



ICPS

International
Centre
for Policy
Studies

14, Instytutska str., office 10, Kyiv, 01021, Ukraine
office@icps.kiev.ua | www.icps.com.ua

Mapping of dialogue initiatives to resolve the conflict in Ukraine



**National
Dialogue**

January 2015

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	4
CHAPTER 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF CONFLICT SETTLEMENT IN UKRAINE	6
MULTI-LEVEL NATURE OF THE CONFLICT	6
DIPLOMATIC INSTRUMENTS FOR CONFLICT RESOLUTION	9
THE APPLICATION OF OFFICIAL, SEMI-OFFICIAL AND UNOFFICIAL DIPLOMACY INSTRUMENTS TO RESOLVE THE CONFLICT IN UKRAINE	11
NATIONAL DIALOGUE AS A TOOL OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION IN UKRAINE	13
TRACK TWO DIPLOMACY TOOLS OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION	16
CHAPTER 2. DIALOGUE INITIATIVES OF UKRAINIAN NGOS	17
CHRONOLOGY OF DIALOGUE INITIATIVES DEVELOPMENT	17
UKRAINE TODAY: IN SEARCH OF SOCIETY CONCEPTION (FOUNDATIONS FOR FREEDOM)	18
DIALOGUES ON MAIDAN (INITIATIVE OF “CULTURE OF MAIDAN IN UKRAINE”)	18
“ODESSA FOR CONSENT” (ODESSA REGIONAL MEDIATION GROUP)	19
PUBLIC DIALOGUE (CIRCLE OF PEOPLE’S TRUST)	21
P.E.A.C.E SUMMIT (INSTITUTE FOR CULTURAL RELATIONS – UKRAINE)	21
LOCAL INITIATIVES (MYKOLAIV, KHARKIV AND SLOVIANSK)	22
THE INITIATIVE OF CHANNEL 17 TO HOLD DIALOGUES WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SO-CALLED DPR/LPR	23
WOMEN’S DIALOGUE INITIATIVE	25
CONCLUSIONS	26
RECOMMENDATIONS	27
CHAPTER 3. DIALOGUE-ORIENTED PROJECTS WITH THE PARTICIPATION OF INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS AND EXPERTS	28
THE CRIMEAN POLITICAL DIALOGUE (PATRIR: 2009 – 2014)	29
A HIGH-LEVEL PLATFORM TO DISCUSS THE FUTURE (CRISIS MANAGEMENT INITIATIVE)	30
THEATRE FOR DIALOGUE	31
DIALOGUE IN UKRAINE: POSSIBILITIES, PARAMETERS AND INVOCATIONS (MEDIATEUR, INTERPEACE AND ICPS)	31
NANSEN DIALOGUE NETWORK (NORWAY)	32
JAPANESE “PEACE BOAT” (GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP AND ARMED CONFLICTS PREVENTION)	33
INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR NONVIOLENT COMMUNICATION (USA)	33
CONCLUSIONS	34
RECOMMENDATIONS	34
CHAPTER 4. DIALOGUE PROJECTS SUPPORTED BY SYSTEM DONORS IN UKRAINE	35
INITIATING THE PARTICIPATORY NATIONAL DIALOGUE IN UKRAINE (MATRA)	35

UKRAINIAN BORDERLANDS CONFLICTS RESOLUTION AND PREVENTION STRATEGIES (BRITISH EMBASSY IN KYIV)	36
UKRAINE NATIONAL MULTI-STAKEHOLDER DIALOGUE (BRITISH EMBASSY IN KYIV)	39
COUNTERING POLARISATION AND CONFLICT IN UKRAINE (BRITISH EMBASSY IN KYIV)	40
UKRAINE – OUT OF THE CRISIS THROUGH DIALOGUE (BRITISH EMBASSY IN KYIV)	41
FOSTERING TOLERANCE, DIALOGUE AND UNITY AMONG THE REGIONS OF UKRAINE (USAID)	42
COMMON FUTURE OF UKRAINIAN SOCIETY AFTER MAIDAN. FOSTERING MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING AND COOPERATION IN CONFLICT PREVENTION (GERMAN FEDERAL MINISTER FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS)	44
DIALOGUE PROJECTS SUPPORTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL FUND “RENAISSANCE”	46
CONTEST HELD BY THE EUROPEAN UNION TO UKRAINE	47
CHAPTER 5. UKRAINIAN-RUSSIAN DIALOGUE INITIATIVES	48
THE PLATFORM FOR UKRAINIAN AND RUSSIAN CONTACTS, DIALOGUE AND INITIATIVES	48
A DIALOGUE PROJECT BETWEEN UKRAINIAN AND RUSSIAN EXPERTS IN GEORGIA	49
DIALOGUES: UKRAINE – RUSSIA BY HALYNA POKHMIELKINA	49
UKRAINIAN-RUSSIAN DIALOGUE BETWEEN THE MEDIA AND THE THIRD SECTOR (INTERNEWS – UKRAINE)	49
MEETING OF ATO PARTICIPANTS WITH RUSSIAN VETERAN PARTY REPRESENTATIVES	50
CONCLUSIONS	51
RECOMMENDATIONS	51
APPENDICES	52
THE CONCEPT OF A NATIONAL PUBLIC DIALOGUE BY CIRCLE OF PEOPLE’S TRUST	53
APPEAL OF CIVIC INITIATIVE GROUPS OF UKRAINE TO THE CABINET OF MINISTERS OF UKRAINE, THE VERKHOVNA RADA AND THE PRESIDENT OF UKRAINE (CIRCLE OF PEOPLE’S TRUST)	55
PLATFORM FOR UKRAINIAN-RUSSIAN CONTACTS, DIALOGUE AND INITIATIVES (BUILT UP BY THE CONFERENCE “FAIR MANAGEMENT” IN SWITZERLAND)	59

Introduction

The document “Mapping of dialogue initiatives in Ukraine” has been prepared within the “Initiating the Participatory National Dialogue in Ukraine” project in Ukraine and implemented by the International Centre for Policy Studies (ICPS) with the financial support of the Matra social transformation program (government of the Netherlands).

While preparing this document, experts aimed at gathering, describing and analyzing existing initiatives designed to hold a dialogue between social groups or communities that have different views on the conflict in Ukraine. Dialogue initiatives between residents of different regions of the country, displaced persons and locals, enforcement authorities and people affected by their actions are among them. The fact that these projects are in different stages of implementation should be considered. Some of them have already been completed, others were implemented as pilot projects, whereas a number of them are still at the development stage or need support.

Chapter 1 analyses the Ukrainian conflict as a conjunction of conflicts at three levels: global (geopolitical), regional (Ukrainian-Russian) and local (within Ukraine). As a result, official, unofficial and semi-official “tracks of diplomacy” (track 1, 2, 1.5) and tools that can be employed to resolve the conflict are analyzed. Taking into consideration that the concept of different “tracks of diplomacy” is almost not used in Ukrainian academic discourse on conflict resolution in contrast to the discourse of international organizations, the document provides a detailed description of these tools in accordance with the methods [applicable in the UN Peacekeeping Departments](#)¹.

Chapter 2 presents the development of Ukrainian NGOs’ dialogue initiatives from business mediation and facilitation to the dialogues between social groups and communities with different political views.

Chapter 3 is devoted to the description and analysis of dialogue initiatives of international NGOs that focus on peacemaking and try to apply existing practices to prevent aggravation of the conflict between different communities. Chapter 4 examines initiatives of Ukrainian and international NGOs supported by system donors operating in Ukraine, namely the Matra social transformation program (the Netherlands), the British Embassy in Ukraine, German Foreign Office, USAID, International Renaissance Foundation and others.

Chapter 5 analyses the bilateral Ukrainian-Russian initiatives of NGOs aimed at establishing a dialogue between civil society in Ukraine and Russia.

¹ http://peacemaker.un.org/sites/peacemaker.un.org/files/TrackOneandaHalfDiplomacy_Mapendere.pdf

At the end of each chapter which analyses dialogue initiatives there are also recommendations for their further effective development.

The document might be helpful for Ukrainian authorities, international organizations and players involved in peace processes in Ukraine (UN, OSCE, EU, third states etc.). It contributes to better understanding of the status and prospects of dialogue processes in Ukraine at the level of civil society and unofficial diplomacy.

It may also be of interest to representatives of foreign diplomatic missions in Ukraine and donors who support peace and dialogue projects as it is the first attempt to organize and analyze a significant number of various projects in different regions and at different levels, as well as to map dialogue initiatives in Ukraine. This will help to identify dialogue areas which need the most support in the nearest future and will promote quality and reasonable selection of projects to fund.

Moreover, the document will be beneficial for Ukrainian and international NGOs and experts working in the field of conflict resolution, mediation, negotiation, dialogue, post-conflict rehabilitation since it will help avoid repetition of certain initiatives and unite efforts to obtain synergy in launching dialogue projects in Ukraine.

Chapter 1. Characteristics of conflict settlement in Ukraine

Multi-level nature of the conflict

Escalating Ukrainian conflict, which has already led to Crimea annexation and armed fight in the east, in some cases is wrongly or unilaterally regarded as purely domestic issue (civil conflict) or as a conflict between Ukraine and Russia (Ukrainian-Russian war). Narrowed or one-sided perception of the conflict leads to the inefficiency of suggested ways of its regulation.

The current crisis, which can be called Ukrainian, Russian, European and even worldwide or geopolitical, should be addressed comprehensively. It resulted from a conjunction of conflicts at three different levels: geopolitical (global), Ukrainian-Russian (regional) and within Ukraine (local). What is more, the conflicts of higher level aggravate the conflicts of lower level and vice versa, and the same actors can act at different levels in different roles (see Fig.1).

At the global level, it is a conflict between the major players in the international arena, first of all, between Russia and the West (under the term “West” we imply the US, EU, NATO and other players who share common standards of behavior with them, e.g. Japan or Australia). Prerequisites for the conflict are triggered by errors in creating and developing European and North Atlantic security and cooperation architecture in the early 1990s, false parameters of the former Soviet Union countries involvement in European and Euro-Atlantic integration. Violation of international laws by leading players in the global arena and application of double standards (from Iraq gamble to independence of Kosovo) undermined the moral credibility of the West and created a series of precedents of international law violation. Kosovo precedent became a time bomb, refusal to Ukraine and Georgia Action Plan for NATO membership triggered Russian imperialism and Crimea annexation utterly destroyed the post-bipolar system of international relations that existed last two decades.

The process of the post-bipolar disintegration will go on to set up new world order and renew key international institutions.

Only now leading actors start to comprehend the collapse of the post-bipolar system of international relations and search for possible new options for global security architecture. Ukraine’s objectives at this level are to frame a new foreign policy that would take account of the principles of future international relations system and to outline specific proposals. Ukraine, which by force of circumstance has become a key catalyst for the destruction of existing international security and cooperation system, must act not only as a subject of arrangements focusing its own foreign policy on such critical issues as conflict division line or conflict zone status. To preserve its subjectivity in international relations,

Ukraine should initiate the revision of European and North Atlantic security and cooperation architecture principles and renewal of international institutions. It is essential to offer and promote its own vision of Russia and other former Soviet Union countries' role in European and international organizations, put forward solutions to global and bilateral conflict resolution with Russia, and occupy its own place in the new world order.

At the regional level, we primarily deal with bilateral conflict between Russia and Ukraine which was caused by erosion of the post-Soviet system of relations in the region and Russia's desire to restore the "historical truth" and return its position in the region it considers its own sphere of influence, as well as to provide a proper place in world and European architecture of security and cooperation. The catalyst for the conflict became a repeated victory of pro-European forces in Ukraine (after the Orange Revolution) and their attempt to finally break away from Russia's Eurasian integration project.

Russia sees Ukraine as a sphere of influence and a core component of post-Soviet integration processes. In this respect, Ukraine's European integration aspirations depend on its internal strength, ability to withstand the pressure from Russia, or on the internal weakness of Russia and its inability to implement imperial policy by force. The weakening of Ukraine and strengthening of Russia in the last decade have made European integration of Ukraine a hostage to Russian imperialism, while Ukrainian political corruption, heterogeneity of Ukrainian society, weakness of the military and security structures let the Russian political elite consider Ukraine a surmounted obstacle on the way to the Eurasian Union.

The complexity of Ukrainian-Russian ties, interdependence of Ukrainian and Russian economies, military industrial cooperation, energy factor, Crimea, Russian political elite's psychological dependence on Ukrainian issue and a number of other reasons hinder fast and simplified settlement of the conflict. The wider regional context, precedential nature of Ukrainian-Russian settlement for the former Soviet Union, objective strengthening of European integration vectors in the former Soviet Union countries should also be taken into account. Ukrainian-Russian conflict handling and ways of reconciliation will bring peace, stability and prosperity not only to the two countries but to other countries of Eastern Europe, Southern Caucasus and Central Asia. That is why Ukraine has to put forward concepts of defusing not short-term consequences of the crisis but its underlying causes. We have to outline for Russia and international community truly innovative conceptual proposals as regards Ukrainian-Russian security and economic relations, tackling Sevastopol problem, the Black Sea Fleet of the Russian Federation base and the status of the current conflict zones. International experience makes it possible to formulate such ideas and proposals. Heavy sanctions should be imposed against Russia if it refuses to embrace them and keeps escalating violence.



Fig. 1. Multi-level nature of the conflict in Ukraine

The local (within Ukraine) conflict refers to the conflict between closed political and economic social institutions and new civil society which denies oligarchic Latin American-post-Soviet model of nation building and socio-economic relations. This conflict escalates due to the heterogeneous nature of Ukrainian society and improvident deployment of regional, cultural, linguistic and religious differences by political elites to derive their own short-term benefits. Political elites speculate on historical, linguistic, religious, cultural, economic and other differences between regions of the country in order to advance their political positions and chances to enrich through economic rent. Instead of uniting different regions by common vision of the future, political elites increase electoral preferences and their own political capital by swinging the pendulum of cultural and historical differences between regions.

This process has been taken place since independence of the country and led to weakness of dialogue culture and cultivation of policy in which “winner gets everything”. What is more, each political cycle enhanced the amplitude of the pendulum that under the condition of weakened state institutions resulted in disintegration of the country and armed conflict in Donbas. At the same time, the conflict potential that could be activated in any time exists in the number of other Ukrainian regions.

To resolve the conflict at this level, it is necessary to hold a national dialogue and formulate national coherent policy aimed at uniting regions of Ukraine by common vision of the future country development and preventing future disintegration.

Given a huge number of issues in political, security, economic, energy, social and other spheres, society and political elites cannot afford to spend decades discussing some historical vicissitudes or justifying themselves by deploying plausible arguments. National dialogue in Ukraine should be held relatively quickly and focus primarily on the social agenda points that *bring together* different regions or people. The issues that cause irritation or rejection in large social groups should be discussed but in case of lack of immediate prospects to reach a consensus, they should be postponed to address later or in the regions and communities where they will not trigger fundamental contradictions or conflicts. Ukrainian national dialogue should be based not only on the culture of discussion and consensus, but also on respect to the other point of view and the capacity to accept the fact that society is united on the principle of “lowest common denomination”. In other words, Ukrainian national dialogue aims to set the future-oriented and common for most Ukrainians agenda of principles, ideas, goals and objectives which will give grounds for the state comfortable for all its citizens.

Diplomatic instruments for conflict resolution

In today’s world not only representatives and instruments of official diplomacy are involved into conflict resolution but also representatives and tools of public sector, which form the so-called Track Two Diplomacy.

The traditional and most popular tools of conflict resolution are tools of official diplomacy, which is also known as Track One Diplomacy. Official diplomacy is an instrument of foreign policy to establish and maintain contacts between the governments of different countries with the help of reciprocally recognized representatives of the parties. The most important feature that distinguishes Track One Diplomacy from all other forms of diplomacy is its formal application at the state-to-state level. It follows a certain protocol to which every state is a signatory. Track One Diplomacy is usually considered to be the primary peacemaking tool of a state’s foreign policy. It is carried out by diplomats, high-ranking government officials, and heads of states and is aimed at influencing the structures of political power. The term “negotiations” is often used as a synonym for official diplomacy.

It is believed that official diplomacy has its strengths and weaknesses. The most common strengths of Track One Diplomacy are the following:

- The ability to use political power to influence the direction of negotiations and outcomes. This power might include using the threat of military force if a party decides to go against international treaties;
- Track One Diplomacy has the capacity to access material and financial resources that give high leverage and flexibility in negotiations;
- Track One Diplomacy can employ in-depth knowledge about the parties' interests because of the use of various intelligence sources;
- Track One mediators have the competence to use broad knowledge of their states' foreign policies, and also the foreign policies of the conflicting parties.

Regardless of Track One's strengths outlined above, Track One Diplomacy has several identifiable weaknesses:

- Conflict resolution approaches of Track One Diplomacy are corrupted by power. State power can be a liability to durable peace, rather than a facilitative tool. Power can suppress underlying issues of weaker parties, thereby undermining the sustainability of a peace agreement;
- Diplomatic missions, an asset to Track One Diplomacy, are normally closed down at the peak of conflicts between countries "thereby reducing communication when it is needed most";
- Officials cannot, of course, speak against their country and, as a result, may either be too rigid or delay negotiations through consultations with their leaders at home;
- Track One Diplomacy is affected by electoral cycles.

Track Two Diplomacy or informal diplomacy is unofficial interaction between members of adversary groups or nations that aim to develop strategies, to influence public opinion, organize human and material resources in ways that might help resolve their conflict. Track Two Diplomacy is not a substitute for Track One Diplomacy, but compensates for the constraints imposed on leaders by their people's psychological expectations. Most important, Track Two Diplomacy is intended to provide a bridge or complement official Track One negotiations.

Strengths of Track Two Diplomacy are the following:

- Track Two parties are not inhibited by political or constitutional power; therefore, they can express their own viewpoints on issues that directly affect their communities and families;
- Track Two officials do not have the fear of losing constituencies because they are the constituency;
- Track two empowers the socially, economically, and politically disenfranchised groups by giving them a platform from which they can air their views on how peace can be achieved in their own communities or nations;

- Track Two is effective both at the pre-violent conflict and post violent conflict stages; therefore it is a very effective tool for violent conflict prevention and post-conflict peacebuilding;
- «Track Two involves grassroots and middle leadership who are in direct contact with the conflict.
- Track Two is not affected by electoral cycles.

Weaknesses of Track Two Diplomacy are the following:

- Track Two participants have limited ability to influence foreign policy and political power structures because of their lack of political power;
- Track Two interventions can take too long to yield results;
- Track Two has limited ability to influence change at the war stage of a conflict;
- Track Two participants rarely have resources necessary for sustained leverage during negotiations and for the implementation of agreements;
- Track Two is not effective in authoritarian regimes where leaders do not take advice from lower level leaders;
- Track Two actors due to their lack of political power, are in most cases not accountable to the public for poor decisions;
- because of their multiplicity Track Two actors/organizations are notoriously known for their lack of coordination.

In a number of cases, when the weaknesses of official and unofficial diplomacy collapse negotiations between the conflicting sides, the so-called Track One and a Half Diplomacy can be applied.

Track One and a Half Diplomacy is an informal interaction between official representatives of the state in which representatives of non-governmental sector mediate negotiations between the parties. Former prominent politicians or public figures very often serve as mediators.

Although this level of diplomacy is considered to be unofficial intervention, to some extent it combines strengths of official and unofficial diplomacy. Credibility and availability of Track One Authority resources along with creativity and informal exchange of opinions in Track Two Diplomacy are some of them.

The application of official, semi-official and unofficial diplomacy instruments to resolve the conflict in Ukraine

To resolve the conflict in Ukraine, the work must be done simultaneously at three levels: global, regional and local.

Three formats of negotiations on conflict resolution in Ukraine have been introduced so far: Geneva, Normandy and Minsk.

The Geneva and the Normandy formats of negotiations correlate with the efforts to resolve the conflict at the global level.

The Geneva format of negotiations (Ukraine, Russia, EU and US) is the only format involving all three global players and Ukraine. Ukrainian conflict settlement at the global level is negotiated within the Group of Eight (G8) and the Group of Twenty (G20) Summits, in which all leading actors of international relations participate, but Ukraine in these formats acts more as an object rather than a subject of international relations.

The Normandy format with Ukraine, Russia, Germany and France's participation leaves out the US and translates discussions on conflict resolution into geopolitical and regional levels. At this level there is less geopolitical competition and it is possible to solve not only the issues of European security architecture revival but also define the role and place of both sides of the conflict in European processes of cooperation and integration.

The Minsk format with the participation of unofficial representatives from Ukraine, DPR, LPR, Russia and OSCE representatives is an attempt to regulate the conflict at the local level and the only format of negotiations which includes representatives of separatists. Official representatives from Ukrainian authorities are not in this format in order to prevent legitimizing of DPR/LPR representatives in the eyes of international community. In fact, the Minsk negotiation format is Track One and a Half Diplomacy into which unofficial people Kuchma and Medvedchuk were involved along with official representatives of Russia and the OSCE. The weakness of this format is that the negotiations are held behind closed doors and in some cases not only the information about the reached agreements is withheld but also the parties' authorities and status, a list of all the participants, their competence etc. are not disclosed.

There are defined dialogue formats at the first and second levels of conflict but the discussion format of intra-Ukrainian issues remains uncertain. Due to various circumstances that are not the subject of this study, domestic controversies have not been discussed at the state level for 24 years of independence but have been fuelled and abused by political elite for their own electoral and other benefits.

Therefore, the government should officially initiate the formulation of state policy of reintegration and national unity. It will give grounds for stimulating integration processes in the country, weaken centrifugal and separatist tendencies, settle a number of objective political, economic, social, humanitarian issues and provide official Kyiv with effective tools to deal with temporarily occupied territories directly rather than through international organizations or dialogue with Moscow or its subordinate bodies. This policy should be carried out through dialogue between opinion leaders and parties involved in different regions ranging from grass roots level.

Track One Diplomacy, Track One and a Half Diplomacy and Track Two diplomacy negotiation tools of conflict resolution at different levels in Ukraine

	Global level	Regional level	Intra-Ukrainian level
Track One Diplomacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summit G8; • Summit G20; • Geneva negotiation format 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Normandy negotiation format 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Implementation of the state national policy of unity</i>
Track One and a Half Diplomacy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minsk negotiation format 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>National dialogue</i>
Track Two Diplomacy			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dialogue initiatives of Ukrainian and international NGOs

National dialogue as a tool of conflict resolution in Ukraine

National dialogue is a tool of internal semi-official diplomacy, which has been increasingly used to resolve conflicts in various countries in transition recently.

National dialogue is a public negotiation mechanism aimed at extending the range of actors involved in situation amelioration during periods of transition caused by certain conflicts. The purpose of this mechanism is to move away from formulating and making decisions solely by power elites but instead engage representatives of various social, ethnic, cultural and other groups whose opinion is often not considered or ignored, which eventually leads to exacerbation of conflict.

The national dialogue mechanism has been applied in a lot of countries in transition periods of development. In Ukraine, one of the few attempts to launch a national dialogue was National political round-table discussion, initiated by then current President of Ukraine Victor Yushchenko in July 2006, which resulted in signing the Universal of National Unity. The document was signed by the President of Ukraine Viktor Yushchenko, Prime Minister Yuriy Yekhanurov, Chairman of the Verkhovna Rada Oleksandr Moroz, leaders of parliamentary parties, namely by the leader of "Our Ukraine" Roman Bezsmertnyi, the leader of the Socialist Party Vasyl Tsushko and the leader of the Party of Regions Viktor Yanukovich. The Communist Party leader Petro Symonenko signed the universal with reservations and Yulia Tymoshenko refused to put her signature. The document highlighted the need for national reconciliation and implementation of the tradition of national political and social dialogue to combat inherited and acquired problems of state life. Despite the fact that the participants of national political round-table discussion signed the final document, some of them violated all the arrangements later.

Another attempt to solve social and political conflicts by means of dialogue was a national round-table meeting summoned by the President of Ukraine Viktor Yanukovich during the height of Euromaidan events in December 2013, with three former Presidents' of Ukraine participation: Leonid Kravchuk, Leonid Kuchma and Viktor Yushchenko. These round-about talks brought no results and were used to simulate a dialogue on finding ways out of crisis by power elite.

The next attempts to hold a national dialogue were made in May 2014 when three round-table meetings were arranged in Kyiv, Kharkiv and Mykolaiv with the OSCE support. Ukrainian authorities regarded the event as merely the need to adhere to quadripartite Geneva agreements (Ukraine-Russia-US-EU) with their Western partners of April 17, 2014. Under the agreements, "the immediate beginning of a broad national dialogue in the context of the constitutional process that would take into account interests of all the regions, political formations of Ukraine and public opinion" were advocated. National round-tables discussions in May were fruitless and simulated an attempt to address the problem in the East, which at that time did not yet developed into a large-scale armed conflict, by political means.

Today's ruling elite is not interested in national dialogue and reconciliation policy. The reason for this is its inability to go beyond the matrix of political culture in Ukraine that has existed during all years of independence and lets financial and political groups take advantage of regional differences to obtain their own electoral benefits. As a consequence of Crimea annexation and parliamentary elections in uncontrolled Donetsk and Luhansk regions, the pro-government bloc managed to significantly reduce the number of their opponents from the Opposition bloc (former Party of Regions) and completely eliminate the Communists from the newly elected parliament. If citizens of the mentioned regions had participated in elections, winning political forces that form a coalition now would have much less representation in the Verkhovna Rada, and Petro Poroshenko would not have succeeded in the first round of presidential elections in May.

None of the programs of political parties or blocs that signed the coalition agreement (People's Front, Bloc of Petro Poroshenko, Samopomich, the Radical party of Oleh Liashko and Batkivshchyna) contains provisions for national dialogue or reconciliation and does not address the issue of returning Crimea to Ukraine or reintegration of uncontrolled territories of Donetsk and Luhansk regions. These issues were not also mentioned in the coalition agreement.

The above-mentioned participants of the political process consider the conflict in the eastern Ukraine to be merely a conflict with Russia and ignore the fact that, in case of no grounds for internal disagreements in Ukraine, Russia would never have been able to exploit the situation to its advantage (as it happened in other south eastern regions).

Only the program of the Opposition bloc recognizes the need to "develop and implement a national reconciliation plan which would provide the platform for dialogue between local councils' representatives from all regions of Ukraine" and "define and develop

the concept of human development “Unity in diversity”. Moreover, this political force emphasizes the need to protect the rights of Ukrainian citizens in Crimea along with the rights of displaced persons. It also stresses the need to create conditions under which “residents of the regions affected by hostilities could see their prospects within united Ukraine”.

However, the Opposition bloc’s approach to the issue of country reunification should not be idealized since it comprises individuals who used to actively swing the pendulum “East-West”, which turned the conflict into a military phase. Today the party employs the rhetoric of reconciliation and national dialogue in order to strengthen its positions in Ukrainian politics so as to safeguard its own interests affected by the conflict.

As for the Ukrainian government and the President, their reluctance to implement state policy of national unity and reconciliation is evident in their official withdrawal from uncontrolled areas in Donbas, cutting social benefits in these areas and refusal to resolve the problems of residents who are citizens of Ukraine.

Another problem is the government’s inability to ensure the rights of displaced persons from the ATO zone and citizens of Ukraine in Crimea due to refusal to reform the outdated administrative and licensing systems inherited from the Soviet Union. Thus, Ukraine seems to be unable to integrate internally displaced persons who are the most active part of Donbas society and who are in favour of unified Ukraine, as well as the Crimean people that left the peninsula or continue living there as citizens of Ukraine.

There is a considerable risk that such citizens, feeling irrelevant in Ukraine, will eventually get disappointed with the idea of unified Ukraine.

In addition, given the government’s unwillingness to bring about reforms but stick to the old corrupt schemes, it is reasonable to assume that the ruling elite is interested in the conflict in the east and the lack of national dialogue. On the one hand, the conflict makes an excuse for absence of reforms and on the other hand, it provides favourable conditions for redistribution of financial assets and property. Therefore, the idea of getting Crimea back and Donbas reintegration by setting up a worthwhile project to reform Ukraine is rapidly losing its prospects for implementation.

National dialogue may not be held in Ukraine for a number of reasons. Some European countries might regard it as a way to relieve tension related to the current conflict and let it enter a frozen phase. It will allow posing a question of lifting sanctions against Russia in some time (currently they have a negative impact on these countries’ economy). As a matter of fact, European countries and Russia hold the same views on this issue.

Meanwhile, Russia intends to achieve other goals through the national dialogue project in Ukraine. First of all, it will assist in legitimizing leaders of self-proclaimed DPR and LPR who are supposed to be engaged in dialogue at the political level. Considering that national dialogue is likely to be realized through the OSCE, Russia could get an additional channel to present “in first person” alleged violations of Russian-speaking citizens of Ukraine in Donbas.

In case of opening a dialogue at the social level, Russia will be able to promote its opinions on current events through fully controlled representatives of self-proclaimed republics.

Track Two Diplomacy tools of conflict resolution

Taking into consideration the shortcomings of Ukraine's political system, Crimea annexation and the war in the east of the country, it would be unreasonable to expect the establishment and development of state institutions. Moreover, the attempts to have a "national dialogue" as a round-table discussion under the Geneva agreements reached in April 2014 more stifled than encouraged this idea.

At the same time, the attempts of new political elite to ignore the need for dialogue will certainly lead to mounting tension in society and will stimulate the growth of centrifugal and disintegration processes.

In this regard, the role of unofficial diplomacy in holding both intra-Ukrainian dialogue and dialogue with external interested parties is growing.

A number of dialogue initiatives from Ukrainian and international NGOs designed to mitigate the consequences of the crisis and prevent new ones have crystallized in Ukraine.

However, today not only the government but also part of the civil society does not properly understand the importance of dialogue for country reintegration. Besides, a large number of people do not regard this mechanism as an alternative to armed conflict resolution.

The following chapters of this document are devoted to the analysis of a number of dialogue initiatives in Ukraine, as well as the prospects for settlement of current conflicts and prevention of new ones.

Chapter 2. Dialogue initiatives of Ukrainian NGOs

Chronology of dialogue initiatives development

Ukrainian society's problem is the lack of dialogue culture, particularly at the political level. Debates, which aim to defend the virtue of a position, have prevailed in Ukrainian political environment since independence proclamation. Such a situation has been relayed to the public and social levels for a long time, especially through the media. Political talk shows, namely such television projects as "Shuster-live", which led to dialogue displacement from social and political life, served a pivotal role in promoting debates. This situation triggered the confrontation swings, which caused armed confrontation.

The development of initiatives of Ukrainian NGOs to reach a consensus through dialogue can be divided into three periods. In the pre-crisis period, starting in 2010, Ukraine had a unique initiative aimed at opening a dialogue between speakers of different national memory in Ukraine, which was implemented by NGO "Foundations for Freedom". At that stage, issues of Ukrainian society heterogeneity and different historical memory in different regions were overlooked.

Since the confrontation at Maidan, various dialogue initiatives started to emerge in the country and they were endorsed by professional facilitators and mediators who specialized primarily in conflict resolutions in business environment or in judicial facilitation. In many cases, such dialogues were held among like-minded people (especially pro-Ukrainian), i.e. within the groups (Dialogues on the Maidan, Public dialogue, Peace summit etc.) and did not relate to the main vectors of divide – "Maidan – Antimaidan", "EU- Custom Union", "Pro-Ukrainian – pro-Russian views", "East – West", "Kyiv – Donbas" and so on.

Before the armed confrontation between pro-Ukrainian and pro-Russian forces severely aggravated in August 2014, society did not feel the need for dialogues but for exertion of all its forces to win. In general, during that period society, on the one hand, united around pro-Ukrainian ideas in most of Ukraine and, on the other hand, completely split from pro-Russian representatives in Donetsk and Luhansk regions.

The events in Ilovaisk in August 2014 and Ukrainian heavy casualties during the conflict (in January 2015 the UN reported such numbers: 4,700 killed and 10,000 wounded) fostered awareness of the need to resolve the conflict peacefully, first of all through dialogue between different forces. The events on May 2, 2014, became such a trigger for Odessa, which led to launching and developing dialogue initiatives between pro-Ukrainian and pro-Russian citizens in this city before others.

In the autumn of 2014, a new phase of Ukrainian public dialogue initiative started. It already involved searching for new opportunities to enter into dialogues between supporters of different vectors of country development (initiatives by Channel 17 on teleconferences between Kyiv and Donbas). However, this initiative is treated ambiguously

in society and often harshly criticized, which signals that a large part of society is not ready to seek peaceful ways of conflict settlement.

Ukraine today: in search of society conception (Foundations for Freedom)

Before 2014 Ukraine had the single local initiative aimed to heal historical past, reconcile and interact through dialogues at the individual levels and levels of local and Eastern Europe communities. This program "[Ukrainian Action: Healing the Past](http://www.iofc.org/ukrainian-action-healing-the-past)"² being implemented by the [international non-governmental organization "Foundations for Freedom"](http://www.iofc.org/foundations-for-freedom)³ via its representative office in Ukraine. From 2010 to 2013, this program carried out a series of educational programs, dialogues, seminars and conferences aimed at reconciliation in the perception of ambiguous historical past. The dialogues involved members of the public with different views on certain historical events.

In response to the situation in Ukrainian society and in connection with the events at Maidan, "Foundations for Freedom" launched a series of dialogues to reach a consensus among Ukrainians entitled "Current situation in Ukraine: ways to find mutual understanding" in January 2013. Members of the public with different views on revolutionary events in Ukraine, namely in Kyiv's Independence Square, were invited to participate in these dialogues in Kyiv, Simferopol, Donetsk and Lviv.

In the fall of 2014 under the program "Ukrainian Action: Healing the Past" a series of trainings was held aimed to create a network of dialogue facilitators helping in finding consensus at the local level. The course was designed and conducted in cooperation with the experts of NGO "Nonviolent communication". At the beginning of 2015, the network of dialogue facilitators has 20 professional facilitators.

Today the activity of "Foundations for Freedom" and especially the "Ukrainian Action: Healing the Past" aims to develop a network of dialogue facilitators in Ukraine, conducting dialogues in the Ukrainian communities as well as development of the initiatives to find ways of healing the past.

Dialogues on Maidan (initiative of "Culture of Maidan in Ukraine")

In response to events at Maidan, a group of some professional coaches, mediators and facilitators specializing in business initiated Civil dialogues at Maidan "[Take Maidan with](http://www.iofc.org/civil-dialogues-at-maidan)

² <http://www.iofc.org/ukrainian-action-healing-the-past>

³ <http://www.iofc.org/foundations-for-freedom>

[you](#)⁴ within the framework of the initiative “[Culture of Maidan in Ukraine](#)”⁵ in December 2013 in Kyiv. Dialogues at Maidan encouraged development of social competencies of Maidan participants. In fact, they were held between representatives of the general public who supported Maidan, and aimed at exchanging ideas and visions for further development. Citizens who did not support protest in Kyiv were not involved in this format. However, this initiative enhanced the involvement of professional business facilitators and mediators, including representatives of the National Association of mediators of Ukraine, in working in social conflicts.

“Odessa for Consent” (Odessa Regional Mediation Group)

Immediately after the events of May 2, 2014 in Odessa, which claimed lives of more than 40 people, [Odessa Regional Mediation Group](#)⁶ initiated dialogues among residents with different views on the events, including representatives of Maidan and Antimaidan, within the scope “[Odessa for consent](#)”⁷.

Odessa Regional Mediation Group carries out strategic planning of dialogue practices in Odessa and implements a number of projects:

- weekly interactive meetings and dialogues among city residents who hold different views on country development. Meetings are arranged within the scope of German-Ukrainian project “Common home. Odessa is an infinite dialogue” implemented in cooperation with [Berlin Centre for Integrative Mediation](#)⁸;
- project “Bridges” which involves training sessions on conflict resolution and establishing effective communication for volunteers working with internally displaced persons (project is implemented with the financial support of the [Institute for International Cooperation of the German Adult Education Association DVV International](#)⁹ and “[Integration and development center](#)”¹⁰)

⁴ <http://dialogy.in.ua/>

⁵ <https://www.facebook.com/maidan.culture/timeline>

⁶ <https://www.facebook.com/OdessaGroupMediation/timeline>

⁷ <https://www.facebook.com/odessa.za.soglasie/timeline>

⁸ <http://www.cssp-mediation.org/>

⁹ <http://www.dvv-international.org.ua/?q=en>

¹⁰ <http://www.integration.org.ua/index.htm>

- round-table discussion "[Peculiarities of internal dialogue between political opponents](#)"¹¹ on August 15, 2014 in Odessa;
- seminar "[Monsters among us: the war and "dehumanization" of others](#)"¹² on August 23, 2014;
- the film "[10 years after the war](#)"¹³ was shown together with the [Nansen Centre for Peace and Dialogue](#)¹⁴ (Norway) on August 28, 2014 in Kyiv;
- the round-table discussion "[Is peace feasible during the war?](#)"¹⁵ together with [Peace Boat](#)¹⁶ participants and the [Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict](#)¹⁷ representatives on September 12, 2014;
- an interregional working meeting devoted to conflict analysis and dialogue construction in Ukraine (in cooperation with the [Institute for Peace and Common Ground](#)¹⁸, Ukraine, and the [Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue](#)¹⁹, Switzerland) on November 4 – 5, 2014 in Odessa;
- an international conference "[Dialogue instruments as a way to overcome the crisis: international experience and implementation in Ukraine](#)"²⁰ with the support of the OSCE Project Coordinator in Ukraine and Odessa Regional State Administration on December 10-12, 2014 in Odessa.

Nowadays Odessa Regional Mediation Group has become a leading centre of social dialogues in Ukraine. It has succeeded in ensuring effective cooperation with a number of international organizations and foreign experts who work in the field of social dialogues and conflict resolution. The essential characteristic of Odessa Regional Mediation Group is the fact that its dialogue initiatives are enthusiastically supported by regional authorities, including Odessa Regional State Administration. At the same time the initiative is local.

¹¹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H5-8uL2a2bk>

¹² <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UIYKtGz90jE&feature=youtu.be>

¹³ https://www.facebook.com/events/1517252738510244/?ref=3&ref_newsfeed_story_type=regular

¹⁴ <http://www.nansen-dialogue.net/index.php/en/>

¹⁵ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7jWXoMcfUI&feature=youtu.be>

¹⁶ <http://www.peaceboat.org/english/?page=view&nr=109&type=4&menu=64>

¹⁷ <http://www.gppac.net/>

¹⁸ <http://en.ipcg.org.ua/>

¹⁹ <http://www.hdcentre.org/en/>

²⁰ <http://www.odcrisis.org/mizhnarodna-konferenciya-instrumenti-dialogu-yak-zasobu-podolannya-krizovix-yavishh-mizhnarodnij-dosvid-ta-perspektivi-zastosuvannya-v-ukra%D1%97ni/>

Public dialogue (Circle of People's Trust)

After Ukrainian round-table talks and awareness of their low efficiency due to populism, attempts to push through some pre-election interests within the presidential campaign and the absence of many layers and groups' of Ukrainian society representatives, the Maidan initiative "[Circle of People's Trust](#)"²¹ initiated Public dialogue. The first open public meeting to initiate the Public dialogue entitled "[Uniting Ukraine by the public](#)"²² was held from May 30 to June 1, 2014 in Dnipropetrovsk region.

The event was attended by representatives of most regions, including Donetsk and Luhansk regions, as well as representatives of the Department of Political Affairs, the OSCE and the EU Delegations as observers. The meeting aimed to work out methodology of Public dialogue implementation, lay down criteria for selecting organisers, participants, international observers and create communicative platform for Public dialogue and affirmation of its decisions.

During the preliminary meeting representatives of various initiative groups presented their views on causes of the crisis in the country, agreed on the need to launch Public dialogue and specified vital and strategic steps to follow.

As a result of the event, "[Concept of national public dialogue](#)" was formulated and "[Appeal of Ukrainian Civic Initiative Groups to the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, the Verkhovna Rada and the President of Ukraine](#)" was lodged.

This initiative was organized before the actual DPR and LPR legitimization and did not involve dialogue with the party that opposed Kyiv policy, but only dialogue within the group of associates. The initiative was not pursued.

P.E.A.C.E Summit (Institute for Cultural Relations – Ukraine)

In response to the events in Ukraine, Ukrainian team of professional facilitators, integrated into the structure of the [Institute for Cultural Relations](#)²³, Ukraine, initiated "[P.E.A.C.E Summit: integration through decentralization](#)"²⁴ on July 4 – 5, 2014 in Kyiv. The summit focused on civil society and local authorities' role in ensuring success of public administration decentralization in Ukraine. The purpose of the summit was to outline common vision of Ukraine development through dialogue of participants. An international team of Ukrainian (Kyiv, Kharkiv, Lviv, Zaporizhia, Vinnytsia), US, Taiwan, French, Dutch facilitators assisted in all the events. The outcome of the summit was the resolution of joint community forces of P.E.A.C.E Summit, which was passed on to the President of Ukraine

²¹ <http://kolodoviry.com/>

²² <http://kolodoviry.com/?p=49>

²³ <http://www.ica-ukraine.org.ua/>

²⁴ <http://peacesummit.org.ua/>

Petro Poroshenko. Any information about the continuation of the initiative is unavailable now.

Local initiatives (Mykolaiv, Kharkiv and Sloviansk)

The situation in the country led to other local dialogue initiatives.

The increasing tension in Mykolaiv after the tragic events that took place on May 2 in Odessa led to a series of dialogue meetings. The first meeting was called on May 17, 2014 (four days before Ukraine-wide round-table meeting of national unity on May 21, 2014 in Mykolaiv). About 30 people participated in the meeting, namely representatives of Samooborona, the Right sector, pro-Russia Anti-Maidan and “Russian Bloc”, the clergy of Ukrainian Orthodox Church of Moscow and Kyiv Patriarchate, city residents who did not take part in active confrontation, as well as representatives of city Department of Internal Affairs and representatives of the OSCE Special Monitoring Mission to Ukraine (as observers). [The second dialogue meeting was held on November 21, 2014²⁵](#) and participated by 20 people. Such dialogue meetings will be arranged every month at least until spring 2015 (from autumn 2014 the events are held within the scope of the project “[Countering polarisation and conflict in Ukraine](#)” implemented by the Institute for Peace and Common Ground).

The first public dialogue among representatives of the Right forces in Kharkiv was held on October 10, 2014 and aimed at reducing tension after the “March of Heroes” on October 14, 2014 which was organized by the right-win movements and city organizations. Dialogue was held among one group representatives with different opinions and intended to agree on joint actions to ease confrontation in the community (in particular, it was agreed that dangerous stun devices could not be used during the event). The succeeding Kharkiv dialogues were held within the project “[Conflict resolution and countering polarization in Ukraine](#)” (to get detailed information see Chapter 4. Dialogue projects supported by system donors in Ukraine of this document), implemented by the Institute of Peace and Understanding (“What to do with Lenin?”, October 21, 2014, and “New identity of Kharkiv: joint analysis”, December 3, 2014). The project is implemented by [Kharkiv Local Democracy Foundation²⁶](#), which comprises the Laboratory of peaceful solutions, in cooperation with [Kharkiv Civic Forum²⁷](#).

²⁵ <http://novosti-n.org/analitic/read/1967.html>

²⁶ <http://fmd.kh.ua/>

²⁷ <http://civilforum.com.ua/>

The initiative of Channel 17 to hold dialogues with representatives of the so-called DPR/LPR

Today the only initiative aimed at holding dialogue between pro-Ukrainian activists and leaders of DPR/LPR and their supporters are teleconferences initiated by the newly created Channel 17.

There have been five such dialogues:

- [October 20, 2014: an online dialogue on the topic “How feasible peace is”²⁸](#) between ATO soldiers (including Camil Valetov, a Donetsk-born representative of the Afghan War Veterans’ 8th company of the Dnipro battalion; Oleksiy Tsybko, a native of Smila, Cherkasy region, a representative of the 5th company of the Dnipro battalion and a former president of the Ukrainian Rugby Federation; Volodymyr Shylov, a native of Donetsk, the commander of the 5th company of the Dnipro battalion; Jean Novoseltsev, a journalist from Channel 17) and Oleksiy Mozgoviy, a field commander from Alchevsk, Luhansk People’s Republic. Moderation was provided by the journalist Dmytro Filatov.
- [October 25, 2014: the resumption of the online dialogue on “How to bring about peace”²⁹](#) between pro-Ukrainian civic activists (incl. Camil Valetov, a native of Donetsk, a representative of the Afghan War Veterans’ 8th company of the Dnipro battalion; Tetiana Montian, the leader of the Spilna Diya (Joint Action) party; Dmytro Karp, one of the AutoMaidan leaders; Kateryna Kuvita, a representative of “AutoMaidan”, and Oleksii, a member of the Svoboda (Freedom) party from Makiyivka) and the activists and militiamen of DPR / LPR (incl. Oleksiy Mozgoviy, an LPR field commander from Alchevsk; Serhii Shyrkov, a journalist from Russia’s NTV channel; Ihor Zhdamirov, a bard and a member of the Russian Writers’ Union, Lipetsk; a militiaman Anatoly aka “Ded”; Tonay Cholkhanov, positioning himself as an Islamic or Crimean Tatar civic activist, and some Don Cossack from Luhansk region). During the teleconference T.Montian and O.Mozgoviy agreed upon Montian’s visit to Alchevsk and the release of a Ukrainian prisoner of war. Conference moderation was done by the journalist Dmytro Filatov.
- [November 15, 2014: an online dialogue between Ukrainian Cossacks and pro-Ukrainian activists³⁰](#) (incl. Mykola Bondariev, the chief commander of Ukrainian Cossacks; Oleksandr Zolotukhin, a lawyer, civic activist and soldier of the Aydar battalion; Andrii

²⁸ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=52xlwIQcmDg>

²⁹ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n4w0-1bA_EI

³⁰ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DRE76KtP6VE>

Petyk and Ivan Liuty, the centurion of the 4th company of the Maidan guard; Nadia Kuramshyna, a representative of the Union of Soldiers' Mothers, and Oleksandr Morozov, former deputy of General Lev Rokhlin) on the one hand, and Mykola Kozitsyn, the chief commander of the Great Don Army (a DPR ally controlling the city of Antratsit at the time of the dialogue) on the other hand. The event was moderated by Andrii Pavlovskiy.

- [November 28, 2014: a teleconference between the Donbas refugees currently living in Kyiv and Donetsk residents and militiamen³¹](#). The event was organized by Channel 17 together with Russia's NTV channel. The studio in Donetsk was hosted by NTV's "Central TV" reporter Volodymyr Zaitsev, while the anchors in Kyiv were Olena Solodovnikova, an NTV journalist, a spokesman for Road Control NGO and a former employee of Ukrainian Channel 112, and Oleksii Kutieпов, a journalist of Channel 17. The teleconference, which lacked proper mediation, resulted in the debate sliding to personal insults between its participants and turned out to be counterproductive regarding the search of the ways to end the war.
- [December 2, 2014: a teleconference between the soldiers of the volunteer battalions and the representatives of various Kyiv NGOs on the one hand and the representatives of Luhansk on the other³²](#). The Kyiv studio was represented by Oleksandr Zolotukhin, a lawyer, civic activist and soldier of the Aydar battalion; Camil Valetov, a native of Donetsk and a representative of the Afghan War Veterans' 8th company of the Dnipro battalion, and Oleksii Tsybko, a native of Smila, Cherkasy region, a representative of the 5th company of the Dnipro battalion and a former president of the Ukrainian Rugby Federation. Luhansk was represented by Oleksii Mozgoviy, an LPR field commander from Alchevsk; Mikhail Surikov, a resident of Odessa and the commandant of the Kulikovo field, and Vladimir Krutolevych, a captive soldier of the 45th battalion of the territorial guard. The debate also involved Kateryna Maldon, a representative of the Russian anti-war movement, joining in live from Moscow. Event moderation was facilitated by the journalist Jean Novosieltsev. During the teleconference Oleksii Tsybko spoke about his voluntary trip to Moscow to meet the Head of Russia's Party of Veterans Ildar Reziapov with the view to negotiate at the grassroots level the prospects of ceasing armed confrontation between Ukraine and Russia. At the close of the meeting the participants of the dialogue agreed to draw the Memorandum on the ways to end the war.
- [January 16, 2015: the subsequent teleconference³³](#) between Kyiv volunteer organizations that help the Ukrainian military and the volunteers providing aid to the residents of Donetsk was disrupted due to problems with the internet connection. The event was

³¹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XCFG05sgX3I>

³² <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pwh5waQ2RCE>

³³ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7oKjglUdPhc>

reduced to discussing the issues of Donetsk airport and the tragedy in Volnovakha between volunteer organizations of Kyiv.

Teleconferences of Channel 17 demonstrate that civil society and Ukrainian volunteer battalions undertake initiative to find a consensus between conflicting parties.

Women's dialogue initiative

Women's dialogue initiatives aimed at de-escalation of the conflict and its transformation into dialogue are worth mentioning.

At the end of June and beginning of July 2014, there was an initiative of the [Union of Ukrainian women](#)³⁴ to appoint the organization leader Valentyna Semeniuk-Samsonenko and her deputy Hanna Osova as heads of Donetsk and Luhansk Regional State Administrations. According to leaders of the initiative, women's appointment to senior positions in conflict regions should promote de-escalation of violence and conflict resolution. After the death of Semeniuk-Samsonenko on August 27, 2014 there was no any other information about the Union of Ukrainian women.

In late August 2014, the singer Ruslana made a trip to Donbas and on September 1 she gave a [press conference in Kyiv](#)³⁵ together with the head of the Centre for Humanitarian Assistance for the Release of Prisoners and Hostages in ATO zone [Volodymyr Ruban](#)³⁶. They urged to end the war in Ukraine and the main message was "Stop fire on countrymen". The singer emphasized that the war was artificially provoked by those who shot, as it was on Maidan, in both directions. In her opinion, it is an unscrupulous game that should be over. Ruslana Lyzhychko is convinced that the Ukrainians may reach agreement and stop shooting countrymen and unite against a real enemy, an external aggressor. On September 2, 2014, Ruslana Lyzhychko posted a detailed report and conclusions on her [Facebook page](#)³⁷.

At the beginning of December 2014 the lawyer and politician Tetiana Montian went to not controlled by Kyiv territories, where she visited Luhansk, Alchevsk and Donetsk. This trip resulted from the agreements reached during Channel 17 teleconference between Tetiana Montian and Oleksii Mozhovyi on October 25, 2014. During Montian's visit to Donbas, she [met with Oleksii Mozhovyi](#)³⁸, LPR field commander who controls Alchevsk. Mozhovyi

³⁴

³⁵ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yV1gjHFrXMM>

³⁶

http://uk.wikipedia.org/wiki/%D0%A0%D1%83%D0%B1%D0%B0%D0%BD_%D0%92%D0%BE%D0%BB%D0%BE%D0%B4%D0%B8%D0%BC%D0%B8%D1%80_%D0%92%D0%BE%D0%BB%D0%BE%D0%B4%D0%B8%D0%BC%D0%B8%D1%80%D0%BE%D0%B2%D0%B8%D1%87

³⁷ <https://www.facebook.com/notes/754944497901096/>

³⁸ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=agwkQ_Y6zv8

released a captive soldier Volodymyr Krutolevych who was held captive since August 2014. Besides, Montian held public meetings in Luhansk and Donetsk and answered journalists' questions ([first part](#)³⁹ and [second part](#)⁴⁰). After coming back to Kyiv, Tetiana Montian together with Channel 17 journalist Dmytro Filatov gave [a press conference "Humanitarian disaster in Donbas"](#)⁴¹

Lyzhychko and Montian's initiatives, being presented publicly, prompted a barrage of criticism from the public, especially from pro-Ukrainian supporters. It indicates society's unwillingness to open dialogues with ideological opponents and lack of dialogue culture in general.

Conclusions

Most dialogue initiatives of Ukrainian NGOs arose spontaneously and randomly in response to the crisis in the country and mounting confrontation in society. Initiatives originated in different parts of Ukraine, and had both local and national character. So, civil society once again assumed state functions feeling the government inaction towards arriving at the national consensus.

The first dialogue initiators were professional facilitators and mediators from business environment that could not stay away from the events in society and they began to apply their knowledge and skills in social and political dialogues.

However, Ukrainian facilitators, who have experience mostly at the level of local groups, currently focus on holding dialogues at the community level.

Another problem is that the vast majority of Ukrainian facilitators who participate in social dialogues usually represent pro-Ukrainian side as citizens of the country involved in social and political process. There is no information about Ukrainian professional facilitators that represent pro-Russian side or live on uncontrolled territories now.

Ukrainian facilitators are often unprepared to hold dialogues by the main divide vector "Kyiv-Donbas" because of their involvement into social processes and prevalence of dialogue experience at the local level. Journalists, not professional facilitators, initiated dialogues between pro-Ukrainian representatives and the so-called DPR/LPR.

Having dialogues between representatives of different views (pro-Ukrainian and pro-Russian) in controlled by the Ukrainian government territories is also complicated by the fact that pro-Russian vector supporters tend to hide their position at the moment or cannot

³⁹ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VC392fmjvwo>

⁴⁰ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h5VQEpxuHFY>

⁴¹ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=J_kOGB0_9Lg

express their views openly. It makes their involvement into dialogue processes more difficult.

Fragmentation and lack of a joint coordination centre which could promote dialogue culture in Ukraine and analyse the need of local communities impedes Ukrainian dialogue initiatives. Work in this area is also hindered by the lack of joint information online resource that could accumulate information on relevant processes in Ukraine.

Ukrainian dialogue initiatives also lack the government support at both the national and regional levels. Such a situation makes it more difficult to directly involve the authorities into dialogues. An exception is the dialogue process in Odessa, actively supported by Odessa Regional State Administration.

Another disadvantage is a sheer lack of dialogue culture in Ukrainian society, which results in negative attitude of some social groups to the idea of dialogue, especially with DPR/LPR supporters.

Recommendations

To enhance work in this field, Ukrainian community initiatives should:

- create a coordination center that would analyze various local communities' needs for dialogues and foster their realization;
- create an online resource that could accumulate information on dialogue processes in Ukraine ;
- keep extending the network of professional facilitators of social dialogues through trainings and workshops;
- devise a strategy to promote dialogue culture in Ukraine;
- develop a communication strategy of cooperation with the authorities at the national and regional levels. It will support dialogue initiatives of NGOs and involve the government representatives in these processes.

Chapter 3. Dialogue-oriented projects with the participation of international non-governmental organizations and experts

Before the military confrontation in Ukraine, international non-governmental organizations underestimated the conflictogenic potential inside the country. As an only exception one can consider the Crimean Political Dialogue Project by the Peace Action, Training and Research Institute of Romania (PATRIR) which was initiated in 2009 and was to finish in 2014. The project at hand did not accomplish the goals it had set forth, did not prevent the annexation of Crimea and its relevant findings were not implemented.

Particularly noteworthy are the visit of Bert Hellinger to Ukraine in 2010, an acknowledged philosopher and psychotherapist who studies the issues of reconciliation, and the broadcasting of *Shuster-Live* TV show, [a social and psychological experiment of reconciliation](#)⁴² between groups of Ukrainians having different historical memories.

The unfolding of a hot phase of the conflict in Ukraine catalyzed the activities of international organizations dealing with dialogue. Over 2014, a number of such organizations made fact-finding visits to Ukraine so as to study the situation in more detail and to find entry points for building dialogues.

The inclusion of leading international organizations in the conflict management in Ukraine has several advantages such as the opportunity to use their experience in settling social conflicts which was acquired in hot spots of the world and the lack of prejudice as the specialists of such organizations are predominantly foreigners and not psychologically involved in the conflict.

On the other hand, activities of such organizations are often hindered by poor knowledge of the conflict specifics, political context, interested parties, cultural and mental characteristics of the parties to a conflict. Therefore, to make this work more fruitful, it appears reasonable for international organizations to cooperate with local partners.

One more problem of dialogue initiatives of international organizations currently working in Ukraine is their scattered nature and the lack of information about their colleagues' activities. Consequently, representatives of these organizations often attempt similar projects and fiercely struggle for the resources of system donors.

A positive contribution to unifying various dialogue initiatives of both local and international civic organizations was made by the International Conference "[Dialogue Tools to Respond to Crisis Developments: International Experience and Prospects for Application](#)

⁴² <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=05rrGVcBQw8>

[in Ukraine](#)⁴³, jointly held on December 10 – 12, 2014 by the coordinator of OSCE project in Ukraine, Odessa Regional Mediation Group and with the support of Odessa Regional State Administration. This conference gathered representatives of a number of international peacebuilding organizations and Ukrainian dialogue initiatives so they could share their experience and possibly develop a common strategy of activity.

The Crimean political dialogue (PATRIR: 2009 – 2014)

Declaration of independence by Kosovo in February 2008 and recognition of independence of South Ossetia by the Russian Federation negatively affected the safety and stability in the Black Sea region, particularly in the context of the Crimean issue. Therefore, the [Peace Action, Training and Research Institute of Romania \(PATRIR\)](#)⁴⁴ initiated the [Crimean Policy Dialogue Project](#)⁴⁵. This project was implemented by the [Association of Middle East Studies](#)⁴⁶ (Kyiv) while PATRIR provided expert advice on facilitation and peacebuilding. The project lasted from June to October of 2009 and was carried out with the financial support of the British Embassy in Ukraine.

This project was followed by the [Crimean Policy Dialogue](#)⁴⁷ which was managed by PATRIR and funded by the [Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Finland](#)⁴⁸. Its implementation started at the end of 2009.

The project was aimed at preventing violent escalation of unresolved conflict situations concerning Crimea. The intended result of the project implementation was the adoption of a new and thoroughly developed policy for resolution and prevention of conflict situations in Crimea by respective institutions. Such policy had to be based on solely multilateral dialogue and supported by factual data of respective studies.

The conception of the project included three components:

- regular exchange of expert commentaries, joint strategic analysis and forecasts as to conflict factors at Ukrainian and international regional levels.
- empirical studies into topics determined by participants of these discussions according to their results;
- practical steps towards the political promotion of common recommendations of project participants in Crimea, Kyiv and regional centers.

⁴³ <http://www.odcrisis.org/mizhnarodna-konferenciya-instrumenti-dialogu-yak-zasobu-podolannya-krizovix-yavishh-mizhnarodnij-dosvid-ta-perspektivi-zastosuvannya-v-ukra%D1%97ni/>

⁴⁴ <http://www.patrir.ro/en/peaceoperations2/black-sea-region>

⁴⁵ <http://www.patrir.ro/en/peaceoperations2/black-sea-region>

⁴⁶ <http://uames.org.ua/en/>

⁴⁷ <http://www.patrir.ro/peaceoperations2/black-sea-region?id=34>

⁴⁸ <http://formin.finland.fi/public/default.aspx?contentId=299712&nodeId=43283&contentlan=2&culture=en-US>

The project supported the discussions on language, land and identity policies, and stipulated the possibility of studying the experience of political work on similar problems in other regions of Europe.

During the project, 8 panel discussions [were held](#)⁴⁹ in Brussels, Helsinki, Yalta, Foros and Istanbul and participated by 50 experts from the Crimea, Kyiv, Moscow, Brussels, The Hague, Ankara, Latvia, Finland and Croatia. There were organized several training trips of the Crimean and Kyiv experts to Latvia and Finland so they could learn about experience of the countries in implementing multilingual education and political instruments of protecting identities of Sami and Aland autonomies in Finland.

The project participants elaborated the recommendations on land and language policies aimed at the continuous development and conflict prevention in Crimea. They also produced amendment recommendations on the Law of Ukraine “On Land Market” which took into account the specifics of the Crimean region. As regards the language policy, the project attempted to develop the conception of multilingual education in Crimea under the operating name of the Crimean School. This initiative was supported by the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine and contributed to by the Ministry of Education and Science, Youth and Sport of Crimea.

A high-level platform to discuss the future (Crisis Management Initiative)

On the escalation of conflict around Crimea and Donbas, experts of [Crisis Management Initiative \(Martti Ahtisaari Centre\)](#)⁵⁰ initiated [a high-level platform for Ukrainians to discuss their future](#)⁵¹. The initiative intended to find ways to overcome the Ukrainian crisis through dialogue with all interested parties.

Within the scopes of the project, on July 19 – 20, 2014, Vienna witnessed a high-level dialogue involving Ukrainian political actors and experts which was held to start a platform for the discussion of current events in Ukraine and the crisis.

On the first day of the event, the participants had the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the conflict conciliation in Northern Ireland. The experience was shared by mediators regarding the Good Friday Agreement (Belfast Agreement) of April 10, 1998, signed to stop the conflict in Northern Ireland. On the second day, the participants discussed the Finnish experience of defining foreign-policy priorities and nation-building, as well as the

⁴⁹ <http://www.patrir.ro/images/stories/DPO/CPD/cpd%20en%20update%20project%20outputs.pdf>

⁵⁰ <http://www.cmi.fi/en>

⁵¹ <http://www.cmi.fi/en/media-en/news/eecca/308-ukraine/921-cmi-provides-a-high-level-platform-for-ukrainians-to-discuss-their-future?highlight=WyJ1a3JhaW5lIIO=>

role of OSCE in the settlement of the conflict in Ukraine. The project was funded by [Irish Aid, an Irish Government's program](#)⁵², and a private [Jane and Aatos Erkkö Foundation](#)⁵³.

The implementation of the project under discussion is continuing within the project of Ukrainian Dialogue Involving Many Interested Parties and with the financial support of the Embassy of the United Kingdom in Ukraine.

Theatre for Dialogue

In January 2014, an initiative group launched the [Theatre for Dialogue Project](#)⁵⁴. It aimed to create safe territory for the dialogue around the events in Ukraine, help the participants hear different points of view and try to work out a common vision of the solution to the situation. This initiative uses the methodology of the Theatre of the Oppressed introduced by a Brazilian director Augusto Boal in the 1960s during dictatorships in Brazil and other countries of Latin America. The methodology includes a set of special games and exercises intended to help the participants to master the language of theatre so as to discuss and overcome social oppression.

On February 13 – 16, 2014, five cities of Ukraine – Kyiv, Lviv, Donetsk, Chernihiv and Chernivtsi – hosted seminars on social theatre, which closed with performances about current events in the country. The seminars were conducted by seven international trainers: Hjalmar Jorge Joffre-Eichhorn (Germany-Bolivia), Olivier Forges (Belgium), Brent Blair (USA), Hector Aristizábal (Columbia), Roberto Mazzini (Italy), Evan Hastings (USA/India), Idan Meir (Ireland). Public theatrical performances were followed by discussions involving a wide circle of spectators, owing to which everyone present was able to express their personal and civic opinion in the context of current events.

Dialogue in Ukraine: possibilities, parameters and invocations (MediatEUr, Interpeace and ICPS)

From May to October 2014, the [European forum for international mediation and dialogue "MediatEUr"](#)⁵⁵ and the [International peacebuilding organization "Interpeace"](#)⁵⁶ with the support of the Ukrainian partner, the [International Centre for Policy Studies \(ICPS\)](#)⁵⁷, carried out a pilot project "Dialogue Capacities, Options and Challenges in Ukraine"

⁵² <https://www.irishaid.ie/>

⁵³ <http://www.jaes.fi/en/>

⁵⁴ <https://www.facebook.com/theatrefordialogue/timeline>

⁵⁵ <http://www.themediateur.eu/>

⁵⁶ <http://www.interpeace.org/>

⁵⁷ <http://icps.com.ua/en/>

which aimed at defining the need for dialogue at different levels and the possible ways of getting involved in the process.

Within the project, the representatives of “MediatEUR” and “Interpeace” visited Ukraine twice. On the first visit, which lasted from June 30 to July 4, 2014, the mission participants held a number of meetings with Ukrainian politicians, representatives of various political parties and community, at which the need for dialogue between the conflict parties both at the political and social levels was discussed.

During the second visit (October 14 – 17, 2014), the ICPS and international organizations’ representatives conducted practical seminars in Kyiv and Kharkiv for Ukrainian facilitators who can potentially be involved in the regulation of social and political conflicts in Ukraine. In the course of these events, international experts presented the experience of foreign countries (namely, Great Britain’s experience of the conflict in Northern Ireland and Israel’s experience of the conflict with Palestine) in alleviating the conflicts and creating the peace culture through dialogue.

In addition, a pilot dialogue was held between the representatives of local public organizations and internally displaced persons from eastern Ukraine and Crimea with the participation of Ukrainian and international experts. Within the collaboration with V. Karazin Kharkiv National University, a pilot dialogue was held between the students with different views on the country’s development and its external policy collaboration vectors.

Upon the results of the evaluative missions, the final report was prepared.

Nansen Dialogue Network (Norway)

A famous Norwegian peacemaker from the [Nansen Dialogue Network](http://www.nansen-dialogue.net/index.php/en/)⁵⁸, Steinar Bryn, takes an active part in dialogue-related events happening in Ukraine. Specifically, on May 22, 2014 in Odessa and August 28, 2014 in Kyiv, Bryn’s documentary *10 Years after War* was shown. The film is set in 1999, at the time of war actions in Kosovo when a group of Albanian and Serbian students gathers for round-table talks and discusses the political issues a few days before Yugoslavia bombarding. The next roundtable meeting takes place in 10 years when the participants switch political roles and Kosovo representatives are at ruling positions, while Serbian representatives, who remained in the region, are the national minority. The film demonstration was followed by its public discussion with the participation of Mr. Bryn himself.

⁵⁸ <http://www.nansen-dialogue.net/index.php/en/>

Japanese “Peace Boat” (Global partnership and armed conflicts prevention)

On September 12, 2014, [Peace Boat](#)⁵⁹ was in Odessa, a project of Japanese non-commercial organization, aimed to promote peace, human rights, sustainable development and respect for the environment. Annually, Peace Boat, a chartered passenger ship, travels the world on peace voyages and visits ports of the countries which have conflicts arising on their territories, and engages people in dialogue and mutual cooperation.

During Peace Boat’s stay in Ukraine’s territorial waters, a round-table discussion with the representatives of [Odessa Regional Mediation Group](#)⁶⁰ and the [Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict](#)⁶¹ was held on board to discuss the question “[Is dialogue possible during the war?](#)”⁶². The need and opportunities of opening dialogue under conditions of armed conflict as well as the possible strategies of solving the crisis in Ukraine were discussed.

International Center for Nonviolent Communication (USA)

At the beginning of spring 2014, Carl Plesner, a specialist of the [Center for Nonviolent Communication](#)⁶³, jointly with Ukrainian Center for Nonviolent Communication and Peacemaking “[Room for Dignity](#)”⁶⁴ held a number of dialogues on the “Maidan-Berkut” platform, following the methods of nonviolent communication. According to the dialogue initiators, they managed to reach an understanding between its participants, which later helped their common service in the ATO zone.

On October 16, 2014, the coach of Center for Nonviolent Communication, Duke Duchscherer, together with a group of Ukrainian facilitators, held a [dialogue in Novohorodivka](#)⁶⁵ (Donetsk region, 15 km from the ATO zone) between the representatives of local community and Novohorodivka border guards. Within the project, four meetings were held during the day: with the town citizens, command of border guards’ garrison, border guards and between both sides. After the dialogue, in order to facilitate the communication more effectively, a decision to develop a plan of common actions of the community and border guards was made.

⁵⁹ <http://www.peaceboat.org/english/index.php?page=view&nr=109&type=4&menu=64>

⁶⁰

⁶¹ <http://www.gppac.net/>

⁶² <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7jWXoMcfUI&feature=youtu.be>

⁶³ <https://www.cnvc.org/>

⁶⁴ <https://www.facebook.com/prostir.hidnosti>

⁶⁵ <http://www.iofc.org/dialogue-trustbuilding-method-ukraine>

In addition, on October 2 – 5, 2014 and November 20 – 23, 2014, Mr. Duchscherer conducted a training “Nonviolent Communication Practice” in Lviv and Odessa.

Conclusions

Dialogue initiatives of the international public organizations related to the conflict resolution in Ukraine are not systematic and majority of such initiatives are at the first stage of situation evaluation and searching for the ways of getting involved in the process. In a number of cases, such projects are carried out separately by certain experts or specialists (Duke Duchscherer, Martin Snoddon, Steinar Bryn, etc.).

At the same time, foreign experts often lack the detailed knowledge of the specifics of the conflict in Ukraine, which can affect the efficiency of their work and the possibility of achieving certain results. Not knowing the local realities also causes the absence of elevation to the political circles and other interested sides of the conflict in a number of cases, which limits the work of international organizations to community level.

Because of the mentioned peculiarities, the work of international organizations is more focused on holding dialogues and preventing conflicts in separate communities with a major accent on establishing contact between internally displaced persons and local citizens. At the same time, more global tasks, such as opening a dialogue between Ukrainian communities and Crimea, as well as communities, which live on the territories that are not controlled by Ukrainian government, are not considered by international public organizations.

Recommendations

To enhance the work in this area, international organizations should:

- more actively exchange the information about the dialogue initiatives of their partners, other international organizations, which work or will work in Ukraine. This will allow to avoid repetitive work and use the donor resources more effectively;
- involve local public organizations as partners for performing common dialogue initiatives. This will allow creating a synergy of efforts.

Chapter 4. Dialogue projects supported by system donors in Ukraine

Realizing the threat of further escalation of the conflict in Ukraine and the need to take preventive measures in this regard, a number of system donors have been supporting a few dialogue initiatives implemented by Ukrainian and foreign NGOs since autumn 2014.

Initiating the Participatory National Dialogue in Ukraine (Matra)

The project is carried out by the [International Centre for Policy Studies](http://www.icps.com.ua/en/)⁶⁶ (Ukraine) in cooperation with the [European Forum for International Mediation and Dialogue “MediatEUR”](http://www.themediateur.eu/)⁶⁷ (Belgium) and the [international peacebuilding organization “Interpeace”](http://www.interpeace.org/)⁶⁸ funded by the [Matra social transformation program](http://www.government.nl/issues/matra)⁶⁹ (the Netherlands).

Duration: September 2014 – February 2015.

The project aims to initiate and hold National dialogue between regional elites and opinion leaders to discuss further development of Ukraine as an integral and sovereign state. Following the results of sociological research, it is expected to adopt analytical documents concerning characteristics of the past and future development of Ukraine in different Ukrainian regions, as well as plausible unifying factors that breach Ukrainian society. Besides, the project plans to visions of the past and future development of Ukraine and define stakeholders of dialogue process at the regional level.

The recommendations to the government with regard to national policy formulation and corresponding draft Action Plan for its implementation are expected to be outcomes of the project. The website presentation “National Dialogue” and analysis of dialogue initiatives is scheduled for January 2015, and in February, the presentation on sociological research results will be made.

⁶⁶ <http://www.icps.com.ua/en/>

⁶⁷ <http://www.themediateur.eu/>

⁶⁸ <http://www.interpeace.org/>

⁶⁹ <http://www.government.nl/issues/matra>

Ukrainian borderlands conflicts resolution and prevention strategies (British Embassy in Kyiv)

Implementing organisation: [Association of Middle East Studies](#)⁷⁰ (Ukraine); financial support: [Conflict Pool program of the British Embassy in Kyiv](#)⁷¹.

Duration: September 2014 – March 2015.

Purpose: Development and implementation of long-term strategies of transforming local conflicts in borderland Ukrainian regions into the mediation process with participation of local activists, journalists and authorities.

The project will be implemented in all problematic borderland regions of Ukraine: Donbas (Luhansk and Donetsk regions with focus on borderlands with Russian Federation and adjacent regions of Ukraine); Kherson – border with Crimea and territories where IDPs from Crimea are hosted, waterline borders; all borders with Transnistria, as sleeping conflict potential which could be induced artificially; Volyn – issue of historical Polish-Ukrainian inter-ethnic hatred, which could be induced artificially.

Activities will target both hot and lingering conflicts and develop strategies of both conflict transformation and prevention.

The project plans to train 60 peacemakers who will share the knowledge and skills with others, and to obtain success stories of local conflicts transformations to be shared with local and central government bodies, media and EU decision makers.

Four resource centres will be created to serve as framework of permanent peacemaking efforts and training in the future (Kyiv, Kharkiv, Odessa and Berezhany).

The project will target identity conflicts, illegal trafficking and emerging conflicts related to creation of non-transparent guarded borders with Russian Federation and Moldova.

The project is implemented within the Ukrainian peacemaking school, which is a joint project of the Centre for Middle Eastern Studies, [Europe XXI Foundation](#)⁷², [Information centre “Maidan monitoring”](#)⁷³ (Ukraine) and [“Union of June 4”](#)⁷⁴ (Stowaryszenie 4 Czerwca, Poland). Two sessions already took place: November 25 – 30, 2014 in Kharkiv and December 11 – 14, 2014 in Berezhany (Ternopil region). The session in Kharkiv, which involved experts and public figures, aimed to explore ways of conflict occurrence and resolution, while the

⁷⁰ <http://uames.org.ua/en/>

⁷¹ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/375216/CPP_peacebuilding_Projects.pdf

⁷² <http://www.europexxi.org.ua/>

⁷³ <http://maidanua.org/>

⁷⁴ <http://4czerwca.org/>

session in Berezhany, which involved journalists, targeted coverage of conflict situations. The participants from Volyn, Kherson, Donetsk and Luhansk regions (regardless of the current residence), from Ukraine territories bordering with Transnistria and temporarily displaced persons from Crimea are invited to take part in the school. In future Ukrainian peacemaking school envisages forming a few working groups that will devise ways of conflict de-escalation in eastern and western regions of Ukraine.

Note: Information about two events within this project is available in open sources.

There was the [first session of the Ukrainian peacemaking school on November 25 – 30, 2014⁷⁵](#). The participants analysed different types of conflict: conflict of identities, inter-religious and inter-ethnic conflicts, conflicts of historical memory and conflicts of common future vision.

The following issues were discussed:

- How to recognize a conflict in its early stages?
- What happens to people involved in conflict and how to stop them from becoming enemies;
- How to understand and deal with social and community conflict;
- How to deal with emotions of people in conflict;
- What techniques help open negotiations between the parties of the conflict;
- How to make people listen to each other;
- How to find common solutions to problems that divide;
- How to shape a common future for communities with conflict past;
- Gaining experience from a participant of the round-table meeting in 1989 in Poland, which ended communism
- Why conflicts are good for democracy;
- How social networks (human community and Internet tools) promote conflict transformation.

⁷⁵ <http://uames.org.ua/php/art.php?id=55564>

It is assumed that the participants of the training will create working groups, identify the conflicts they will be working with, and then will make group trips with coaches to the conflict zones so as to analyse and transform them.

The training was conducted by experts of the Centre for Middle Eastern Studies, International NGO with the board in Kyiv “Information Centre “Maidan Monitoring”, Polish NGO “Union of June 4” and Ukrainian Europe XXI Foundation.

[On December 11 – 14, 2014⁷⁶](#), the second session of Ukrainian peacemaking school, with broader journalist’ participation, took place in Berezhany (Ternopil region). During the session the following issues were discussed:

- What happens to people involved in conflict and how to stop them from becoming enemies;
- How to deal with social and community conflicts;
- How to deal with the emotions of people in conflict;
- How to find common solutions to problems that divide;
- How to shape a common future for communities with conflict past;
- Why conflict is good for democracy;
- How social networks (human community and Internet tools) promote conflict transformation);
- How to properly cover the topic if displaced persons.

School coaches in Berezhany were:

- Paweł Zalewski, a Polish politician, Member of the European Parliament;
- Zbigniew Bujak, a Polish trade unionist and politician, one of the leaders of Solidarity movement and co-founder of «Gazeta Wyborcza»;
- Natalia Zubar, the chairman of the Maidan Monitoring Information Centre;
- Ihor Semyvolos, the director of the Centre for Middle Eastern Studies;
- Halyna Yavorska, PhD, professor, chief researcher at the National Institut for Strategic Studies;
- Natalia Belitser, an expert at the Pylyp Orlyk Institute for Democracy (Kyiv);

⁷⁶ http://tenews.te.ua/news_all.php?id=2011

- Hanna Usatenko, a psychologist, business coach, member of the Ukrainian Psychiatrist Association, member of the governmental organization “Ukrainian association of overcoming the consequences of traumatic events”;
- Volodymyr Hanas, the head of Ternopil male adaptation centre;
- Yaroslav Svatko, a Ukrainian writer and publisher, the main editor of a weekly “Victory Way” (Lviv-Munich-New York) in 1992-1996, an author and presenter of parliamentary TV program “Council” in 1995-1998, the director of the Publishing House “Galician Publishing Union” since 1995, compiler of the site maidan.org.ua;
- Daria Taradai, a senior producer, BBC Ukraine, Kyiv Mohyla Academy Doctoral School, PhD “Mass Communication”, postgraduate studies “Journalism”;
- Oleksii Matsuka, a journalist of “Public TV”, one of the founders of the “Donets Public TV”, an editor of the portal “News of Donbas”, a winner of the International Prize CJFE International Press Freedom Award (IPFA), awarded by the Canadian jury.

The participants of the training in Berezhany are expected to cooperate with Ukrainian peacemaking school graduates in Kharkiv, to join the working groups and later to take part in peacekeeping trips to the border regions of Ukraine.

Ukraine National Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue (British Embassy in Kyiv)

Implementing organisation: [Crisis Management Initiative⁷⁷](#) (Brussels) with [Ukrainian Center for Independent Political Research NGO⁷⁸](#); financial support: [Conflict Pool program of the British Embassy in Kyiv⁷⁹](#).

Duration: September 2014 – March 2015.

Purpose: support a multi-stakeholder dialogue among members of political parties and intellectual leaders in Ukraine, which will help to prevent future escalations of violent conflict and constructively address existing divisions between key socio-political groups in the country.

Within the scope of the project, on September 15 – 22, 2014 in Kyiv, Crisis management initiative experts conducted [stakeholders consultations⁸⁰](#) in Kyiv to support dialogue and intellectual elites.

⁷⁷ <http://www.cmi.fi/en/>

⁷⁸ <http://ucipr.org.ua/lang/en>

⁷⁹ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/375216/PPP_peacebuilding_Projects.pdf

⁸⁰ <http://www.cmi.fi/en/media-en/news/ecca/308-ukraine/935-cmi-conducts-stakeholder-consultations-in-kyiv>

The project stemmed from the pilot project of Crisis management initiative [“A high level platform for Ukrainians to discuss their future”](#), which was launched in the spring-summer 2014.

Countering polarisation and conflict in Ukraine (British Embassy in Kyiv)

Implementing organisation: [Humanitarian Dialogue Centre](#)⁸¹ (Switzerland) with the [Institute for Peace and Common Ground NGO](#)⁸² (Ukraine); financial support: [Conflict Pool program of the British Embassy in Kyiv](#)⁸³.

Duration: September 2014 – March 2015.

Purpose⁸⁴: To prevent escalation and to reduce conflict through the facilitation of nationwide dialogue initiatives. This project seeks to prevent further polarization in Ukraine and to help overcome divisions within society through bottom up civil society peacebuilding initiatives and through creating linkages with and advising on top down government devolution packages to ensure they are more inclusively designed and implemented. The initiative plans a range of activities in the East, West and South working through Government bodies, national and regional civil society groups and engaged individuals at two levels:

- At the community level, it will build the capacity of regionally based groups and individuals throughout the country to help them develop and implement community dialogues. The project will assist in facilitating these dialogues and mobilise comparative experiences as well as strategic advice through international and national experts. This will help bridge existing divides and make the community level initiatives more effective at preventing and resolving conflict;
- In Kyiv, a consultative group composed of representatives from key Ministries, members of Parliament as well as a cross section of regional leaders will be convened monthly to strategize, initiate and identify activities, to share ideas among the community level groups and to work with the Government particularly through the dialogue process envisioned in their decentralization plans. This consultative group will be a strategic link to ensure relevance, to target initiatives and to feed insights from the community initiatives to the political level and vice versa. This will create a more sustainable process of public engagement which has high level support and impact.

⁸¹ <http://www.hdcentre.org/en/>

⁸² <http://en.ipcg.org.ua/>

⁸³ https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/375216/PPP_peacebuilding_Projects.pdf

⁸⁴ <http://ipcg.org.ua/?p=681#more-681>

Within the scope of the project, on [November 4 – 5, 2014 in Odessa](#)⁸⁵, a working meeting between representatives of the Institute of Peace and Understanding and the Centre for humanitarian Dialogue with the support of the Odessa Regional Mediation Group took place. The meeting discussed conflicts and dialogue structure in Ukraine.

Ukraine – out of the crisis through dialogue (British Embassy in Kyiv)

Implementing organisation: [Centre for Cultural Relations – Caucasian House NGO](#)⁸⁶ (Georgia) financial support: [Conflict Pool program of the British Embassy in Kyiv](#)⁸⁷.

Duration: September 2014 – March 2015.

Purpose: To promote transformation of the conflict between Ukraine and Russia through organizing face-to-face meetings among Russian and Ukrainian experts, civil society representatives and mid-career officials in Georgia, and support Ukraine's political and economic transformation by sharing Georgia's experience. The project consists of two major components:

- Face-to-face meetings of Ukrainian mid-career officials, representatives of academia, civil society and media with Russian experts, including their Russian counterparts. The major objectives of this component are to decrease confrontation and promote an increase of rational attitudes among Russian and Ukrainian experts through constructive discussions and by promoting joint initiatives; and to encourage Russian and Ukrainian experts to produce joint policy documents, which will encompass thorough and relevant solutions to the problems existing between Ukraine and Russia;
- Study trips in Georgia, including meetings of Ukrainian mid-career officials, representatives of academia, civil society and the media with their Georgian counterparts - at both governmental and civil society levels. The study trips will cover two major dimensions: a) sharing Georgia's experience with regard to transformation of the Georgian/Abkhaz/Georgian-South Ossetian conflicts and normalisation process with Russia; b) introducing reforms in Georgia in the following spheres: reforms of public administration, police and army, judiciary, education and healthcare, and anti-corruption measures.

⁸⁵<https://www.facebook.com/OdessaGroupMediation/photos/a.403068929735033.84267.369195283122398/790664977642091/?type=1>

⁸⁶ <http://www.caucasianhouse.ge/en/>

⁸⁷https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/375216/ CPP_peacebuilding_Projects.pdf

Within the scope of the project, on November 23-30, 2014, Ukrainian experts and media representatives first visited Georgia. [On November 28- 29, in Kvareli⁸⁸](#), Ukrainian, Russian, Georgian and European experts met to discuss the conflict between Russia and Ukraine.

Ukrainian participants: Viktor Shlinchak (IWP), Maria Zolkina (Foundation “Democratic initiatives”), Oksana Kuziakiv (Institute for Economic Research and Policy Consulting), Volodymyr Kravchenko (journalist, “Mirror of the Week”), Alla Dubovyk (journalist, “Day”), Maryna Vorotniuk (National Institute for Strategic Studies in Odessa branch), Yaroslav Kovalchuk (ICPS), Daria Gaidai (IWP) and Pavlo Bulhak (Analytical Center “Open politics”).

The discussion was moderated by Yaroslav Petruskevych, the head of the Caucasian Centre for OSCE Conflict Prevention.

Two similar meetings are scheduled for 2015.

Fostering tolerance, dialogue and unity among the regions of Ukraine (USAID)

The project is implemented by the [Consortium for Enhancement of Ukrainian Management Education⁸⁹](#) and funded by the [US Agency for International Development \(USAID\)⁹⁰](#) within the project “[Training programs for professional growth](#)”⁹¹.

Duration: January 18 – 25, 2015

Purpose: To lay down the principles of bitter conflicts resolutions and their integration into journalists, activists, humanitarian aid organizers’ work, as well as to support efforts aimed to establish peace and prevent conflicts within and between regions of Ukraine. The participants will acquire skills that will help to prevent violence and gain perception of people from different sides of the conflict on the principle “do not harm”. For example, journalists will learn how information, photos and videos can bring about peace instead of inciting hatred. They will find out how to cover information on peace efforts at the local and international levels, and how to influence the audience and make it more tolerant of other views. The organizations which provide humanitarian aid will be able to function more inclusively and structure humanitarian aid so that it is beneficial both for displaced persons and host side, without conflict aggravation.

⁸⁸ <http://iwp.org.ua/ukr/public/1330.html>

⁸⁹ <http://www.studymarketing.in.ua/aboutCEUME.html>

⁹⁰ <http://ptp.ceume.org.ua/stvorennya-umov-tolerantnosti-nalagodzhennya-dialogu-ta-posilennya-yednosti-mizh-regionami-ukra%D1%97ni>

⁹¹ <http://ptp.ceume.org.ua/>

The curriculum is designed for 10 participants and will last for a week in one of the following countries: Serbia, Bosnia or Croatia.

The program is Ukraine-wide. The priority is given to participants from Donetsk, Luhansk, Kharkiv, Dnipropetrovsk, Zaporizhia, Kyiv, Odessa and Lviv regions.

The following topics will be discussed during the program:

- analysis of conflicts (reasons for dissatisfaction, conflict parties, conflict momentum and other factors which provoke violence);
- the main aspects of the concept “do not harm”;
- providing conditions for tolerance, diversity and national unity among the diverse population;
- understanding and willingness to apply new knowledge and skills for the benefit of all parties as well as introducing peacemaking concept in Ukraine;
- models, methods and practical steps to promote internal dialogue and establish contacts;
- adopting approaches to achieve tolerance, open dialogue and restore unity through journalism/social activities/humanitarian aid;
- devising and employing the methods for conflict resolution;
- understanding the conflict context by civic activists and journalists;
- interaction between civic activists and journalists in settling the conflict and presenting information in order to end the conflict;
- citizens, media and civil society involvement in administration in peaceful areas;
- methods and approaches to humanitarian aid structuring and uniting internally displaced persons and host communities.
- Potential participants in the program are:
- journalists who cover events in the conflict zone;
- civil society activists involved in peacemaking activities to ensure unity and psychological rehabilitation;
- humanitarian aid organizers who work or remotely manage programs in the east;
- leaders among internally displaced persons and host community leaders who can evince their interest in ensuring peaceful conflict resolution between displaced persons and host communities.

Common future of Ukrainian society after Maidan. Fostering mutual understanding and cooperation in conflict prevention (German Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs)

The project is carried out by the [Delegation of the Institute for International Cooperation of the German Association of People's Universities in Ukraine](#)⁹² in cooperation with the [Information and Research Centre "Integration and Development"](#)⁹³ funded by German Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs.

The project started on August 15, 2014.

Purpose: To promote mutual understanding between displaced persons and their social environment as well as to facilitate internally displaced persons' integration into new conditions. The main objective of the project is to provide financial and organizational support for NGOs throughout Ukraine in undertaking activities aimed at peaceful conflict prevention and resolution in society. It also aims to challenge stereotypes, increase tolerance through trainings, teach methods of conflict prevention and heighten public awareness of internally displaced persons' life. The project is carried out through awarding mini-grants to local NGOs.

"Academy of humanitarian education" in Kremenchug, providing multi trainings, information campaign and round-table talks with regional administration and media representatives, strives to boost assistance efficiency for displaced persons by building up volunteers' stress resistance by teaching them how to prevent conflicts. The target project group are volunteers, representatives of NGOs and local authorities in Kremenchug, Komsomolsk and Svitlovodsk.

"Democracy and civil initiatives" in Korosten is aimed at fostering public awareness of displaced persons' situation. By launching a massive information campaign, the organization fosters dialogue between different population groups at the regional and interregional levels.

Trust building between ethnic and social groups through facilitation, press campaigns and collection of media materials are the main objectives of ["Cultural di@logue"](#)⁹⁴ project **"Trust incubator"** in Kremenchug. Media representatives, local minorities, displaced persons and local authorities' representatives act as target groups of the project.

⁹² <http://www.dvv-international.org.ua/?q=en>

⁹³ <http://www.integration.org.ua/index.htm>

⁹⁴ <https://www.facebook.com/pages/Cultural-Dialogue/224538404317309>

Kyiv educational centre [“Tolerance space”](#)⁹⁵ makes its contribution to work with young people. The organization plans to teach the youth involved in internal migration and professionals working with them how to open a dialogue and resolve conflicts.

“**Council of young scientists**” in Sumy and [Kherson community development foundation “Protection”](#)⁹⁶ (Zahyst) are oriented towards young generation and intergenerational dialogue. Through discussions and platforms, “Council of Young Scientists” enhances constructive dialogues between students and academic community to release aggression, foster mutual understanding and reconcile modern Ukrainian society. “Protection” educates teachers and school administrators about conflict prevention. Pupils and their parents take part in the project.

The project of the NGO “**Centre for Education and Human development**” in Lviv supports internally displaced persons in the new environment through interactive sessions on personal development, job search, business start-up trainings and public participation in decision-making by local authorities.

Poltava charitable organization [“Light of Hope”](#)⁹⁷ implements a project to support internally displaced persons who try to adapt and integrate into their new residence. By conducting information campaigns, trainings and workshops, the organization intends not only to increase public awareness of displaced persons’ situations, but to boost efficiency of the local authorities working with displaced persons.

Through discussions, website and seminars, [Chernihiv Centre for Human Technologies “Ahalar”](#)⁹⁸ develop community and local leaders’ competence in conflict prevention.

The project of Chernivtsi charitable foundation “**Community Resources and Initiatives**” focuses on issues and rights of ethnic and linguistic minorities and internally displaced persons in the region. It collects and prepares media materials to increase Chernivtsi region population awareness of internal migration. The objective of the project is to harmonize interethnic relations and create a tolerant environment in the border areas of Ukraine.

[Ukrainian centre of concordance](#)⁹⁹ in Kyiv and Kharkiv city civic organization “**Chornobyl Union**” make a noteworthy contribution to conflict prevention. The Centre “Consent” develops and conducts online courses on conflict management and mediation for the sake of peace and harmony in Ukraine. Members of NGOs, trainers, coaches and specialists in development are the target group of this course. These online centres function as information and counselling centres in Kharkiv and there are three of them in Kharkiv

⁹⁵ <https://www.facebook.com/tolerspace/timeline>

⁹⁶ <http://zahyst.ks.ua/>

⁹⁷ <http://www.lightofhope.com.ua/>

⁹⁸ <http://ahalar.org/>

⁹⁹ <http://concordance.org.ua/>

region. The project involves citizens affected by the conflict in the ATO zone: ATO participants, internally displaced persons, those living in the conflict zone and family members of killed ATO participants.

The project “**Bridges**” of [Odessa Regional Mediation Group](#)¹⁰⁰ focuses on tension reduction between displaced persons and local community in Odessa through trainings, press conferences, new interactive dialogue spaces for conflict reflection and others. Target groups are local community, volunteer organizations working with displaced persons and members of Odessa City Administration Coordinating Council.

Raising awareness of the issues of internally displaced persons is a key priority for **Vinnytsia regional organization’s society “Knowledge”** and [NGO “Crimean Diaspora”](#)¹⁰¹. The society “Knowledge” accelerates mutual adaptation and integration of Crimean Tatar displaced persons into local community by introducing cultural, social and domestic traditions of this ethnic group to Vinnytsia region population. To achieve the goal, the organization holds festivals, exhibitions and seminars. “Crimean diaspora” enhances the efficiency of regional civic organizations and local governments work to address social issues and displaced persons’ integration. The organization holds 2nd Ukrainian Forum of internally displaced persons to share experience and coordinate efforts among the above- mentioned target group and various national and international organizations.

Dialogue projects supported by the international fund “Renaissance”

At the end of December 5, 2014, to endorse community initiatives in Eastern, Southern and Western Ukraine, the International Fund “Renaissance” supported [a number of project proposals](#)¹⁰² concerning the dialogue between various communities, including:

- The project “Modern Crimean community and Lviv community: understanding through dialogue” NGO [“Civil Society Institute”](#)¹⁰³;
- The project “Library theatre for dialogue and understanding “Let’s hear each other” Kropyvnytskyi Central city library and Central Library System for Adults in Mykolaiv;
- The project “Forum theatre as a way to settle conflicts in modern Ukrainian society” NGO “Workshop of kindness”.

¹⁰⁰ <https://www.facebook.com/OdessaGroupMediation>

¹⁰¹ <http://crimea-diaspora.org/>

¹⁰² http://www.irf.ua/knowledgebase/news/rezultati_konkursiv_dlya_gromadskikh_initsiativ_regioniv

¹⁰³ <http://www.csi.org.ua/www/?cat=8>

Contest held by the European Union to Ukraine

In early October 2014, the European Union to Ukraine announced a contest among public and private organizations and local governments to [support communities affected by the crisis in Ukraine](#)¹⁰⁴.

The objective is to strengthen the capacity of local authorities and other stakeholders to implement effective regional development programs.

Contest results have not been announced yet as of January 2015.

¹⁰⁴ http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/ukraine/press_corner/all_news/news/2014/2014_10_07_1_en.htm

Chapter 5. Ukrainian-Russian dialogue initiatives

In general, a number of initiatives concerning conducting a dialogue between community representatives from Ukraine and Russia are insufficient at the present, demonstrating thereby unwillingness from both sides to start the dialogue.

The initiative of the Centre for Cultural Relations “*Caucasian House*”, implemented with support of British Embassy in Ukraine, remains the only system project in this sphere.

Other events have been implemented first of all as private and in most cases spontaneous initiatives that need financial support to obtain systemic character.

The platform for Ukrainian and Russian contacts, dialogue and initiatives

During the conference “*Just Governance for Human Security*”, July 16, 2014¹⁰⁵, organized by the international organization “*Initiatives of Changes*” in Caux (Switzerland), the discussion between participants from Eastern and Western Ukraine, Crimea and Russia took place. Out of these discussions came the statement “[Platform for Ukrainian-Russian Contact, Dialogue and Initiatives](#)” (see Appendices). The statement was signed by a representative of initiative group from Russian side Andryh Zubov, a historian, former professor of Moscow State Institute of International Relations and a representative of initiative group from Ukrainian side Myroslav Marynovych, a vice-rector of Ukrainian Catholic University in Lviv. This statement has been spread in Russia and Ukraine appealing to public organizations to join it.

The platform aims to unite efforts of Ukrainian and Russian citizens to reestablish relationship, set up a dialogue and assist various initiatives. It is important to share values and norms declared in the statement in order to join it. The activities of the Platform initiative groups are carried out both independently and in agreement with coordinators from Russian and Ukrainian sides. The group contact is carried out through [Facebook group](#)¹⁰⁶ or through a joint e-mail: platform2peace@gmail.com.

¹⁰⁵ <http://www.iofc.org/ukraine-way-to-peace>

¹⁰⁶ <https://www.facebook.com/groups/Platform2peace>

A dialogue project between Ukrainian and Russian experts in Georgia

From September 2014 Georgian public organization “[The Centre for Cultural Relations “Caucasian House”](#) with the support of [British Embassy in Ukraine \(Conflict Pool program\)](#) started a project “Ukraine: way out of crisis through dialogue”.

[Read in details about the project at Chapter 4 Dialogue projects supported by system donors in Ukraine.](#)

Dialogues: Ukraine – Russia by Halyna Pokhmielkina

In spring 2014, [Halyna Pokhmielkina](#)¹⁰⁷, a Russian mediator, initiated negotiations between representatives of Russia and Ukraine concerning the issue of the ongoing conflict. The initiative was transformed into the project “[Dialogues: Ukraine – Russia](#)”¹⁰⁸. The first meeting within this framework took place in Minsk (Belarus) in November 2014. Its participants, representatives of different professional fields in Ukraine and Russia (including business people, lawyers, psychologists, educationists, priests, and journalists) held a dialogue aiming to establish personal contacts and provide conditions allowing opposite sides to meet each other as individuals but not as enemy camps at the battle field. The first meeting resulted in listing “[Emotional irritants](#)” which may jeopardize Russian-Ukrainian negotiations¹⁰⁹ and make constructive discussions impossible. [The second meeting took place on December 13, 2014](#)¹¹⁰ nearby Chernihiv (Ukraine) and looked for ways to conduct negotiations between Ukrainian and Russian societies. The project is carried out with the support of individual representatives of [the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict](#)¹¹¹ and private business funds.

Ukrainian-Russian dialogue between the media and the third sector (Internews – Ukraine)

At the beginning of autumn 2014, the international civic organization “**Internews – Ukraine**” announced [a negotiation initiative between Ukrainian NGOs and media, Russian representatives of the third sector](#)¹¹², opposition political forces and public leaders and

¹⁰⁷ http://mediators.ru/rus/training_of_mediators/trainings/text4/pokhmelkina_galina

¹⁰⁸ http://24tv.ua/news/showNews.do?propaganda_zaminyuye_zhivih_lyudey_na_monolitnu_bezliku_masu__psiholog&objectId=508770

¹⁰⁹ <http://geftr.ru/archive/13510>

¹¹⁰ <http://uainfo.org/blognews/466407-razgovarivat-nelzya-srazhatsya-itogi-mirotvorcheskoy-iniciativy-mirnyedialogi-ukraina-rossiya.html>

¹¹¹ <http://www.gppac.net/>

¹¹² <http://internews.ua/2014/09/ukraine-russia-civil-and-media-dialogue/>

independent experts. To begin this dialogue, the project initiators appealed to Ukrainian public society members to [answer a number of questions](#)¹¹³, primarily concerning the framework, experts, public leaders and most burning issues of the dialogue.

Information regarding further project realization is unavailable so far.

Meeting of ATO participants with Russian Veteran Party representatives

At the end of November 2014, voluntary battalion “Dnipro” representatives Oleksii Tsybko (a vice-president of Ukrainian Rugby Federation) and Kamil Valetov visited Moscow and met the Chairman of [Russian Veteran Party](#)¹¹⁴ Ildar Reziapov to negotiate confrontation cease between Ukraine and Russia at the local level. As the participants themselves confirmed, the visit was carried out on their own initiative.

Within the meeting there was a dialogue with Reziapov ([first](#)¹¹⁵ and [second parts](#)¹¹⁶). The Ukrainian side tried to convey the idea that Maidan participants in Kyiv had not supported those politicians who are currently in power in Ukraine but had advocated reforms in the country. According to Mr. Tsybko and Mr. Valetov, provoked by the Russian side conflict in eastern Ukraine did not allow civil activists to complete second Maidan and as a result, politicians and oligarchs who are not interested in systemic change in the country came to power. If the Russian side cuts off support for the so-called DPR/LPR, civil society representatives will be able to channel their passionate efforts to Kyiv to offset the incumbent government. On the other hand, the Ukrainian side emphasized that by involving Russian activists in eastern Ukraine, Russian government diverts their attention from internal issues in the country. Thus, according to Ukrainian veterans, the armed opposition in Ukraine is favourable for oligarchs and politicians from both Ukrainian and Russian sides. While citizens of neighbouring countries are killed, the initiators of these processes make money.

The parties agreed that the objective of veterans from both sides is to prevent killing during the conflict.

The participants agreed to convene a joint conference between Ukrainian, Russian veterans and community organizations to develop the concept and strategic plan to prevent further bloodshed.

¹¹³ <https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1xoemQDrk6htLhFUjHOKmAehp1uMSSUM24GipBdoybHg/viewform>

¹¹⁴ <http://veteransrussian.ru/>

¹¹⁵ https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4aP_OgTNsPw#t=65

¹¹⁶ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2UvoMJLM3LQ>

Conclusions

Under the influence of propaganda, from both Russian and Ukrainian sides, the Ukrainian-Russian dialogue initiatives prompt quite a lot of rejection and criticism in both countries, which signals their unwillingness to enter into a dialogue. At the same time these initiatives might be potentially uncomfortable for both Ukrainian and Russian authorities since in some cases they criticise them. There is a potential threat that in case of Ukrainian-Russian dialogue process success, the sides may unite around common demands to the authorities in both countries.

On the other hand, donors' support of Ukrainian-Russian dialogue initiatives at expert level is insufficient.

Recommendations

To reinforce work in this field Ukrainian and Russian public initiatives should:

- activate the format of teleconferences for Ukrainian-Russian dialogue, which is less costly compared to the dialogue in interpersonal communication;
- compile the list of Ukrainian-Russian initiatives at expert level;
- work out communication strategy to promote Ukrainian-Russian dialogues as an indispensable part of peace in both countries.

Appendices

The concept of a national public dialogue by Circle of People's Trust

1. Basic principles of public dialogue:

- 1.1. Public dialogue is a dialogue on the basis of equality with wide involvement of all stakeholders from both the state and civil society, regardless of the level at which public dialogue held: local, regional or national.
- 1.2. Public dialogue is a mechanism to resolve problems which require consolidated position of civil society and to be able to come to agreement between society and government on further particular interaction.
- 1.3. Public dialogue has to provide information about its initiation, stages of implementation, including direct public negotiations, intermediate achievements, reached agreements and their implementation for citizens, authorities and the world
- 1.4. **The legitimacy** of public dialogue affects the subsequent implementation of agreements. Given that public dialogue should be based on public support, official recognition and state's willingness to participate in it.
- 1.5. Public dialogue has to become regular in order to accomplish the following objectives:
 - 1.6. short-term:
 - 1.6.1. Counteract indoctrination and public consciousness manipulation through the media;
 - 1.6.2. Instant reliable information exchange;
 - 1.7. Long-term:
 - 1.7.1. Involve citizens in active thoughtful participation in public life and formation of public opinion;
 - 1.7.2. Providing a source of national trust;
 - 1.7.3. Formation of a new generation of public figures and politicians;
 - 1.7.4. Formation and development of civil society;
 - 1.7.5. Society control over state authorities;
 - 1.7.6. The growth of social welfare;
 - 1.7.7. Promoting the image of Ukraine in the world.

2. The actors of public dialogue are:

- 2.1. **Guardians (circle of guardians)**, responsible for holding a public dialogue, are impartial and politically neutral people who are trusted both by the state and civil society. The circle of guardians will comprise representatives of various political, social, cultural, professional and other organizations. Foreign participants might be involved as well in order to build up the international community trust in public dialogue. The formation of the circle is public and open to extensive consultation. The guardians' activities must be transparent. The recommended composition of the circle should not exceed 25-30 people. The guardians can act as the secretariat of a certain public dialogue or delegate the responsibility.
- 2.2. Any interested party can initiate a public dialogue.

- 2.3. Participants, interested in selected topics of public dialogue. The recommended number of direct participants in a particular dialogue is defined according to its level: 50-100 people for the regional level and 30-50 people for the local public dialogue.

3.Preparation

- 3.1. Opening a dialogue can result from evaluation of existing public opinion or prior public demand generating. The decision to hold public dialogue must be reasonable and meet the criteria for the appropriateness and strong demand to become the subject of public dialogue.

Having reached the decision to open a public dialogue, guardians hold extensive consultations, formulate a topic (agenda) of a particular public dialogue, outline its objectives and expected results.

- 3.2. Formation of public dialogue space includes:
 - 3.2.1. Information about previous topic;
 - 3.2.2. Identifying stakeholders (whose interests are influenced or represented);
 - 3.2.3. Providing a comprehensive public education about public dialogue and building common vocabulary;
 - 3.2.4. Testing public dialogue agenda validation and viability;
- 3.3. After final agreement on the topic (agenda) of a particular public dialogue, the guardians define the format, analyse available and required resources, organization issues, financial sources and stages of dialogue implementation.

4.Implementation

- 4.1. Public dialogue consists of several stages. The initial stages might have the format of consultations and be conducted online. Direct negotiations between the parties are subject to open meeting with wide coverage of the process.

5.Public dialogue outcomes

- 5.1. Public dialogue outcomes are written officially in the document sealed with all stakeholders' signatures;
- 5.2. According to the results of the dialogue, recommendations for the government and civil society are submitted
 - 5.2.1. Recommendations are summarized as urgent, short-term or long-term ones.
 - 5.2.2. Recommendations should be set with a focus on different fields of implementation and accordingly different places of implementation;
 - 5.2.3. Recommendations will determine persons and/or state organizations and civil society organizations responsible for their implementation.
 - 5.2.4. Recommendations underlie mechanisms for public monitoring of their implementation.
- 5.3. Upon the outcomes of a public dialogue, they check if obtained results correlate with stated objectives, analyse the dialogue to decide if additional rounds are needed and modify the agenda.

Appeal of Civic Initiative Groups of Ukraine to the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, the Verkhovna Rada and the President of Ukraine (Circle of People's Trust)

We, the united force of civic initiative groups from all Ukrainian regions, gathered by the initiative of the Circle of People's Trust, in almost 100 km to Sloviansk, and held a meeting "Ukraine's unification with the help of civil society" to open public dialogue in the presence of the observers from international organizations UNO, OSCE and EU representatives.

Representatives from eastern and southern Ukraine emphasized the need for situation regulation in the eastern Ukraine and the participants discussed the solutions to an ongoing conflict and its humanitarian outcomes.

The compelling need for immediate concrete actions from the government, aimed at defending the citizens, was emphasized during the discussion of the situation with the representatives of the public and direct participants of the conflict.

Upon the results of the public monitoring, an inconsistency between the official information and the real state of things about the actions of the government related to the stabilization of the situation in the East and the South of the country was revealed. The crisis situation has caused serious humanitarian consequences for the citizens of these regions, and society has to deal with them today because no effective measures are taken by the government.

According to the results of the meeting "Ukraine's unification with the help of civil society", the following demands to the government to deal with the critical situation of the citizens of Crimea, Donetsk and Luhansk regions are issued.

We appeal to the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine and the newly elected President with a request to enact the following laws:

- 1.The law "On declaring the legal martial law on the territory of Donetsk and Luhansk regions". Based on the new law, to issue the Edict of the President of Ukraine on imposing martial law on the territory of Donetsk and Luhansk regions;
- 2.The law "On the status of the internally displaced persons", which would provide the internally displaced persons of the above-mentioned regions with a state protection and their legal status regulation.

In addition, we appeal to the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine and urge to take the following measures immediately:

- 1.With the help of Ukrainian army and National Guard of Ukraine to block the state border of Ukraine in all the places of saboteurs' mass penetration into the territory of Ukraine, as opposed to solely in the official crossing points of the state border. In

the current conditions, it is necessary to introduce (at least temporarily) a visa regime with the Russian Federation.

2. Due to virtual absence of Ukraine's state governing bodies on the territory of Donetsk and Luhansk regions, to immediately renew the system of the local governing bodies on the safe territory (which means, in fact, transferring the administrative governing center) in order to prevent the serious humanitarian consequences. To renew (update) the work of the law enforcement officials, introducing personnel and organizational changes;
3. To submit the data on every case of treason by the representatives of security forces and inefficient use of the Armed forces of Ukraine to the Register of Pre-trial Investigations and immediately start preliminary investigations into such criminal charges;
4. Take all the necessary legal measures for criminal prosecution of the local governments' officials, the local councils' deputies and People's Deputies who supported separatists and were directly involved in organizing fights by providing finances and weapon or organizing separatists' (facilitated the "referendum", public gatherings and meetings supporting DPR and LPR).

Protection of citizens is the state's direct duty, violation of which can be accepted by the public as the government inaction or its interest in the current flow of events and plausible outcomes.

Tensions in society and criticism of the government's actions concerning conflict settlement in eastern and southern Ukraine have approached a critical level: people feel abandoned and worthless for their country. If the mentioned issues are not addressed during the current month, it can lead to the society's outburst with incorrigible consequences and humanitarian catastrophe.

Signed by:

PO "Circle of People's Trust"

Confederation of free labor unions of Luhansk region

Union of public associations "Labor movement" "Solidarity"

PO "Luhansk remedial group"

Public parliament of Ukraine (Kharkiv)

Public platform "Kharkiv public forum"

Kharkiv Anti-crisis info center

Association of private employers (Kharkiv)

PO "Zaporizky Media-Center"

PI "Euroyouth" (Enerhodar)

PO "Hrad", Dnipropetrovsk
All-Ukrainian public initiative "Pravo"
Mykolaiv home guard
"Center of social partnership" (Sumy)
SMPO "Students brotherhood of Sumy region"
Free labor unions association of the southern railway (Poltava)
Kyiv labor union of the workers of education and science
Anti-corruption Committee of Maidan
Donetsk regional public organization "Interaction"
Donetsk regional public organization "Legal protection"
Donetsk regional public organization "Regional entrepreneurs club"
All-Ukrainian striking committee
PO "AutoMaidan Cherkasy"
FPI "Pravo" (Dnipropetrovsk)
Labor union of the workers of the free trade of Khmelnytsky region
Public organization "Podillya Kozak Sich" (Khmelnytsky)
All-Ukrainian union "People" (Zakarpattia)
"Ukrainian Students Union"
PO "Union of the internally displaced persons"
PO "AutoMaidan of Ukraine" (Lutsk)

Addendum to “Appeal of Civic Initiative Groups of Ukraine to the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine, the Verkhovna Rada and the President of Ukraine”. Legal grounds of the demand for passing the Law “On Introducing Legal Regime of Martial Law on the Territories of Donetsk and Luhansk Regions”

There is an ongoing internal conflict between the legitimate central state authorities of Ukraine and quasi-public local bodies on the territories of Luhansk and Donetsk regions, i.e. so-called Luhansk People’s Republic and Donetsk People’s Republic acting with the support (provision of weapons, funding, and gunmen) of external aggressive forces. Vostok Battalion which is operating in Donetsk region entered this territory from the Russian Federation. Such conflict is regulated pursuant to Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 as an armed conflict between Ukraine as a High Contracting Party and organized armed groups which are acting under responsible command and controlling a part of the territory of Ukraine. Therefore, there is namely a military conflict on the territory of Luhansk and Donetsk regions, which, for the purposes of its resolution, necessitates the application of norms of international law, statutory constitution of Ukraine (Article 64, Article 106, Clause 20, Article 92, Clause 19) and legislation of Ukraine on introduction of martial law.

However, the operative Law of Ukraine “On Legal Regime of Martial Law” of 6 April 2000 #1647-III does not allow effective regulating issues of martial law state on the territory of Luhansk and Donetsk regions as it does not provide for the existing situation which entails undermining the principles of Ukrainian statehood in these regions, complete replacement of state fundamentals in the majority of districts in these regions by quasi-public state bodies of “DNR” and “LNR” (“Luhansk People’s Republic” and “Donetsk People’s Republic”), availability of socio-economic basis for mistrust to central state authorities of Ukraine and Ukrainian statehood in these regions. Consequently, the new law or a new edition of an existing one must provide for the restoration of the principles of Ukrainian statehood and central state administration on the territory of Luhansk and Donetsk regions, for instance, through establishing military commandant’s offices which shall replace local state administrations and bodies of self-government controlled by “DPR” and “LPR”. It must also stipulate for the “reboot” of key personnel, rank and file of law-enforcement agencies and public prosecution offices on the territory of Luhansk and Donetsk regions.

Platform for Ukrainian-Russian Contacts, Dialogue and Initiatives (built up by the conference “Fair management” in Switzerland)

We, citizens of Russia and Ukraine, believe that it is vitally important to build bridges of understanding, dialogue and cooperation between Ukraine and Russia.

The sad alternative to such mutual understanding would be continuing down the road to the abyss of war, mutual accusations and, as a result, hatred.

It is with great pain that we realize there is a real threat of total breakdown of relations between the two nations, formerly considered to be close. There is a possibility of full-scale war between Russia and Ukraine that would lead to countless casualties on both sides and threaten international security. The world would be faced with the possibility of a global military conflict.

A common value base for building Russian-Ukrainian relations should be as follows:

- acknowledgement that human life, rights and dignity should have the highest priority;
- unconditional compliance with existing international agreements and commitments;
- readiness to look honestly and openly at the history, as well as the current relations between our peoples and to accept these truths, even if they are very painful;
- understanding the necessity of overcoming our common totalitarian past and building a just and free society in our countries;
- unacceptability of media warfare, propaganda and manipulation of information recovering peace and good neighbourly relations between our peoples is only possible if based on truth, transparency, mutual respect and no-violence by either side.

Recovering peace and good neighbourly relations between our peoples is only possible if based on truth, transparency, mutual respect and non-violence.

This can only be implemented if both sides share these principles:

- There is no future in trying to resolve the situation between the two nations by means of military action. There is an urgent need to restore the territorial integrity of Ukraine, end war between our nations and not allow it to happen in the future.
- We do not accept the aggressive and hostile actions of the Russian Federation towards Ukraine. The undeclared war that the Russian Federation is waging in Ukraine has led to countless casualties, and may create insurmountable obstacles in relation between our two countries for decades to come.
- Every nation has a right to choose its own path of governmental and societal development.

We invite everyone who shares these principles to contribute to improving relations between the people of Russia and Ukraine through dialogue, joint initiatives, and other means.

We urge everyone to share their ideas on practical steps to build peace and establish good neighbourly relations between our two nations

Initiative group from Russian side: Andrii Borysovych Zubov

Initiative group from Ukrainian side: Myroslav Frankovych Marynovych

16.07.2014

@2014 International Centre for Policy Studies (ICPS)

If citing please give reference on the ICPS

Responsible for the project: Olena Zakharova

Team of ICPS experts:

Vasyl Filipchuk, Olena Zakharova, Volodymyr Prytula, Yaroslav Kovalchuk, Anatoliy Ohtysiuk.

Proofreading: Patrick E. McGrath

This material has been prepared within the “Initiating the Participatory National Dialogue in Ukraine” project in Ukraine and implemented by the International Centre for Policy Studies (ICPS) with the financial support of the Matra social transformation program (the Netherlands).