 1972 the signing of the Addis Ababa Agreement ended the 17-year First Civil War (1955-1972) between the Arab North and the black African South. The South obtained some autonomy in internal affairs.

After about 10 years of stability, Gaafar Nimeiry, who took power in 1969 through a military coup, resumed the policy of Islamization. He imposed Islamic law throughout the country, including such kinds of punishment as stoning, public flogging and the cutting off of hands. As a result, the People’s Liberation Army of Sudan resumed the military conflict.

According to some estimates, over two decades after the armed conflict began again in the south of Sudan, government troops exterminated about 2 million civilians. Periodic droughts, starvation, lack of fuel, growing armed conflict and violations of human rights forced over 4 million people from the south to leave their homes and flee to cities or neighboring countries – Ethiopia, Kenya, Uganda and the Central African Republic, as well as Egypt and Israel. The Refugees could not cultivate the land or make a living any other way, suffered from starvation and malnutrition, and had no access to education and health care. The protracted war resulted in a humanitarian catastrophe.

Negotiations between rebels and the government in 2003-2004 formally ended the 22-year second civil war, although separate
armed clashes in a number of southern regions continued to take place occasionally. On January 9, 2005, the Naivasha Agreement was signed in Kenya. It gave the region its autonomy and leader of the South John Garang became Vice-President of Sudan. South Sudan gained the right to hold a referendum on independence after six years of autonomy. The Agreement also provisioned the equal division of oil revenues between the central government and the leadership of the southern autonomy. These measures helped somewhat to ease tensions in the region. However, on July 30, 2005 Garang died in a helicopter crash, and the situation began to escalate again. To help to settle the conflict, UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon visited South Sudan in September 2007.

The world community introduced peacekeeping and humanitarian forces to the conflict zone. Within 6 years, the authorities of the South arranged quite a full and efficient control over its territory by the government, armed forces and law enforcement forces. All assessments suggested that the aspiration and ability of the non-Arabic region to live independently could not be doubted.

In June 2010, the US announced it would welcome the emergence of a new state if there was a positive outcome to the referendum.

On the eve of the referendum, on January 4, 2011, Sudan’s President Omar al-Bashir, during a visit to the South Sudanese capital Juba, promised to recognize any results of the referendum. He even said he was willing to take part in the official celebrations when the new state was formed, if the population of the South voted for independence. In addition, he promised freedom of movement between the two countries, offered to help the southerners to set up a safe and stable state, and promised to organize an equal-right union of the two states, like the European Union, if the South became independent.

South Sudan formally became independent from Sudan on 9 July 2011, following the referendum. 98.83% of the population voted for independence. Most countries of the world have recognized South Sudan’s independence.
The fact that the politicians brought to power by the Ukrainian Maidan revolutions turned out to be clearly anti-democratic, fully reliant on advantages of the moment stolen from opponents on the square, and not ready to compromise or stick to agreements made with opponents, is both the fault and a generic trait of the Maidan revolutions. It is this fact that eventually became the key factor in the collapse of the Ukrainian state. Indeed, if we imagine that the February 21 agreements between the opposition and Yanukovich had been implemented, there would not have been the referendum in Crimea, nor the Odessa massacre, nor the referendum in the Donbass, nor the bloody civil war, and most likely somebody other than Yanukovich would have become President of Ukraine. However, given the logic of ochlocracy, it is just as clear that this was impossible. For the leaders of opposition are through and through square-dwelling provocateurs, pushed from behind by a similar, though far more radical, breed.

While elections tend to have a low turnout, with the procedures usually well defined, the turnout at referendums tends to be high, although there are often procedural questions.

These are the realities one has to learn to evaluate correctly. The institution of representative democracy attracts less and less the attention of the citizens of different countries. If there is still some interest in elections for the head of state (although fatigue builds up because all politicians are the same), people rarely understand
who to vote for and why, when it comes to parliamentary elections. The shows put on, or the intensified controversies between politicians before elections, only show that national leadership does everything possible to attract people’s attention to a voting procedure that has become uninteresting or meaningless for them. On the other hand, the instruments of direct democracy, such as referendums that decide truly life-changing questions for a country or a region, draw more and more people. The answer to the question of why this is happening is obvious — people show their civic-mindedness when something is vital, when their voice defines the fate of their country, but they do not want to take part in meaningless games imposed on them. On the other hand, this suggests the more profound conclusion that the public conscience, the proverbial civil society is a real, sizeable phenomenon, rather than a “Frondesque” narrow circle of party activists. And the position of the true civil society, i.e. people who perceive themselves as citizens of their country who care about its future, has long since outgrown the meaningless formalism of liberal democracy.

Unfortunately, Europe itself has never paid any attention to this phenomenon. This is not only a problem of double standards. The thing is also that countries with undeveloped democratic institutions that disrespect both the will of the people and basic European principles, are now seeking to join the European Union. In trying to secure geopolitical success, Europeans themselves are adding to the decay of the system of their own basic values.

In the meantime, a referendum is one of the most democratic forms of expressing one’s civic position on important questions. A referendum is a form of direct democracy when people themselves make decisions on key questions and directions for the functioning of the state. Switzerland addresses national issues through referendums. A referendum in France buried the project for EU constitutional reform, and Brussels had to revisit the EU integration strategy.

To be fair, it should be noted that the institution of referendums, unlike elections, is typical of very few democratic states and is not for-
malized or recognized formally in international law. However, world experience shows quite a few examples of state dissociation through the self-determination of the people, including the use of the results of the people’s will at a referendum.

As regards the referendums in Gagauzia (February 2, 2014) and Crimea (March 16, 2014), they not only met constitutional norms, but also were quite well designed in terms of law, which undoubtedly contributed to a fuller implementation of the principles of popular government.

On the other hand, one cannot ignore the danger related to an excessive use of the institutions of direct democracy, without proper attention to legal questions — the danger of ochlocracy, mob rule. The period of Soviet Perestroika with its endless protests and de facto collapse of the government is a glaring example. Ukraine from 2004 until 2014, going through all the phases of “Maidan rule” from a coup d’état to a de facto failure of the state itself, is another example.
The Donetsk People’s Republic Law
“On the Election of Deputies to the DPR People’s Council”

Article 1.
The Basic Principles of the Election of Deputies
to the People’s Council of the Donetsk People’s Republic

1. Deputies of the People’s Council of the Donetsk People’s Republic (hereafter “deputies of the People’s Council”) shall be elected on the basis of universal, equal and direct suffrage by secret ballot. Participation in the election shall be free and voluntary.

2. In accordance with the Constitution of the Donetsk People’s Republic, 100 deputies shall be elected to the People’s Council for a four-year term.

3. The election of deputies of the first convocation of the People’s Council shall be called by the Supreme Council of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

4. Deputies of the People’s Council shall be elected in one republican electoral district comprising the entire territory of the Donetsk People’s Republic in proportion to the number of votes cast for a republican list of candidates for the deputies of the People’s Council. Voters residing or staying outside the territory of the Donetsk People’s Republic during the election shall be included in the republican electoral district.

5. The preparation and conduct of the election of deputies of the People’s Council, implementation and protection of the electoral rights of citizens and control over the observance of the electoral rights
shall be carried out by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic and territorial electoral commissions formed in accordance with this Law.

Article 2.

Electoral Rights of Citizens in the Election of Deputies to the People’s Council

1. A Donetsk People’s Republic citizen who permanently resides in the territory of the Donetsk People’s Republic and has attained the age of 18 on voting day shall be entitled to elect deputies of the People’s Council, to participate in the nomination of candidates for election to the People’s Council, in the election campaigning, in the monitoring of the conduct of the election and the work of electoral commissions and in the performance of other electoral activities.

2. A citizen of the Donetsk People’s Republic who has attained the age of 21 on voting day and has permanently resided on the territory of the Donetsk People’s Republic (Donetsk Oblast) for at least 5 years immediately prior to the election shall be eligible for election as a deputy of the People’s Council.

3. A Donetsk People’s Republic citizen shall not be entitled to the right to elect or be elected or participate in other electoral activities if he/she has been declared by a court to be legally incompetent or is being held in custody according to a court sentence.

Article 3.

Electoral Precincts and Voter Registration Lists

1. Electoral precincts shall be formed by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic to conduct voting and count votes in the election of deputies of the People’s Council.

2. Electoral precincts shall be of approximately equal size in terms of the number of voters.

3. Electoral precincts shall be formed outside the territory of the Donetsk People’s Republic for voters who are outside the territory of the Republic on the day of the election of deputies of the People’s Council.
4. The procedure and timescale to form electoral precincts shall be established by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

5. The lists of electoral precincts indicating their number, boundaries and names of population centers, the location of the premises of precinct electoral commissions and polling stations, the addresses of precinct electoral commissions shall be brought to voters’ notice by the electoral commissions.

6. Voter registration lists are formed by territorial electoral commissions individually for each electoral precinct. A voter shall be included in the voter registration list only at one electoral precinct. The fact of residing on the territory of an electoral precinct is the basis for the inclusion of a voter in the voter registration list at the relevant electoral precinct. If a voter cannot come to the said electoral precinct on voting day, he/she is included in the voter registration list at the precinct where the voter is situated on voting day. In this case, a voter who is included in the voter registration list at the place of his/her registration is removed from the list by the territorial electoral commission of the precinct.

7. The voter registration lists specify first name, last name and patronymic, year of birth (additionally day and month of birth at the age of 16), address of registration. A blank space is provided on the voter registration list for the number and batch number of the passport or other identification document of a citizen as well as for the voter’s signature for the voting ballot he/she receives and signature of the member of the territorial electoral commission giving the ballot.

8. The procedure and terms to form voter registration lists shall be established by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

9. Territorial electoral commissions shall be responsible for publication of voter registration lists.

Article 4.

The Formation of the Central Electoral Commission and Territorial Electoral Commissions and Their Powers

1. The Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall consist of 6 members with the right to a deciding vote. When
the first convocation of the Central Electoral Commission is formed, half of its members shall be appointed by the People’s Council of the Donetsk People’s Republic, the other half shall be appointed by the head of the executive power of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

2. Members of the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall elect, from among their members, the Chairman of the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic whose candidacy is put forward by the head of the executive power of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

3. The Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall make decisions according to a majority of the votes. In the event of a tied vote, the Chairman of the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall have the casting vote.

4. When preparing and conducting the election of deputies to the People’s Council, the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall:
   1) organize the preparation and conduct of the elections, exercise control over the observance of the electoral rights of citizens;
   2) form territorial electoral commissions and manage their activities;
   3) form election precincts;
   4) establish a procedure for compilation of voter registration lists;
   5) inform voters on dates of and procedure for electoral actions, the electoral campaign and candidates;
   6) register republican lists of candidates;
   7) register authorized representatives and agents of public organizations (movements) that have submitted republican lists of candidates;
   8) distribute funds allocated from the budget of the Donetsk People’s Republic to provide finance for the preparation and conduct of elections, exercise control over the proper use of such funds;
   9) approve, within the scope of their competence, the form of documents related to the preparation and conduct of elections;
   10) approve the text of the voting ballot for the elections, ensure the production of ballots and the transfer of ballots to territorial electoral commissions;
11) determine the results of the elections of deputies to the People’s Council and publish them;

12) prepare a list of candidates elected as deputies of the People’s Council and forward it to the People’s Council of the Donetsk People’s Republic with other necessary documents;

13) within the scope of its competence, consider complaints (appeals) about the preparation and conduct of the elections and take reasoned decisions on such appeals;

14) follow instructions and legal norms on issues relating to the application of this Law;

15) fulfill other obligations in accordance with this Law.

5. The Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall be responsible for establishing the procedure for forming territorial electoral commissions and the number of members with a casting vote.

6. When organizing the elections of deputies to the People’s Council, territorial electoral commissions shall:

1) exercise control over the preparation and conduct of the elections and over the observance of the electoral rights of citizens on the relevant territory;

2) compile voter registration lists for each polling station;

3) inform the population about the day, time, and place of voting, the progress of the electoral campaign and candidates on the relevant territory;

4) organize the voting in the polling station on voting day;

5) count the votes, determine the election results for the relevant polling stations, forward the report of vote returns to the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic;

6) exercise other powers in accordance with this Law.

7. Decisions of the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic made within the scope of its competence shall be binding for territorial electoral commissions.

8. The Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall define the procedure for the activities of electoral commissions in accordance with this Law.
9. Candidates included in republican lists of candidates, authorized representatives and agents of public organizations (movements) that have submitted republican lists of candidates, citizens under the age of 18, and citizens declared by a court to be legally incompetent shall not be members of electoral commissions with a casting vote.

**Article 5.**

**Openness in the Activity of Election Commissions**

1. Members of the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic, agents or authorized representatives of public organizations (movements) that have submitted republican lists of candidates, and candidates on the lists may attend meetings of any election commission and may be present when territorial electoral commissions counting votes and working with voter registration lists, ballots, reports of vote returns. Members of the press may also be present at meetings of election commissions when they are working with the said electoral documents and counting votes.

2. Decisions of electoral commissions directly relating to the preparation and conduct of the elections of deputies to the People’s Council are published in the media or brought to voter’s attention in another way.

3. On voting day, persons indicated in Clause 1 of this Article as well as observers, including foreign (international) observers, may be present at polling stations.

4. During the elections of deputies to the People’s Council, observers may be appointed by public organizations (movements) that have registered republican lists of candidates.

5. Observers may:
   1) inspect voter lists;
   2) be present at the polling station of the relevant electoral precinct on voting day;
   3) observe ballots being issued to voters;
   4) observe votes being counted at the polling station, watch the election commission preparing the report of vote returns and other documents, inspect the report;
5) appeal against actions (omissions) of a territorial electoral commission, to the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

6. Observers shall not be entitled to:
   1) issue ballots to voters;
   2) sign on behalf of a voter for receipt of a ballot;
   3) fill in a ballot for a voter;
   4) do anything that may violate the secrecy of voting;
   5) directly participate in the counting of ballots together with the voting members of the election commission;
   6) do anything that may interfere with the work of the election commission;
   7) conduct election campaigning among voters;
   8) participate in the making of decisions by the election commission.

7. Members of the media shall be entitled to:
   1) be present at meetings of electoral commissions;
   2) examine the report of vote returns of territorial electoral commissions;
   3) be present at campaigning events and report on them;
   4) be present at polling stations on voting day and film and document the procedures.

8. Foreign (international) observers shall be accredited by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic, if they have an appropriate invitation from the government bodies of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

**Article 6.**

**The Submission of the Republican Lists of Candidates**

1. Republican lists of candidates may be put forward by a public organization (movement) registered as participating in the electoral campaign for the election of deputies to the People’s Council authorized thereto by the Government of the Donetsk People’s Republic. The procedure for and terms of the registration of public organizations (movements) that would like to submit the aforementioned lists are defined by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.
2. The decision to put forward a republican list of candidates is made by a public organization (movement) in accordance with its constituent document.

3. Public organizations (movements) may include persons who are not members of or participants in public organizations (movements) in the republican list of candidates.

4. When the election of deputies to the People’s Council and the election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic are held together, the candidate for the position of the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic may be included in the republican list of candidates.

5. A candidate may be included in only one republican list of candidates.

6. The list of candidates must contain the given name, surname and patronymic, date and place of birth, registration address, number, batch number and date of issue of the passport or other identification document, name of the body which issued this document as well as occupation for each candidate. The candidate may wish to mention his/her membership of the public organization (movement) that has nominated him/her in republican list of candidates.

7. The republican list of candidates nominated by a public organization (movement) shall be signed by a person authorized thereto by the charter or other constituent document of the public organization (movement) and certified by the organization’s (movement’s) seal.

8. The composition of a republican list of candidates, total number of candidates and the arrangement of candidates on the list shall be defined by the public organization (movement).

9. A public organization (movement) that has submitted a republican list of candidates may appoint authorized representatives and/or agents who represent the public organization (movement) regarding all questions of its participation in the elections of deputies to the People’s Council.

**Article 7.**

**Collection of Voter Signatures**

1. A public organization (movement) that has submitted a republican list of candidates shall collect not less than 1000 voter signatures in support of the list.
2. Voter signatures shall be put on signature sheets according to the form approved by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

3. The participation of members of electoral commissions with a casting vote in collecting voter signatures shall not be permitted. In the course of signature collection it shall be prohibited to force voters to put their signatures or to remunerate them in any way for putting their signature. Signatures collected in violation of the aforementioned criteria are considered invalid.

4. A voter shall put his signature on the signature sheet and write the date, his surname, given name and patronymic, year of birth (also day and month of birth for voters aged 16 on voting day) registration address; number, batch number and date of issue of the passport or other identification document. A voter may put his signature in support of the submission of different republican lists of candidates, but only once in support of the same republican list of candidates.

5. Each signature sheet shall be certified by the signature of an authorized representative or agent of the relevant public organization (movement). The authorized representative or agent of the public organization (movement) shall put his signature against his surname, given name and patronymic, registration address, number, batch number and date of issue of the passport or other identification document, name of the body which issued this document and write the date.

6. After the collection of voter signatures has been completed, the authorized representatives or agents of the public organization (movement) shall count the number of collected signatures and make a report of the results of signature collection.

7. The timescale for collecting voter signatures is defined by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

Article 8.

The Submission of Republican Lists of Candidates for Registration

1. Republican list of candidates shall be submitted to the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic for registration. An authorized representative or agent of a public organization (move-
ment) shall submit the republican list of candidates to the Central Elec-
toral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

2. Along with the republican list of candidates, the following elec-
toral documents shall be submitted:

1) the decision of the public organization (movement) to submit
the republican list of candidates;

2) a copy of the charter or other constituent document of the public
organization (movement) containing the procedure for submitting a re-
publican list of candidates;

3) a list of authorized representatives and/or agents of public organ-
ization (movement) with their given name, surname and patronymic,
date and place of birth, registration address, number, batch number
and date of issue of the passport or other identification document,
name of the body which issued this document for each authorized re-
presentative and/or agent, signed by the leader of the public organiza-
tion (movement) or another person authorized thereto;

4) a letter from each candidate included in the republican list of can-
didates confirming his/her intent to stand for election on this list and
his/her obligation, in case of being elected, to cease any activity incompati-
ble with the status of a deputy of the People’s Council. The letter
shall specify given name, surname and patronymic, date and place
of birth, registration address, number, batch number and date of issue
of the passport or other identification document, name of the body
which issued this document as well as the candidate’s occupation. The
candidate may wish to mention his/her membership of the public or-
organization (movement) that has nominated him/her in the republican
list of candidates or any other organization (movement);

5) signature sheets with voter signatures collected in accordance
with the criteria specified in this Law. The number of collected signatures
may exceed the required number of signatures in support of the sub-
mission of the republican list of candidates indicated in Clause 1, Article
7 of this Law, but by no more than 50 percent;

6) a report of the signature collection results.

3. With the documents indicated in Clause 2 of this Article, an author-
ized representative and/or agent of a public organization (movement)
submits copies of documents confirming the information on candidates
included in the relevant republican list of candidates, authorized representatives and/or agents of the public organization (movement).

4. When accepting electoral documents and signature sheets, the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall issue to the authorized representative or agent of a public organization (movement) a written receipt confirming the acceptance of the documents and indicating the number of accepted signature sheets and the stated number of voter signatures.

5. The timescale for submitting the documents indicated in this Article for the registration of republican lists of candidates is defined by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

Article 9.
Registration of Republican Lists of Candidates

1. The Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall make a decision on the registration of republican lists of candidates based on the result of the verification of the submitted documents and signature sheets.

2. The Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall verify, in accordance with the procedure it establishes, the authenticity of the information on candidates included in republican lists of candidates, compliance by public organizations (movements) with the rules of this Law for the submission of republican lists of candidates, for voter signature collection and the checking of signature sheets and shall verify the authenticity of the data contained in these signature sheets. Members of territorial electoral commissions, experts, specialists and other people may be involved in verifying the documents. With the aim of verifying the authenticity of the information on candidates submitted for the registration of republican lists of candidates, the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic may apply to government bodies of the Donetsk People’s Republic, other bodies as well as organizations.

3. When verifying signature sheets, verification shall cover all voter signatures and corresponding voter data. The procedure for the verification of voter signatures is established by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.
4. Authorized representatives or agents of public organizations (movements) that have submitted the required number of voter signatures may be present at the verification of signature sheets. The indicated public organizations (movements) shall be informed about the verification of signature sheets.

5. As a result of verification, the data contained in signature sheets may be pronounced authentic or unauthentic and/or invalid.

6. Signatures shall be deemed unauthentic if put by one person on behalf of another person.

7. If verification of signature sheets reveals several signatures put by one person in support of the submission of the same republican list of candidates, only one signature shall be deemed authentic and the rest shall be pronounced invalid.

7. The following signatures shall be deemed invalid:
   1) signatures of persons who are not entitled to an active electoral right in the elections of deputies of the People’s Council;
   2) signatures of voters who submit false information in the signature sheet, or do not submit all the information required under this Law;
   3) voter signatures in a signature sheet that are not signed in accordance with this Law.

8. Corrections and erasures specially endorsed on the signature sheet by a voter or person signing the signature sheet shall not be used as a reason for invalidating a signature unless it has been pronounced unauthentic or invalid in accordance with this Article.

9. For a republican list of candidates to be registered, signature sheets shall contain at least 1000 authentic voter signatures after verification. If the number of authentic voter signatures is not enough for registration, the republican list of candidates shall not be registered.

10. Based on the verification of documents and signature sheets submitted for the registration of a republican list of candidates, the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic, at a meeting, shall make a decision to register or refuse to register the list indicating the reasons for refusal.

11. The reasons to refuse the registration of a republican list of candidates may any be the following:
1) a violation of the requirements of the law for the submission of a republican list of candidates indicated in Clauses 1 and 2, Article 6 of this Law;

2) the documents required for the registration of a republican list of candidates are not submitted by the day prior to the day of the meeting of the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic that shall consider the registration of the list;

3) an insufficient number of submitted authentic voter signatures in support of a republican list of candidates indicated in Clause 9 of this Article.

12. The decision not to register a republican list of candidates may be appealed by the public organization (movement) to the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

13. The Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall remove a candidate from a republican list of candidates for the following reasons:

1) the candidate is not entitled to a passive electoral right in the elections of deputies to the People’s Council;

2) a candidate has been registered in another republican list of candidates;

3) a letter with a candidate’s confirmation of intent to run for election in this list or information on a candidate required for his/her registration is not submitted by the day prior to the day of the meeting of the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic that shall consider the registration of republican lists of candidates.

14. The timescales for completing the verifications indicated in this Article and making decisions based on the results of the verifications are established by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

15. The Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic, in accordance with the procedure and volume it establishes, publishes or brings to voters’ notice by other methods the information on registered republican lists of candidates and candidates included in them.

16. Public organizations (movements) that have registered republican lists of candidates are entitled to appointing one member of an elec-
toral commission with a consultative vote in both the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic and every territorial electoral commission.

17. The registration of a republican list of candidates may be cancelled by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic for the following reasons:

1) withdrawal of a republican list of candidates by the public organization (movement) that submitted it;

2) newly discovered circumstances that justify the refusal to register a republican list of candidates. Newly discovered circumstances are circumstances that existed at the moment the decision to register the republican list of candidates was made, but were not and could not have been known to the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic that registered the republican list of candidates;

3) a repeated violation by a public organization (movement) that has submitted a republican list of candidates of this Law and acts adopted by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic in accordance with this Law.

**Article 10.**

**Election Campaigning**

1. Citizens and public organizations (movements) are entitled to conduct an election campaign.

2. Election campaigning shall be understood as any activity that is conducted during an election campaign and is aimed at encouraging or does encourage voters to vote for a republican list of candidates (republican lists of candidates) or against it (them), for candidates included in the republican list of candidates or against them.

3. Election campaigning may be conducted:

1) on the channels of TV and radio broadcasting organizations, in the printed media and the Internet;

2) by means of public campaigning events;

3) by producing and distributing printed, audio-visual and other campaign materials;

4) by other methods which are not prohibited by law.
4. Public organizations (movements) that have submitted republican lists of candidates may select the content, form and method of their election campaigning at their own discretion, conduct their own election campaign and involve other persons in the procedure.

5. The following shall be regarded as election campaigning during the election of deputies to the People’s Council:
   1) calls for voting for or against a republican list(s) of candidates;
   2) expression of preference for a public organization (movement) that has submitted a republican list of candidates, in particular, statements indicating the public organization (movement) or the republican list of candidates for which a voter will vote;
   3) description of the possible consequences of including one or another republican list of candidates in the distribution of deputies’ mandates or electing one or another candidate included in the said lists.

6. Election campaigning shall not be conducted by:
   1) government bodies;
   2) electoral commissions and members of commissions with a casting vote;
   3) international organizations and international public movements.

7. Election campaigning shall commence from the day of the calling of the election of deputies to the People’s Council and end at 00.00 hours local time one day before voting day.

8. Complaints (statements) connected with the conduct of an election campaign are considered by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic according to the procedure established by it.

**Article 11.**

**The Funding of the Preparation and Conduct of the Election of Deputies to the People’s Council**

1. The expenses incurred in the preparation and conduct of the election of deputies to the People’s Council shall be paid by the election commissions from the funds allocated for these purposes from the republican budget.

2. The allocation of funds from the republican budget for the preparation and conduct of the election of deputies to the People’s Council
shall be organized by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

3. Distribution of the funds among the territorial electoral commissions shall be conducted in accordance with the procedure established by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

**Article 12.**

**Voting Premises**

1. Voting premises shall contain booths or other specially equipped places for secret voting, provided with a lighting system and writing utensils other than pencils as well as ballot boxes.

2. Inside or directly in front of voting stations, a notice-board shall be set up for displaying information on all registered republican lists of candidates and on all public organizations (movements) that have submitted the lists and candidates included in the lists. The volume of information to be displayed shall be established by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

3. The notice-board shall display samples of filled-in ballots which must not contain the names of candidates on the ballots or the names of public organizations (movements) that submitted the republican lists of candidates.

4. At the voting premises, there shall be the registered republican lists of candidates.

5. The voting premises shall be organized in such a way that the places where ballots are issued, as well as the voting booths or other specially equipped places for secret voting and the ballot boxes are all located within the field of vision of the members of the territorial electoral commission and observers.

**Article 13.**

**Ballots**

1. The procedure for controlling the production of ballots for the election of deputies to the People’s Council, their quantity as well as the procedure and timescale for the transfer of the ballots to the territorial electoral commissions shall be established by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.
2. The text of the ballots shall be printed in the Ukrainian and Russian languages.

3. A ballot shall contain the names of public organizations (movements) that have registered republican lists of candidates. Under the name of each public organization (movement), there shall be the surnames, given names and patronymics of the first three candidates included in the corresponding republican list of candidates.

4. A blank box shall be placed to the right of the name of each public organization (movement) or under the name of each public organization (movement).

**Article 14.**

**Voting Procedure**

1. Voting shall be conducted from 8.00 to 20.00, local time. In the event of circumstances at a polling station impeding the process of voting at the indicated time, the territorial electoral commission may, by agreement with the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic, change the times of the beginning and end of voting.

2. Territorial electoral commissions shall inform voters about the day, time and place of voting.

3. Each voter shall vote in person. Voting for other voters shall not be allowed.

4. Ballots shall be issued to voters upon presentation of a passport or other identification document. When receiving a ballot, a voter shall put his signature in the relevant section of the voter registration list.

5. Each voter is entitled to one ballot.

6. A voter shall vote by putting any mark in the box corresponding to the republican list of candidates chosen by the voter.

7. Voters shall drop marked ballots into a sealed stationary ballot box.

8. Persons indicated in Clause 3, Article 5 of this Law may be present at the polling station during voting, when votes are being counted and when the territorial electoral commission is preparing the report of vote returns.
9. Voting may be conducted outside voting stations with the use of mobile ballot boxes as well as by mail and via the Internet.

10. Early voting shall be organized by electoral commissions for voters who are not able to come to a polling station on voting day.

11. The procedure for voting outside polling stations with the use of mobile ballot boxes as well as by mail and via the Internet as well as the procedure for conducting early voting shall be established by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic. The indicated methods of voting shall be organized so as to exclude possible violations of the electoral rights of citizens, including distortion of the expression of a voter’s will.

**Article 15.**

**The Counting of Votes and Preparation of the Reports of Vote Returns by the Territorial Electoral Commissions**

1. Votes cast by voters shall be counted openly and publicly, with the results of ballot and vote counting, conducted by voting members of the territorial electoral commission with the right to a casting vote, being consecutively announced and entered in the report of vote returns. The persons indicated in Clause 3, Article 5 of this Law shall be allowed to be present at and observe vote counting.

2. The form of the report of vote returns of a territorial electoral commission shall be determined by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

3. The counting of votes shall start immediately after the end of voting and shall continue without interruption until the vote returns are determined. The results of the count shall be made known to all members of the territorial electoral commission and to the persons indicated in Clause 3, Article 5 of this Law.

4. Votes shall be counted from ballots in the ballot boxes by voting members of the territorial electoral commission with the right to a casting vote.

5. Invalid ballots shall be counted and summarized separately. Ballots shall be deemed invalid if they do not contain any marks in the boxes corresponding to the names of the public organizations (movements), or if more than one box is marked on a ballot.
6. The procedure for counting votes shall be determined by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

7. After the vote count has been completed, the report of vote returns of the territorial electoral commissions shall be signed. Two originals of the report shall be prepared and signed by the president of the territorial electoral commission indicating the date and time (hours and minutes) of signing.

9. After being signed, the first original of the report of vote returns of a territorial electoral commission shall be forwarded to the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic. Attached to the first original of the report of vote returns of a territorial election commission shall be the complaints (statements) about violations of this Law received by a territorial election commission during the period from voting day to the end of the counting of votes.

10. The second original of the report of vote returns of a territorial election commission shall be made available for examination to the persons indicated in Clause 3, Article 5 of this Law. The second original of the report together with other electoral documents, including ballots and the voter registration list shall be kept by the territorial electoral commission until the official publication of the results of the elections of deputies to the People’s Council. Further recordkeeping of the indicated documents and their destruction are conducted according to the procedure and timescale determined by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

**Article 16.**

**The Establishment of Election Results for the People’s Council**

1. Based on the data contained in the first originals of the report of vote returns of the territorial electoral commissions, the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic, after provisionally making sure the reports are prepared correctly by summarizing the data they contain, not later than 10 days after the voting shall establish the results of elections of deputies to the People’s Council. The data contained in the report shall be summarized by members of the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic with the right to a casting vote.
2. The Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall prepare a report of the results of election of deputies to the People’s Council in which the following data shall be included:

1) the number of territorial electoral commissions;
2) the number of report of vote returns of the territorial electoral commissions on which this report is based;
3) summarized data of all lines of the report of vote returns of the territorial electoral commissions;
4) the proportions of votes (in percentage) cast in support of every republican list of candidates from the total number of voters who participated in the voting;
5) the names of the public organizations (movements) whose republican lists of candidates are included in the distribution of deputy mandates and the numbers of deputy mandates due to each of the said lists;
6) the surname, given name and patronymic of the candidates elected as deputies of the People’s Council from each republican list of candidates due to have deputy mandates.

3. Based on the reports of election results of deputies of the People’s Council, the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall make a decision on the election results of deputies to the People’s Council.

4. The Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall declare the election of deputies of the People’s Council not to have taken place if:

1) none of the republican lists of candidates received 5 percent or more than 5 percent of the total number of votes;
2) all the republican lists of candidates together received 50 percent or less than 50 percent of the total number of votes.

5. The republican lists of candidates each of which received 5 percent or more than 5 percent of the votes, if there are at least two such republican lists of candidates and they received together more than 50 percent of votes, shall be included in the distribution of deputy seats. In this case, other republican lists of candidates shall not be included in the distribution of deputy seats.
6. If the republican lists of candidates, each of which received 5 percent or more than 5 percent of the votes, receive together 50 percent or less than 50 percent of the total number of votes, the said lists shall be included in the distribution of deputy mandates, as shall, in decreasing order of the number of votes, the republican lists of candidates which received less than 5 percent of the total number of votes, until the total number of votes in support of the republican lists of candidates included in the distribution of deputy mandates reaches 50 percent of the total number of votes.

7. If a republican list of candidates receives over 50 percent of the total number of votes, while the other republican lists of candidates receive less than 5 percent of the total number of votes, the said republican list of candidates shall be included in the distribution of deputy mandates together with the republican list of candidates that received the largest number of votes from the number of republican lists of candidates which received less than 5 percent of the votes.

8. The republican lists of candidates included in the distribution of deputy seats shall receive said seats in accordance with the procedure set forth by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

9. Deputy seats shall be distributed among the candidates in accordance with the order in which the candidates are arranged on the republican list of candidates, this order being regarded as the order of priority for receiving deputy seats.

10. The report of the results of the election for deputies of the People’s Council shall be prepared by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic and signed by the President of the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic. Complaints (statements) about violations of this Law received by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic in the period from voting day to the day of preparing the report and the decisions taken on such complaints (statements) by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall be attached to the report.
Article 17.
The Publication of Vote Returns
and Results of the Election of Deputies to the People’s Council

1. Vote returns for each electoral precinct, within the scope of the data contained in the reports of vote returns of territorial electoral commissions, shall be made available for examination to all voters, registered candidates, agents and authorized representatives of public organizations (movements), observers, foreign (international) observers and members of the press, upon request, immediately after the report of vote returns of the results of the election for deputies of the People’s Council have been signed by the members of the territorial electoral commission from which this data was requested.

2. Within three weeks of the voting day, the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall officially publish the results of the election for deputies of the People’s Council as well as the data on the votes in support of each registered republican list of candidates.
The Donetsk People’s Republic Law
“On the Election for the Head of the DPR”

Article 1.
The Basic Principles of the Election
for the Head of the People’s Republic
1. The Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall be elected by the citizens on the basis of universal, equal and direct suffrage by secret ballot. Participation in the election shall be free and voluntary.
2. In accordance with the Constitution of the Donetsk People’s Republic, the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall be elected for a term of four years.
3. The first election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall be called by the Supreme Council of the Donetsk People’s Republic.
4. The election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall be conducted in one republican electoral district comprising the entire territory of the Donetsk People’s Republic. Voters residing outside the territory of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall be regarded as being included in the republican electoral district.
5. The preparation and conduct of the election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic, implementation and protection of the electoral rights of citizens and control over the observance of the electoral rights shall be carried out by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic and the territorial electoral commissions formed in accordance with the Law of the Donetsk People’s Republic “On the Elections of Deputies to the DPR People’s Council”.

Article 2.
The Electoral Rights of Citizens in the Election
for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic
1. A Donetsk People’s Republic citizen who permanently resides on the territory of the Donetsk People’s Republic and has attained the age
of 18 on voting day shall be entitled to elect the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic, to participate in election campaigning, in the monitoring of the conduct of the election and the work of the electoral commissions and in the performance of other electoral activities.

2. A Donetsk People’s Republic citizen who has attained the age of 30 on voting day and has permanently resided on the territory of the Donetsk People’s Republic for at least 10 years immediately prior to the election shall be eligible for election as the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

3. A Donetsk People’s Republic citizen shall not be entitled to the right to elect or be elected or participate in other electoral activities if he/she has been declared by a court to be legally incompetent or is being held in custody according a court sentence.

Article 3.
Electoral Precincts and Voter Registration Lists

1. Electoral precincts shall be formed by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic to conduct voting and count votes in the election of the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

2. Electoral precincts shall be of approximately equal size in terms of the number of voters.

3. Electoral precincts shall be formed outside the territory of the Donetsk People’s Republic for voters who are outside the territory the Republic on the day of the election of the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

4. The procedure and timescale for the formation of electoral precincts shall be established by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

5. The lists of electoral precincts indicating their number, boundaries and names of the population centers, the location of the premises of the precinct electoral commissions and polling stations, the addresses of the precinct electoral commissions shall be brought to voters’ notice by the electoral commissions.

6. Voter registration lists are formed by the territorial electoral commissions individually for each electoral precinct. A voter shall be included in the voter registration list only at one electoral precinct. The fact
of residing on the territory of an electoral precinct is the basis for the inclusion of a voter in the voter registration list at the relevant electoral precinct. If a voter cannot come to the said electoral precinct on voting day, he/she shall be included in the voter registration list at the precinct where the voter can come on voting day. In this case, the voter who is included in the voter registration list at the place of his/her registration shall be removed from the list by the territorial electoral commission of the precinct.

7. The voter registration lists specify given name, surname and patronymic, year of birth (at the age of 16 also the day and month of birth), address of registration. A blank space is provided in the voter registration list for the number and batch number of the passport or other identification document of the citizen as well as for the voter’s signature for receiving a voting ballot and the signature of the member of the territorial electoral commission giving the ballot.

8. The procedure and timescale to prepare voter registration lists shall be established by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

9. Territorial electoral commissions shall be responsible for the publication of voter registration lists to inform voters.

**Article 4.**

**The Powers of the Electoral Commissions in the Election of the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic**

1. When preparing and conducting the election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic, the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall:

   1) organize the preparation and conduct of the elections, exercise control over the observance of the electoral rights of citizens;
   2) form territorial electoral commissions and manage their activities;
   3) form election precincts;
   4) establish the procedure for the compilation of voter registration lists;
   5) register candidates;
   6) register authorized representatives and agents of candidates;
7) distribute the funds allocated to it from the budget of the Donetsk People’s Republic, provide financial support for the preparation and conduct of the elections, exercise control over the proper use of such funds;

8) approve, within the scope of their competence, the form of documents relating to the preparation and conduct of the elections;

9) approve the form and text of the voting ballot in the Ukrainian and Russian languages; ensure the production and the transfer of the ballots to the territorial electoral commissions;

10) determine the results of the election of the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic and publish them;

11) within the scope of its competence, consider complaints (appeals) about the preparation and conduct of the election and take reasoned decisions on such appeals;

12) issue instructions and legal norms on issues relating to the application of this Law;

13) fulfill other obligations in accordance with this Law.

2. The Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall be responsible for establishing the procedure for forming the territorial electoral commissions and the number of members with a casting vote.

3. When organizing the election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic, the territorial electoral commissions shall:

1) exercise control over the preparation and conduct of the election, over the observance of the electoral rights of citizens on the corresponding territory;

2) compile voter registration lists for each election precinct;

3) inform the voters about the day, time, and place of voting, the progress of the electoral campaign and the candidates on the relevant territory;

4) prepare the voting premises on voting day;

5) count the votes, determine the election results for the electoral precinct, complete the voting report and forward it to the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic;

6) exercise other powers in accordance with this Law.

4. Decisions of the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk
People’s Republic made within the scope of its competence shall be binding for the territorial electoral commissions.

5. The Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall define the procedure for the activities of the electoral commissions in accordance with this Law.

6. Candidates for the position of the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic, their authorized representatives and agents, citizens under 18 as well as citizens declared by a court to be legally incompetent shall not be members of the electoral commissions with the right to a casting vote.

**Article 5.**

**Openness in the Activity of the Election Commissions**

1. Members of the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic, candidates, their agents or authorized representatives and representatives of the media may attend meetings of the election commissions and be present when the territorial electoral commissions are counting the votes and working with voter registration lists, ballots and reports of vote returns.

2. Decisions of the electoral commissions directly relating to the preparation and conduct of the election of the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic are published in the media or brought to the voters’ attention by other methods.

3. On voting day, the persons indicated in Clause 1 of this Article as well as observers, including foreign (international) observers, may be present at the polling stations.

4. During the election of the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic, observers may be appointed by registered candidates and public organizations (movements). When the election of deputies of the People’s Council and the election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic are held together, such public organizations (movements) shall be the public organizations (movements) registered to participate in the election of deputies to the People’s Council.

5. Observers may:
   1) inspect voter lists;
   2) be present at the polling station of the corresponding electoral precinct on voting day;
3) watch the ballots being issued to voters;
4) watch the votes being counted at the polling station, watch the election commission preparing the report of vote returns and other documents as well as inspect the report;
5) appeal decisions and actions (omissions) of a territorial electoral commission, in the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

6. Observers shall not be entitled to:
1) issue ballots to voters;
2) sign for a voter for the receipt of a ballot;
3) mark a ballot for a voter;
4) do anything that may violate the secrecy of voting;
5) directly participate in the counting of ballots together with the voting members of the election commission;
6) do anything that may interfere with the work of the election commission;
7) conduct election campaigning among the voters;
8) participate in the decision-making processes of the election commission.

7. Members of the media shall be entitled to:
1) be present at meetings of the electoral commissions;
2) examine the report of vote returns of the territorial electoral commissions;
3) be present at campaigning events and cover them;
4) be present at the polling stations on voting day and film and document the procedures.

8. Foreign (international) observers shall be accredited by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic, if they have an appropriate invitation from the government bodies of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

Article 6.
The Nomination of Candidates
1. The nomination of candidates for the election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic is performed by means of self-nomination.
2. After the official publication of the decision to call the election of the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic, each citizen entitled to passive suffrage may nominate himself for the election to the office of the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

3. A citizen who has nominated himself (herself) as a candidate for the position of the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall submit to the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic a written statement of self-nomination indicating his/her given name, surname and patronymic, date of birth and registration address.

4. The following documents shall be submitted simultaneously with the statement:

1) a letter confirming his/her intent to run for the position of the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic and obligation, in case of being elected, to cease any activity incompatible with the status of the Head of State. The letter shall specify given name, surname, patronymic, date and place of birth, registration address, length of residence in the Donetsk People’s Republic (Donetsk Oblast) immediately prior to the election, number, batch number and date of issue of the passport or other identification document and the issuing body as well as the candidate’s occupation. The candidate may wish to mention his/her membership of a public organization (movement) and status in the organization (movement);

2) a list of a candidate’s authorized representatives and/or agents that shall represent the candidate regarding all questions relating to his/her participation in the election. The list shall specify the given name, surname and patronymic of each authorized representative and/or agent, date and place of birth, place of registration, number, batch number and date of issue of the passport or other identification document and the issuing body for each authorized representative and/or agent;

3) copies of documents confirming the information on the candidate, their authorized representatives and/or agents indicated in this Clause.

5. Each candidate shall submit the statement of self-nomination and all the documents attached to the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic in person. If a candidate is unable
to submit the documents in person (due to illness or other external circumstances), the statement of self-nomination and all the documents attached may be submitted by another person at the candidate’s request. In this event, the statement of self-nomination shall indicate the given name, surname and patronymic, date and place of birth, registration address, number, batch number and date of issue of the passport or other document certifying the identity of the person who submits, on the candidate’s behalf, the statement of self-nomination and all the documents attached to the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

6. The statement of self-nomination and all the documents attached shall be accepted by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic upon presentation of the passport or other document certifying the candidate’s identity (or the identity of another person indicated in Clause 5 of this Article).

7. Immediately after receiving the statement of self-nomination and all the documents attached, the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall issue a written receipt confirming the acceptance of these documents indicating the date and time of acceptance to the candidate (or other person indicated in Clause 5 of this Article).

8. The Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall post the data on candidates nominating themselves on the website of the government bodies of the Donetsk People’s Republic or inform voters by other methods.

9. The timescale for self-nomination and submitting the statement of self-nomination and all the documents attached are defined by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

Article 7.
The Collection of Voter Signatures
1. A candidate shall collect not less than 1000 voter signatures in support of his/her self-nomination.
2. Voter signatures shall be put on signature sheets according to the form approved by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.
3. The participation of the members of the electoral commissions with the right to a casting vote in collecting voter signatures shall not be permitted. In the course of signature collection, it shall be prohibited to force voters to put their signatures or to remunerate them in any way for putting their signature. Signatures collected in violation of the aforementioned criteria are considered invalid.

4. A voter shall put his signature on the signature sheet and write the date, his surname, given name and patronymic, year of birth (also day and month of birth for voters aged 16 on voting day), registration address, number, batch number and date of issue of the passport or other identification document. A voter may put his signature in support of the nomination of different candidates, but only once in support of the same candidate.

5. Each signature sheet shall be certified by the candidate’s signature. The candidates shall indicate their surname, given name and patronymic, registration address, number, batch number and date of issue and the issuing body of the passport or other identification document, and write the date.

6. After the collection of voter signatures has been completed, candidates shall count the number of collected signatures and make a report of the results of the signature collection.

7. The timescale for collecting voter signatures is defined by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

Article 8.

Submitting Documents for Candidate Registration

1. A candidate shall submit the following documents to the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic for registration:

1) signature sheets with voter signatures collected in accordance with the form specified in this Law. The number of collected signatures may exceed the required number of signatures in support of self-nomination indicated in Clause 1, Article 7 of this Law, but not by more than 50 percent;

2) a report of the results of the signature collection;

3) information on changes to the candidate’s data submitted in the statement on self-nomination (if any).
2. In exceptional circumstances, the signature sheets and the documents indicated in Clause 1 of this Article may be submitted to the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic by a candidate’s authorized representatives or agents.

3. When accepting signature sheets and the documents indicated in Clause 1 of this Article, the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall issue to a candidate (his/her authorized representative or agent) a written receipt confirming the acceptance of the said documents and indicating the number of accepted signature sheets and the stated number of voter signatures.

4. The timescale for submitting signature sheets and the documents indicated in Clause 1 of this Article are defined by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

Article 9.
The Registration of Candidates

1. Candidates are registered based on the results of the verification of the documents and signature sheets submitted to the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

2. The Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall verify, in accordance with the procedure it establishes, the authenticity of the information on candidates, compliance with the rules of this Law for self-nomination, for signature collection and checking of signature sheets and shall verify the authenticity of the submitted data on candidates as well as the authenticity of the data on voters and signatures contained in the signature sheets. Members of the territorial electoral commissions, experts, specialists and other people may be involved in verifying the documents. With the aim of verifying the authenticity of the information on candidates and other information submitted for their registration, the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic may apply to government bodies of the Donetsk People’s Republic, other bodies as well as organizations.

3. When verifying signature sheets, verification shall cover all voter signatures in support of the nomination and corresponding voter data.
The procedure for the verification of voter signatures is established by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

4. Any candidate that has submitted the required number of voter signatures, or his/her authorized representatives or agents may be present at the verification of the signature sheets. All candidates that have submitted the required number of voter signatures shall be informed about the verification of the signature sheets.

5. As a result of verification, the data contained in the signature sheets may be pronounced authentic or unauthentic and/or invalid.

6. Signatures shall be deemed unauthentic if put by one person on behalf of another person.

7. If the verification of signature sheets reveals several signatures put by one person in support of the nomination of the same candidate, only one signature shall be deemed authentic and the rest shall be pronounced invalid.

7. The following signatures shall be deemed invalid:

1) signatures of persons who are not entitled to an active electoral right in the election of the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic;

2) signatures of voters who provided false data on the signature sheet, or did not provide all the data required under this Law;

3) voter signatures on a signature sheet that was not signed in accordance with this Law.

8. Corrections and erasures specially endorsed on the signature sheet by a voter or person signing the signature sheet shall not be used as a reason for invalidating a signature unless it has been pronounced unauthentic and/or invalid in accordance with this Article.

9. For a candidate to be registered, signature sheets shall contain at least 1000 authentic voter signatures after verification. If the number of authentic voter signatures is not enough for registration, a candidate shall not be registered.

10. Based on the verification of the documents and signature sheets submitted for the registration of a candidate, the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic, at a meeting, shall make a decision to register the candidate or refuse the registration indicating the reasons for refusal.
11. Reasons to refuse the registration of a candidate may be the following:

1) the candidate is not entitled to a passive electoral right in the elections of the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic;

2) the documents required for the registration of a candidate are not submitted by the day prior to the day of the meeting of the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic that considers the registration of the candidate;

3) an insufficient number of authentic voter signatures is submitted in support of a candidate indicated in Clause 9 of this Article.

12. The decision not to register a republican candidate may be appealed by the candidate to the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

13. The timescales for completing the verifications indicated in this Article and making decisions based on the results of the verifications shall be established by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

14. The Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic, in accordance with the procedure and volume it establishes, publishes or brings to voters’ notice by other methods the information on registered candidates.

15. A registered candidate is entitled to appoint one non-voting member of an electoral commission to both the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic and every territorial electoral commission.

16. The registration of a candidate may be cancelled by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic for the following reasons:

1) the self-withdrawal of a candidate;

2) newly discovered circumstances that justify the refusal to register a candidate. Newly discovered circumstances are circumstances that existed at the moment the decision to register the candidate was made, but was not and could not have been known to the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic that registered the candidate;
3) a repeated violation by a candidate of this Law and the acts adopted by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic in accordance with this Law.

**Article 10.**

**Election Campaigning**

1. Citizens and public organizations (movements) are entitled to conduct an election campaign.

2. Election campaigning shall be understood as activity that is conducted during an election campaign and aimed at encouraging or do encourage voters to vote for a candidate (candidates) or against him/her (them).

3. Election campaigning may be conducted:
   1) on the channels of TV and radio broadcasting organizations, in the printed media and via the Internet;
   2) by means of public campaigning events;
   3) by producing and distributing printed, audio-visual and other campaign materials;
   4) by other methods which are not prohibited by law.

4. Candidates may select the content, form and method of their election campaign at their own discretion, conduct election campaigns and involve other persons in the procedure.

5. The following shall be regarded as election campaigning during the conduct of an election campaign for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic:
   1) calls for voting for or against a candidate (candidates);
   2) the expression of a preference for a candidate (candidates), in particular, statements indicating the candidate (candidates) for which a voter will vote;
   3) description of the possible consequences of the election or non-election of a candidate (candidates).

6. Election campaigning shall not be conducted by:
   1) government bodies;
   2) electoral commissions and members of the commissions with the right to a casting vote;
   3) international organizations and international public movements.
7. Election campaigning shall commence from the day of the calling of the election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic and end at 00.00 hours local time one day before voting day.

8. Complaints (statements) connected with the conduct of an election campaign are considered by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic in the procedure established by it.

**Article 11.**

**The Funding of the Preparation and Conduct of the Election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic**

1. The expenses incurred in the preparation and conduct of the election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall be paid by the election commissions from the funds allocated for these purposes from the republican budget.

2. The funds allocated from the republican budget for the preparation and conduct of the election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall be placed at the disposal of the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

3. Distribution of the funds among the territorial electoral commissions shall be conducted in accordance with the procedure established by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

**Article 12.**

**Voting Premises**

1. Voting premises shall contain booths or other special places specially equipped for secret voting, provided with a lighting system and writing utensils other than pencils as well as ballot boxes.

2. Inside or directly in front of voting stations, a notice-board shall be set up for displaying the information on all the registered candidates included in the ballot. The amount of information to be displayed shall be established by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

3. The notice-board shall display samples of filled-in ballots which must not contain the names of candidates.

4. The voting premises shall be fitted out so that the places where ballots are issued, as well as the voting booths and the ballot boxes are
all located within the field of vision of the members of the territorial electoral commission and observers.

**Article 13.**
**Ballots**

1. The procedure for controlling the production of ballots for the election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic, their quantity as well as the procedure and timescale for the transfer of the ballots to the territorial electoral commissions shall be established by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

2. The text of the ballots shall be printed in the Ukrainian and Russian languages.

3. A ballot shall contain the names of the registered candidates in alphabetical order. The ballot shall contain the following information on each registered candidate:
   1) surname, given name and patronymic;
   2) year of birth;
   3) address;
   4) occupation;
   5) if a registered candidate mentions his/her membership of a public organization (movement) in the letter of confirmation of intent to run for the position of the Head of State – the name of this public organization (movement) and the registered candidate’s status in it.

4. A blank box shall be placed to the right of the name or under the name of each registered candidate.

**Article 14.**
**Voting Procedure**

1. Voting shall be conducted from 8.00 to 20.00, local time. In the event of circumstances at a polling station impeding the process of voting at the indicated time, the territorial electoral commission may, by agreement with the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic, change the times of the beginning and end of voting.

2. The territorial electoral commissions shall inform voters about the day, time and place of voting.
3. Each voter shall vote in person. Voting for other voters shall not be allowed.

4. Ballots shall be issued to voters upon presentation of a passport or other identification document. When receiving a ballot, a voter shall put his signature in the relevant blank space on the voter registration list.

5. Each voter is entitled to one ballot.

6. A voter shall vote by putting any mark in the box corresponding to the candidate chosen by the voter.

7. Voters shall drop marked ballots into a sealed stationary ballot box.

8. Persons indicated in Clause 3, Article 5 of this Law may be present at the polling station during voting, when the votes are being counted and when the territorial electoral commission is preparing the report of vote returns.

9. Voting may be conducted outside polling stations with the use of mobile ballot boxes as well as by mail and via the Internet.

10. Early voting shall be organized by the electoral commissions for voters who are not able to come to a polling station on voting day.

11. The procedure for voting outside polling stations with the use of mobile ballot boxes as well as by mail and via the Internet as well as the procedure for conducting early voting are established by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic. The indicated methods of voting shall be organized so as to exclude possible violations of the electoral rights of citizens, including distortion of the expression of a voter’s will.

**Article 15.**

**The Counting of Votes and Preparation of the Reports of Vote Returns by the Territorial Electoral Commissions**

1. Votes cast by voters shall be counted openly and publicly, with the results of ballot and vote counting, conducted by voting members of the territorial electoral commission with the right to a casting vote, being consecutively announced and entered in the report of vote returns. The persons indicated in Clause 3, Article 5 of this Law shall be allowed to be present at and observe vote counting.
2. The form of the report of vote returns of the territorial electoral commission shall be determined by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

3. The counting of votes shall start immediately after the end of voting and shall be continued without interruption until the vote returns are determined. The results of counting shall be made known to all members of the territorial electoral commission and to the persons indicated in Clause 3, Article 5 of this Law.

4. Votes shall be counted from the ballots in the ballot boxes by voting members of the territorial electoral commission with the right to a casting vote.

5. Invalid ballots shall be counted and summarized separately. Ballots shall be deemed invalid if they do not contain any marks in the boxes corresponding to the candidates, or if more than one box is marked on a ballot.

6. The procedure for counting votes shall be determined by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

7. After the count has been completed, the reports of vote returns of the territorial electoral commissions shall be signed. Two originals of the report shall be prepared and signed by the president of the territorial electoral commission indicating the date and time (hour and minutes) of signing.

8. After being signed, the first original of the report of vote returns of the territorial electoral commission shall be forwarded to the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic. Attached to the first original of the report of vote returns of the territorial election commission shall be the complaints (statements) about violations of this Law received by the territorial election commission in the period from the voting day to the end of counting of votes.

9. The second original of the report of vote returns of the territorial election commission shall be made available for examination to the persons indicated in Clause 3, Article 5 of this Law. The second original of the report together with other electoral documents, including ballots and the voter registration list shall be kept by the territorial electoral commission until the official publication of the results of the election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic. Further recordkeep-
Article 16.
The Establishment of the Results of the Election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic

1. Based on the data contained in the first originals of the reports of vote returns of the territorial electoral commissions, the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic, after making sure the reports are prepared correctly by summarizing the data they contain not later than 10 days after voting, shall establish the results of the election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic. The data contained in the reports shall be summarized directly by the voting members of the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic with the right to a casting vote.

2. The Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall prepare a report of the results of the election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic in which the following data shall be included:
   1) the number of territorial electoral commissions;
   2) the number of reports of vote returns of the territorial electoral commissions on which this report is based;
   3) the summarized data with regard to all lines of the reports of vote returns of the territorial electoral commissions;
   4) the surnames, given names and patronymics of the registered candidates included in the ballot;
   5) the number of votes cast in support of each registered candidate.

3. Based on the report of results of the election of deputies to the People’s Council, the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall make a decision on the results of the election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic.

4. The candidate that has received the largest number of votes compared with the other registered candidates shall be considered elected. In the event of an equal number of votes received by registered can-
didates, the candidate that was registered earlier shall be considered elected.

5. The report of the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic of results of the election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall be signed by the President of the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic. Complaints (statements) about violations of this Law received by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic in the period from the voting day to the day of preparing the report and the decisions taken on such complaints (statements) by the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall be attached to the report.

Article 17.
The Publication of Vote Returns and the Results of the Election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic

1. Vote returns for each electoral precinct, within the scope of the data contained in the reports of vote returns of the territorial electoral commissions, shall be made available for examination to all voters, registered candidates, observers, foreign (international) observers, members of the press upon request, immediately after the reports of vote returns, results of the election for deputies of the People’s Council are signed by the members of the territorial electoral commission from which this data was requested.

2. Within three weeks of the voting day, the Central Electoral Commission of the Donetsk People’s Republic shall officially publish the results the election for the Head of the Donetsk People’s Republic as well as the data on the votes in support of each registered candidate.
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