

Institutions of Activism: Museums and Ukraine's Revolution of Dignity

Christi Anne Hofland

A thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

The Master of Arts in Russian, East European, and Central Asian Studies

University of Washington

2015

Committee:

Laada Bilaniuk

Arista Cirtautas

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

The Ellison Center for Russian, East European, and Central Asian Studies

©Copyright 2015
Christi Anne Hofland

University of Washington

Abstract

Institutions of Activism: Museums and Ukraine's Revolution of Dignity

Christi Anne Hofland

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:

Laada Bilaniuk

Anthropology

Amidst unprecedented protests over the winter of 2013-2014, many museums in Ukraine transformed from Soviet era hold-overs to active civil society participants who discovered that they could use their unique circumstances to position themselves at the forefront of societal development. While art, creativity, and play are typically part of the repertoire of protesters in social movements, Euromaidan presents an unusual dynamic in that the participants using art and culture were not only individual protesters, but also institutions, such as museums. They responded by collecting artifacts, creating exhibits during and after the protests, organizing programs for creative engagement and response, and even offering hot tea and power outlets to protesters. Ongoing museum efforts include a discussion of how the protests will be remembered – how can a permanent record be presented in a way that is engaging and responsive: how can such a record be designed to serve community needs, strengthen community ties, energize citizens, make the difficult topics more digestible, and ultimately, become a center for empowerment and societal development? Regardless of how the official Museum of Maidan manifests, Ukraine's museums are becoming examples of what it means to be responsive in crisis, to engage visitors creatively, and to include the community in developing a collective memory narrative.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	5
Soviet Era Legacies in Ukraine’s Museums.....	6
Museums as Sites of Authority.....	8
Museums and Collective Memory	10
Visitor Engagement in Museums.....	17
Responsive Museums of Euromaidan	21
Exhibits During Euromaidan.....	23
Exhibits After Euromaidan.....	31
The Future of Ukraine’s Museums: Challenges of Collective Memory	34
Conclusion.....	38
References.....	41
Personal Communication.....	47

INTRODUCTION

“Mostly, museums are about the past, but now we have a chance to fix the history of today,” said Ihor Poshyvailo, Deputy Director of the Ivan Honchar Museum in Kyiv, Ukraine, amid the aftermath of unprecedented civil unrest in Ukraine (Donadio 2014). It began November 21, 2013, when a small group gathered in Kyiv’s central square, Maidan Nezalezhnosti, to protest the Ukrainian government’s suspension of preparations for signing an Association Agreement with the European Union. When the police forces violently dispersed the protesters on November 30, it sparked a wave of demonstrations and civil unrest that continued until February 23, 2014, and drew hundreds of thousands of protesters to Maidan demanding democratic institutions and rule of law. For participants, the protests, most commonly known as *Euromaidan*, given the connection of the protests with the EU and the location of the protests in the square, have since also been referred to as the *Revolution of Dignity*.

Poshyvailo’s words reflect the role that museums can play in current events, fulfilling Skramstad’s argument that museums must play a “role relative to the real problems of real peoples lives” (Weil 1999:242). It also reflects the changing roles of museums in general as they interact with their environments. “Museums are inventions of men, not inevitable, eternal, ideal, nor divine. They exist for the things we put in them, and they change as each generation chooses how to see and use those things” (Silver, A.Z. cited in Weil 1999:231). In recent years, museums globally have undergone drastic shifts, to the point where there is no longer one form of reality for museums (Hooper-Greenhill 1992). While seemingly problematic, this can be viewed as a strength – what scholars refer

to as the “new museum” has become a cross-disciplinary institution that can adapt to a variety of uses (Message 2006:11, Weil 1999:254).

Though Ukraine’s Soviet past colors its attempts to parallel western-based theoretical prescriptions on museums, many museums in Ukraine have also been undergoing changes. These changes accelerated during Euromaidan as museums became a featured component in the civic awakening that characterized the movement. Ukrainian museums are discovering that they can use their unique circumstances to position themselves at the forefront of societal development. This thesis, therefore, explores the role and function of museums in Ukraine in light of the Euromaidan movement. Because Euromaidan took place in Kyiv, the research primarily focuses on activity in Kyiv. It will explain how many museums there were transformed from Soviet era hold-overs to active civil society participants that collaborate with other cultural actors. At the same time, examples will demonstrate that the changes are still in process. The research is based on personal interviews collected in the summer and fall of 2014. It is framed by museology, social movement, and collective memory scholarship.

SOVIET ERA LEGACIES IN UKRAINE’S MUSEUMS

It is important to contextualize museums within their historical frameworks, because museums have always had historical connections (Message 2006:12). In Ukraine, following the Bolshevik Revolution, the authorities debated what to do with the museums left by the old empire. Such exclusive collections designed to broadcast the preeminence of the empire no longer fit within the new regime’s ideology of the proletariat’s rise. Yet,

these collections were now possessions of the state and could not be ignored. Therefore, the authorities chose to reposition museums to integrate them into a single socialist ideology that would educate the proletariat and turn them into ideal Soviet citizens (Groys 1994:145).

Their strategy parallels the approach of 19th century modern museums of the West. For example, the goal of the South Kensington Museum of the 1850's was to "detach art and culture from the function of bedazzling the population and harness them, instead, to that of managing the population by providing it with the resources and contexts in which it might become self-educating and self-regulating" (Bennett 1995:40). Just as 19th century museums in the West were seen as "instruments for civilizing" that were designed to reform the working-class man (Ibid. 23), Soviet museums were meant to mold a collective ideology of the proletariat. As a result, museums no longer represented a space for contemplation outside of practical life, but instead took on a specific utilitarian, educational role controlled by the authorities. Any collections that did not extol the ideology were used to show the failure of an opposing ideology. "Anti-religion museums," for example, were a common way to exhibit collections of religious works. As another example, one classical art exhibit in a Kyiv museum was reframed with the title "The horrible faces of aristocracy" (Che pers. comm.).

The implications of Soviet history are broad, and the legacy of Soviet times lingers in Ukrainian museums in many ways. This section explores the legacies of the Soviet Union in regards to a spectrum of three functions of museums in post-Soviet Ukraine: 1) museums as sites of authority, 2) museums as creators and manipulators of collective

memory, and 3) museums as centers of engagement. In many ways, Soviet legacies have proved to be a challenge for these museums as they develop in these functions. However, evidence that changes were taking place even prior to the Euromaidan protest is also apparent.

MUSEUMS AS SITES OF AUTHORITY

One legacy from the Soviet Union is that museums tend to represent sites of authority, rather than mutuality (Hooper-Greenhill 2000). There is a tendency among museum professionals to push a single “correct” ideology. For example, at a visitor engagement workshop in 2013 for museum professionals in Kyiv, participants brainstormed questions that could engage visitors with a museum collection. One group selected a piece of religious art and posed the question, “What is the *best* religion?” – a question framed to elicit one “correct” answer instead of fostering dialogue that promotes mutuality (Norris and Chervony pers. comm.). Alternative views have been excluded from public discourse in museums, as illustrated by the work of Volodymyr Kuznetsov whose politically provocative piece, *The Last Judgement*, was painted over in summer 2013 by its commissioning museum, Art Arsenal, before the public could view it (Akinsha and Lozhkina 2014).

There is a corresponding expectation from visitors to be told what to think. Ideas are presented “ready-made” with no room for interpretation or alternatives. For example, when art museum visitors in Ukraine are asked about their favorite piece, their answer is generally the piece considered the museum’s most valuable, instead of their personal opinion (Norris 2014a).

Though museums represent institutions of authority, at the same time they struggle to be regarded as trusted sources of information. A museology student from Kyiv Mohyla Academy explained that under the Soviets, everyone understood museums as mere propaganda vehicles. The subsequent distrust of museums has continued to today. (Norris pers. comm.).

When discussing museums as sites of authority, it is important to point out that, as a result of the Soviet system, a highly developed informal organizational structure has been operating in parallel to formal, authoritative, institutional structures in all aspects of society, including museums. Ukrainians trained in the bureaucracy of the Soviet Union not only know how to work effectively within a corrupt bureaucracy, but also how to resist it. Therefore, by necessity, people are skilled at achieving what they need through high-functioning informal networks. These informal systems are often considered more trustworthy than official structures and their predominance has persisted through Ukraine's turbulent years of independence – often they are the only systems people feel they can depend on in a country characterized by corruption and instability. As a result, the work of museum professionals exists in two parallel realms – in the formal institution of the museum, and through elaborate informal structures that bypass museums as official sites of authority. In fact, Euromaidan proved to be an extreme display of the effectiveness of these informal networks.

MUSEUMS AND COLLECTIVE MEMORY

The second legacy of the Soviet Union concerns collective memory. Ukraine and other post-Soviet states are no exception to Målksoo's reminder that "remembering and forgetting are by definition contentious issues" (2009:656). Museums play a leading role in collective memory. Through the processes of collecting, contextualizing, and displaying, museums decide how history is represented, what should and should not be remembered, and which values and beliefs should be communicated (Dovydaitytė 2010:80).

In Soviet times, many experiences, such as deportation and forced starvation, were covered up by authorities and "frozen" from discourse due to the Soviet policy of "organized forgetting" and "communicative silence" (Wydra, 2007:228). For post-colonial states of the former USSR, re-claiming the right to a national historiography has been central to regaining self-esteem after being taught by Soviet authorities that they were unable to rule their own affairs (Kuzio 2002:247). Therefore, post-Soviet states are currently in the midst of an ongoing process of re-evaluation and searching for a workable collective memory to legitimize them as independent states (Ibid. 249). Målksoo claims that addressing post-socialist memories must begin through engagement with former taboo subjects and through exposing falsifications in predominant historical narratives (2009:659). The upsurge in memory previously suppressed and the growth of museums in the former Soviet block demonstrates that this process is happening (Dovydiatyte 2010:80; Apor 2012).

For all countries that share a multi-totalitarian past, national myth-making involves a contentious process of redefining categories of victim and national hero (Wulf 2011:4).

American sociologist, Barry Schwartz argues that when nations are in crisis, collective memory is constructed from “safe” events of the past that everyone agrees on. When politics are stable, more varied forms of memory are explored (Dovydaitytė 2010:81). This claim is evident in post-Soviet space where most states still struggle to come to terms with their communist past and often seek safe approaches to its collective memory. Lithuanian art historian, Linara Dovydaitytė, identifies three approaches typically taken by post-Soviet states: 1) eliminating the communist period from displays, 2) reducing the narrative to a story of crimes and victims, or 3) creating distance from the communist past by turning it into an exotic story of the “other” (Ibid.). Similarly, historian Meike Wulf, suggests that current depictions of the communist era are either narratives of collective suffering or narratives of collective resistance. The focus on suffering and resistance blank out stories of collaboration and externalize the communist past as the imposition of a coercive “other” (Wulf 2011:3, Apor 2012:572). Furthermore, the emphasis on ethnic suffering assumes a homogeneous population and sidelines the suffering of other groups (Wulf 2011:6; Apor 2012:579). Each of these approaches takes an anti-communist stance, while ignoring complexities and contradictions, narratives that do not fit the scheme, and challenges that require accepting responsibility (Dovydaitytė 2010:86; Norris pers. comm.).

In line with other post-Soviet states, Ukrainian museums also struggle to develop a collective memory and come to terms with the communist past. This struggle is complicated by the interconnections between past efforts to claim independence and authoritarian political traditions. For example, in pursuit of independence, Stephan Bandera collaborated with the Nazis. The safe approach, therefore, is to keep narratives in

the realms of patriotism framed around heroes and victims. Ukrainian museums have not yet addressed challenging topics such as stereotypes of citizens of eastern and western Ukraine, a history of anti-Semitism before and after Nazi occupation, the Ukrainian west's siding with the Nazis, or Ukrainians' roles in the Holocaust ranging from collaborators to rescuers. For example, the Museum of the Great Patriotic War was built in 1981 to celebrate Soviet heroes and commemorate victims of World War II. Following independence, the collection remains the same, but now is re-labeled to promote Ukrainian patriotism, rather than Soviet. Only recently has any information specifically related to Jewish suffering in the Holocaust been included in the Museum of the Great Patriotic War. In the Soviet Union, these stories were blanketed under the collective suffering of "peaceful Soviet citizens." Even today, the museum limits the narrative to a single display case with photos of the Righteous, those Christians who helped Jews (Gurian pers. comm).

In another example of avoiding the contentious material of the Soviet past, the Pavlo Tychyna Museum commemorates the life of Pavlo Tychyna, a famous yet controversial Ukrainian writer who has been criticized for his apparent willingness to collaborate with Soviet authorities. Rather than using his story as an opportunity to explore life under communism or motivations for collaboration or dissent, the museum chooses to focus instead on the safer non-politicized aspects of his life, such as his dining habits or favorite pastimes (Maximova pers. comm.). In this way, it attempts to create a nostalgic representation of the past, create distance, and turn the history into an exotic, safe, story of the "other" (Apor 2012:575-6; Dovydaitytė 2010:81).

Though Ukraine shares similarities with other post-Soviet states in its attempts to address the communist past, what makes Ukraine's case unique is that Ukraine is internally divided with loyalties shaped by regional differences. Though all post-Soviet states have inherited divided populations, with some devoted to the native culture and others assimilated into the former imperial power, Ukraine today is characterized by linguistic, cultural, religious and mnemonic diversity, that has led to diametrically opposing views on the Soviet past and a lack of nation-wide collective memory. The "nativist" view sees independence as the result of decades of patriotic efforts towards liberation from the Soviet "yoke." In this view, Ukraine's lack of post-Soviet transformation is seen as a weakness of national identity that needs to be re-awakened after centuries of foreign domination. The other view, which Kuzio terms "assimilado," sees Ukrainian independence as a result of external geopolitics that brought an end to the Soviet "golden age" (Shevel 2014:150; Kuzio 250). Neither narrative is functional - life in the Soviet Union was more stable, yet restricted, while life since independence has been more open, but it has also been mired by corruption and economic instability. Both narratives avoid responsibility – all crimes become the responsibility of external forces, be it the Kremlin, the Polish underground, or the Nazis. Constructing Ukrainians as victims of external aggression ignores that Ukrainians actively participated in constructing the USSR, and even the Russian Empire (Portnov 2013:236-7). It also takes an ethno-cultural view of Ukraine claiming that liberation from the USSR was a defense of cultural nationalism and ignoring that there is ethnic diversity in Ukraine (Kuzio 2002:243).

An explanation for this situation can be drawn from several points. In Soviet times, Ukraine suffered from Russification and de-nationalization more than other states because it was targeted for full assimilation (Ibid. 248). Soviet historiography claimed that Ukraine-Russia relations were a unity of “brothers” with Ukrainians defined as regional Russians. As a result, core culture and values that could unify Ukraine as a distinct cultural community were undermined (Ibid. 246, 250). Furthermore, many in Ukraine during early independence saw independence as the immediate resolution for economic problems. The population was not prepared to encounter the difficulties of statehood, and many were soon disillusioned. Consequently, discussions of how to deal with the Soviet past were met with ambivalence, improvised strategy, and ambiguity. To avoid conflict, whenever there was division in collective memory, the State left decisions to be made at the municipal level. This led to regional differences regarding collective memory and a situation of increasingly widened pluralism. Examples surfaced such as Dnipropetrovsk celebrating the commemoration of Soviet leaders, while Lviv commemorated Soviet dissidents (Portnov 2013:238).

While the failure to address conflicting narratives has served as a stabilizing factor in the years following independence, the resulting pluralism has not functioned as a space for dialogue, but “a collision of different, closed, and quite aggressive narratives that exist because they cannot destroy their competitors” (Ibid. 247-8). Events ranging from the Orange Revolution to the current conflict in Eastern Ukraine heighten awareness of the acute variation in narratives. Furthermore, each view is predominantly elite driven and neither side leaves room for integrating various versions of the past. These opposing views

have been a non-negotiable source of constant conflict and fractured collective memory since independence (Shevel 2014:152). More importantly, these conflicting narratives, used by politicians as instruments of political division when there is practically no difference among political forces on socioeconomic issues, have hindered efforts towards national unity (Portnov 2013:248).

Museums, being predominantly state-run, have largely reflected these approaches. The only Ukrainian figures who have been accepted unanimously in Ukraine are those, such as Shevchenko, Lesia Ukrainka, and Ivan Franko, who were also allowed in the Soviet version of Ukrainian history (Portnov 2013:245). The few attempts to establish a united collective memory narrative for independent Ukraine have struggled to succeed. For example, the National Holodomor Museum, which memorializes the victims of Stalin's forced starvation in Ukraine, was built as part of former President Yushchenko's aggressive historical memory agenda (Shevel 2014:157; Norris and Ostrovka 2011). The museum pays tribute to the victims and the events of the Holodomor, an important reminder of Stalin's crimes and a commemoration of a tragic past. However, the initiative struggles in two respects. Yushchenko intended the museum to serve as a mechanism of building a united collective memory narrative for independent Ukraine, yet the Holodomor was not a common experience of today's Ukrainian population and memories of it differ. Furthermore, according to Iryna Brunova-Kalisetska of the Integration and Development Center in Crimea, nationalist narrative that has developed around Holodomor has sadly served to diminish the actual tragedy (pers. comm.). Second, as a museum, the initiative serves more as a monument for commemoration than a space for exploration and

knowledge transmission. There is no explanation of the “why” and “who” of the events, no opportunity to understand stories of the victims or of those who served the Soviets. The criminal and victim narrative proposes a completely external criminal and even lacks a hero to cling to (Norris and Ostrovka, 2011). “The visitor has nearly no opportunity to question or critically think about ambiguous events of the past. There is only one choice left for the visitor: to take either the criminal’s or the victim’s side” (Dovydaitytė 2010:82).

During a recent visit to Ukraine, Sara Bloomfield and Vadim Altskan, representatives of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, noted, “Ukraine is in dire need of a new, more honest and complex historical narrative that reflects all the difficult issues of its history, including its darkest chapters. It will not be easy, but Ukraine has a unique opportunity to validate the importance of an honest reckoning with history, recognizing that only a democratic nation can guarantee the security, freedom, and prosperity of all its citizens” (Guttman 2014). It is important to point out that the representatives were hopeful for the future—Holocaust museum officials have been in touch with Ukrainian government representatives for over a decade. For the first time, the new, post-Maidan government has been positive in response and open to discussion (Ibid.).

Despite the optimism, the struggle to address the Soviet past and develop a collective memory for independent Ukraine is ongoing. Ukraine’s museums today demonstrate a lack of social consensus in almost all aspects of Ukraine’s historical politics. There is no all-Ukrainian image of the past, and it remains uncertain whether it is worth striving for a single national narrative or more productive to maintain a space of pluralism (Portnov 2013:248). Recent political actions demonstrate an unsuccessful attempt to

address the challenge. On April 9, 2015, the Ukrainian parliament adopted four so-called “decommunization” laws, laws that easily play with emotions and identity. The laws ban Nazi and Communist symbols and the “public denial of the criminal nature of the Communist totalitarian regime 1917–1991” (Hyde 2015). Furthermore, they criminalize alternative interpretations of the past by introducing legal punishments for publicly expressing “incorrect” opinions about the communist period or about fighters for Ukraine’s independence (Shevel 2015). While the laws attempt to reverse the collective memory narrative that is still predominantly informed by Communist propaganda, critics claim that they would only divide the already struggling country further by replacing one official version of history with another that reduces historical complexities and designates heroes and villains (Hyde 2015). According to an open letter from scholars and experts on Ukraine to the president of Ukraine, the laws contradict the right to freedom of speech and require the denial of Ukrainian culture and intellectual progress during the Soviet period (Marples 2015).

VISITOR ENGAGEMENT IN MUSEUMS

The third Soviet legacy remaining in museums of Ukraine is how museums relate to and interact with visitors. The agenda of the new museum should be to “engage actively in the design and delivery of experiences that have the power to inspire and change the way people see both the world and the possibility of their own lives” (Skramstad 1999:131). In the West, a shift from a collections-focus to a visitor-focus, making museums “‘for someone’ rather than ‘about something,’” has been the most fundamental change for museums in the last fifty years (Weil 1999:232, 247). In Ukraine this shift is

only just beginning, and collection-focused museums of the Soviet Union remain more prevalent. As an extreme example, the Natural History Museum in Lviv, while remaining fully staffed and operating as a research institution, was closed to the public for twenty years following independence, with little resistance from either the museum staff or the public (Chervony pers. comm.).

A visitor to a typical museum in Ukraine will find the experience less than inviting. Halls and exhibits are poorly lit and lack signs of welcome or guidance. Even finding the museum entrance can prove to be a challenge. Visiting hours are inconvenient and may change without warning or explanation. Typically, each room of a museum is staffed by a docent whose purpose is not to greet or engage visitors, but to watch over the collection, following visitors as they move through the exhibit and even locking doors behind as they pass through - creating an uncomfortable and unwelcoming visitor experience.

Exhibit information is minimal, often with only the title and date as labels, as if the objects should speak for themselves. A private tour of the Ivan Honchar Folk Art Museum in Kyiv reveals a collection rich in history and symbolism that represents the diversity of communities across Ukraine. Unfortunately, because no information is provided, without the private tour it is nearly impossible to connect with the exhibit. The same is true at the Museum of the Great Patriotic War in Kyiv. Without the informative tour, the museum is little more than endless rooms of objects and documents. Furthermore, it is rare in Ukraine to find information in other languages, which demonstrates a lack of interest in connecting with outsiders.

This lack of attention to visitors in museums in Ukraine would surely be discouraging for museum scholars such as Edson and Dean who argue, “Museums can only be of service if they are used. They will be used only if people know about them, and only if attention is given to the interpretation of the objects in terms that the visitors can understand” (1994:9). Along the same lines, Skraamstad maintains that, “Museums need to recognize that they are in the experience business and that it is the distinctive theme, context, and value of the experiences they bring to a particular audience that will increasingly define their success” (1999). Fortunately, there are Ukrainian museum professionals who are making their museums more relevant through visitor engagement. Following a 2014 workshop for museum professionals of Ukraine, Tricia Edwards from the Smithsonian Museum commented, “I was impressed by how willing and eager and interested our attendees were [to] serve their visitors more effectively. It ... made me feel hopeful for the future of Ukrainian museums” (Norris 2014b).

An example of a successful effort to engage visitors comes from the Lviv Museum of Natural History. In 2011, the museum opened its doors to the public for the first time in twenty years with the exhibit, *The Story of One River*. The exhibit brought the public into a conversation about the Poltva River that flows below Prospect Svobody, one of the main roads of the Lviv city center. When Lviv was founded in the 13th century, it was situated along the banks of the river, which served as the city’s lifeline for trade and security. However, in the 20th century, the river was covered over due to public health concerns including the outbreak of malaria. Today, there is hardly a trace of its existence in the city, though some city officials now advocate for uncovering it. At the same time, the river is a

source of environmental concern since it is part of the city's sewage system and, unlike most European cities, Lviv does not have separate drainage and sewage pipes (Vozniuk 2013).

To broaden its disciplinary scope, as Weil recommends (1999:246), the museum collaborated with the History Museum and connected the history of the river with the city's contemporary environmental issues. It also included a contemporary art installation related to the theme. There was a wall where people could post notes sharing their thoughts about the river (Norris 2011). This interactive component succeeded in engaging the community in discussion of an important topic that had previously been hidden from the public eye: following the exhibit, the conversation about the river continued in an online forum (Chervony pers. comm.).

The Bulgakov Museum in Kyiv presents another example of successful visitor engagement with its book club - an attempt to change the current prevailing notion that talking is inappropriate in a museum setting. Irina Vorobiova, the club's coordinator, supports the idea that museums should provide settings to stimulate the community (Weil 1990:79). The cozy basement location offers a permanent space for young people to gather and engage in discussion, something she believes is necessary for building a civil society (pers. comm.).

In addition to outreach initiatives, Edson and Dean point to the importance of 'in'-reach for visitor engagement - that is, training and development for museum staff (1992:9). As might be expected, given the history of Ukrainian museums, staff often present a challenge for visitor engagement. Staff members in Ukrainian museums tend to be research

scientists who lack public programming skills. The exhibit docents resist any attempts for “customer service” training by questioning why the approaches should change while salaries remain the same (Chervony pers. comm.).

At other levels, practitioner engagement is taking hold. Linda Norris noted that during her last visit to Ukraine her role shifted from “outside expert” to “co-collaborator” (pers. comm.). Furthermore, Witcomb warns that for many western museums today, there is a tendency to equate visitor engagement with technological “interactives,” which, while entertaining, can actually limit engagement rather than fostering it (2006: 360). Due to their severe material and personnel constraints, such technological “crutches” are not a temptation for Ukrainian museums, which are forced to find low-cost, creative approaches if they want to engage visitors. For example, when the Lviv Natural History Museum had no advertising budget for an exhibit on local ecology in 2013, they stamped exhibit information on leaves from a nearby park. The leaves proved to be an effective campaign and popular souvenir among visitors (Chervony pers. comm.).

RESPONSIVE MUSEUMS OF EUROMAIDAN

Many of the Soviet era holdovers have made it a struggle for museums in Ukraine to develop as the Western counterparts they try to emulate. However, as the previous section demonstrates, progress is being made. Museum professionals credit increased engagement with the Western international community for the development of the museum sector in Ukraine and for the ability of museums to respond successfully in the 2013-2014 protests. Whereas the Orange Revolution of 2004 was characterized by a top-down

structure led by the political opposition, the Euromaidan movement took a more grassroots approach. Their international networks and experiences helped museum professionals build their competencies to be more creative and independent in their responses in 2013-2014 than they had been ten years prior (Savchack pers. comm.).

At the same time, some of the Soviet legacies can be considered assets that are part of Ukraine's usable past. The examples in the previous section of creative approaches to visitor engagement demonstrate this. Furthermore, Ukraine's highly developed informal networks were key to the success of the Maidan protests. As an uprising created by thousands of highly organized citizens connected through elaborate informal networks, activists contributed whatever skills and resources they had. Some cooked food for protesters; others provided medical or psychological services. Artists set up easels and painted on the square (Akinsha and Lozhkina 2014). A community library provided books to read and scholars lectured in the "Open University" (Meyers 2014). Museums also contributed, and their established experience with working around official systems helped them to be responsive and creative. The Maidan protests were in a way a large-scale manifestation of the informal networks that were operating in parallel to official systems – it was as if a complete and self-sufficient city had appeared within the confines of Kyiv's central square to disarm the systems of power, create an alternative existence, and, instead of protesting against, to demonstrate for what the world should look like (Shepard 2011:273).

As an integral component of society, museums have an obligation to use their competencies as instruments of responsiveness to the communities that support them (Weil

1999:254, Black 2009:142). This role of responsiveness becomes particularly pertinent in crises when museums may be called to non-traditional activities. Referring to the Maidan protests, Katrin Hieke of the International Council of Museums asserts that, “At times of crisis, the role of museums can be to respond as good neighbors, even if it’s as simple as offering a cup of tea or a power outlet” (2014). During and after Ukraine’s protests of 2013-2014, museums responded with exhibits and other museum programming, as well as through unique forms of engagement and response. Their activities in the anti-government protests demanded substantial professional and personal risk, since nearly all museums in Ukraine are government operated, at either the regional or national level.

EXHIBITS DURING EUROMAIDAN

The first exhibit activities came from individual protesters, rather than institutions. Since the protests had no defined leadership structure, the initial museum activities were un-curated pop-up exhibits with no limit to the number of participants (Hofland and Norris 2015). For example, when authorities justified the first violent crackdown on protesters by claiming that protesters blocked the installation of the city’s *yolka*¹, or New Year’s tree, the protesters responded by decorating the tree’s frame themselves with flags, slogans, and other signs (fig. 1). The *yolka* became a dynamic, changing exhibit over the course of the protests. Protesters displayed “exhibits” hung on the barricades and produced

¹ *Yolka* is the Russian word for New Years tree. The structure earned the title *yolka* after then president Victor Yanukovich called it by its Russian name when he could not come up with the Ukrainian word “yalynka” in an official statement he made justifying the crackdown on protesters (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sYRjvs3Y-Wk>).

performances. An artists' brigade decorated tents, makeshift shields, and construction helmets, inspired by conversations with protesters and traditional Ukrainian folk motifs. These motifs became a predominant theme serving to identify the movement, while also pointing out the irony of the protesters' new reality—objects needed for protection against government forces had replaced everyday household objects, the traditional surface for folk arts. Since everything took place on the open and level street, there was no distinction between artist and audience, curator and visitor, leader and follower. These democratic responsive activities provided a nonviolent way to engage with power while at the same time, developing a sense of community built on democratic practice (Shepard 2011:261). It also created room for enjoyment and served as a coping mechanism against oppression. According to activist Cindra Feuer of ACT UP, "If you are not enjoying what you are doing... people won't come back. They can't sustain it. You can only go so far in your anger and then you really need to be getting enjoyment and fulfillment" (Ibid. 266).



FIGURE 1 THE YOLKA (NEW YEAR'S TREE) BEING DISASSEMBLED BY AUTHORITIES, JUNE 2014. PHOTO BY AUTHOR.

Among protesters were practicing artists who organized a public art space called the Artistic Barbican. Soon one of the liveliest areas on the square, it hosted exhibitions, readings, discussions, and lectures. The frequent visitors included well-known artists and

intellectuals eager to engage in conversation. For these activists, the space provided an opportunity for artists not only to participate in the protests, but also to offer a voice for the movement. According to Kyiv artist, Olexa Mann, “The artist can offer ideas for revolution. Creating ideas and formulating meanings - that is his task. And then to broadcast these ideas and meanings” (Khudozhnyky 2014). This was important because, unlike the Orange Revolution, which had the specific goal of calling for re-elections in the government, Euromaidan’s goals of human rights and European values are more fragmented and ambiguous. Exhibits became instrumental to unify and articulate the goals of the movement. Among the artist-activists of the protests, Volodymyr Svachiy and Oleksandr Melnyk stand out for their unique approaches and creative “exhibits,” which have since become symbolic artifacts for use in subsequent exhibits commemorating the events.

Volodymyr Svachiy used donated canvases and paints to launch a series of community mural projects. On three occasions, he installed massive canvases on the square as open platforms for anyone to draw or write their thoughts. The first canvas was spread out on the ground on November 28, 2013. Decorating the canvas became an enjoyable way to pass the time for what was, during that period, a small group of mostly student protesters. When police forces violently cracked down on protesters on November 30, they also destroyed the community’s mural. The second two murals became fixtures hung from the protesters’ central stage on Maidan Nezalezhnosti. Each finished canvas now reflects the mood and events of a particular time period. One canvas, installed at the time when nearly 100 protesters were killed by snipers, reflects the despair, hopelessness,

and loss felt by protesters at the time. The other canvas, installed at a time of energized activism, displays messages of hope and resilience (Svachiy pers. comm.).

The story of Svachiy’s canvases did not finish with the protests. The two that were not destroyed became symbolic artifacts of the movement that were displayed at subsequent Maidan exhibits in Ukraine and Europe. In Fall 2014, at the Ivan Honchar Museum’s exhibition, *Freedom of Creativity: (R)evolutionary Culture of Maidan*, the canvases were on display and a new canvas became an interactive component of the exhibit. Following the protests, Svachiy took his community mural concept to Luhansk and Donetsk in Eastern Ukraine in an attempt to foster dialogue amid rising tensions. Though his initiatives were well received by locals, he was soon forced to leave due to rising instability of the region (Svachiy pers. comm.).

Painter Oleksandr Melnyk joined the protests by exhibiting his painting, *Eyes*, a close-up of the eyes from the Christ icon at the highest point of every Orthodox church (fig. 2A). Melnyk came to the square regularly exhibiting his painting by holding it above his head, like a protest banner. He attached a



FIGURE 2A OLEKSANDR MELNYK’S EYES SHOWN ON MAIDAN, DECEMBER 2013. COURTESY OF OLEKSANDR MELNYK.

caption, “I see all that you do,” reminding viewers that all activities of the conflict, both positive and negative, were visible to God and the world. Then, to encourage protesters, he



FIGURE 2B "SACRED STILL LIFE" BY ARSEN SAVADOV ON DISPLAY FALL 2015 AT MYSTETSKYI ARSENAL (KYIV) FEATURES THE MAIN OBJECTS MAIDAN, INCLUDING OLEKSANDR MELNYK'S "EYES." PHOTO BY AUTHOR.

wrote, “You are all wonderful. I love you” in large letters on the back of his canvas (Melnyk pers. comm.). As with Svachiy’s murals, Melnyk’s eyes went on to become an important visual artifact of the movement (fig 2B).

The Euromaidan protests have often been described as an explosion of artistic expression. For participants, these spontaneous exhibits were a way to strengthen the protesting community. According to Euromaidan artist Igor Bezhuk, “Everyone has their way to contribute to a better future—someone stands, someone volunteers, someone sends money, and someone creates art.” Though the political outcome of their actions were not known to participants at the time, simply taking part was most important—it was a way to stay engaged and find agency to keep the movement moving forward (Shepard 2011:262).

In fact, the sentiment of Euromaidan activists is in line with findings of other research on art, creativity, and play in social movements. T.V. Reed determined ten functions of culture in social movements: to encourage, empower, harmonize, inform internally, inform externally, enact movement goals, historicize, transform affects or tactics, critique movement ideology, and make room for pleasure (2005:299-300). In *Play*,

Creativity, and Social Movements, Benjamin Shepard argues that forms of creativity and playful community building activities of protest make the work of social change feel compelling and inviting, while making difficult topics easier. For him, the importance of play and creativity in social movements is that “People must find, in their movement, the immediate joy of solidarity, if only because, in the face of overwhelming state or corporate power, solidarity is their sole source of strength (Shepard 2011:259). Play can sustain activists through difficult times and provide a way to challenge established power nonviolently while creating communities (Ibid. 261). Through interviews with 69 different activists, he developed the following list of the roles people see for play in social movements (Ibid. 263):

- It helps make activism feel invigorating.
- It animates culture
- It helps keep things light--even during dark times
- It fosters creativity, which can help achieve movement aims.
- It recognizes pleasure.
- It creates and supports stories.
- It expands the public commons and makes democracy more colorful.
- It helps garner media attention to new narratives of action, helping actors propel their culture tales into the larger public discourse
- It reduces alienation
- It cultivates humor
- It creates hope
- It gets people to think
- It supports individual and community strengths
- It fosters nonhierarchical leadership networks
- As a low-threshold activity, it brings people into organizing
- It help combat mechanisms that control the body and inhibit political activity
- It makes social change work feel compelling and inviting

Evidence of each role are found in the examples from Euromaidan. It is clear that responsive exhibits were crucial to the success and empowerment of protesters in

Euromaidan. They were used to create an identity for the movement that could be communicated to the outside. They were also used to build solidarity within the movement. This reflects the notion that the arts have a way of getting the “message” across in social change. They are an intergenerational form of social engagement that creates opportunities for maintaining traditions, sharing ideas, and promoting tolerance. Through arts and culture, participants feel that they are part of something; they become more aware of their neighbors; and they build bonds with each other, which builds resiliency (Herranz pers. Comm.). Exhibits were a component of Euromaidan, but at the same time, the entire movement proved to be itself a large-scale live installation (Museum “Revolution”). According to Kyiv artist Vova Vorotnev, “The Maidan itself is a complex collective artistic statement. As a medium. As a performance. As participation... This square is part of a much broader “circle” of Art. This is when everyone is an artist” (Balashova 2014).

While art, creativity, and play are typically part of the repertoire of protesters in social movements, Euromaidan presents an unusual dynamic in that the participants using art and culture were not only individual protesters, but also institutions, such as museums. Lviv artist Serhiy Petlyuk described his experience with Euromaidan by explaining that whereas before he came to Kyiv to soak up the cultural life offered by Kyiv’s cultural institutions, now he went to Kyiv participate in the cultural life the Maidan had to offer: “The Maidan and the surrounding area [was] such a great platform to release the creative energy of the collective unconscious that the artificial spaces of Kyiv’s galleries [were] no longer interesting” (Balashova 2014). Many museum professionals realized a need to step out of their traditional spaces to join the cultural life of Maidan, often working in concert

with artists and other protesters. The Ivan Honchar National Folk Art Museum of Kyiv soon became a notable example of a responsive museum. Ihor Poshyvailo, the museum's deputy director, says that as a museum professional, contributing professional museum work was his way to participate in the movement (pers. comm.). With Ukrainian folk art and traditions quickly becoming predominant themes on the Maidan, his museum was a natural match for the emerging environment.

On December 1, 2013, following the initial crackdown on protesters, Poshyvailo posted a spontaneous statement on the museum's Facebook page condemning the government's actions. Then, following another police attack on protesters ten days later, the museum staff unanimously agreed to use its status as an authoritative institution to publish an official statement jointly with other museums in support of the "civilization choice of the Ukrainian people" (Norris 2013).

Beyond articulating a political stance, the Ivan Honchar Museum transferred all its programming to the square itself, claiming a responsibility to be where the country's attention was. Curators installed a *Didukh*, a traditional holiday decoration, on



FIGURE 3 CHRISTMAS STAR WORKSHOP ORGANIZED BY THE IVAN HONCHAR MUSEUM. COURTESY OF THE IVAN HONCHAR MUSEUM.

the square. Staff organized folk dancing and singing events. There was a master class to create Christmas stars and parade them around the square (fig 3, Poshyvailo pers. comm.).

The purpose of these acts of “play” was to provide relief by transforming a painful and negative experience into something attractive, beautiful, and positive; to create a sense of normalcy amidst an abnormal situation; and to humanize the movement, making it more compelling and inviting. In the words of Andrew Boyd, “There’s certain things play has to offer. It’s humanizing... it can kind of empathize with a common humanity on either side of the picket line” (Shepard 2011:267).

EXHIBITS AFTER EUROMAIDAN

In the aftermath of a movement, the culture created by the movement diffuses into the identity of the larger society (Reed 2005:297). These cultural impacts, including shifts in social discourse, organization of communities, and networks created can be the most important impact of a movement (Bernstein, M., cited in Shepard 262). Museums can be instrumental in this impact because of their role in “articulating, challenging, and responding to public perceptions” (Mason, R., cited in Burch and Zander 2010:53). This was true for Euromaidan, where the artists, curators, and museum professionals served as the main actors and the cultural revolution was more impactful than the shift in political power (Museum “Revolution” 2015).

When the Euromaidan protests ended, many museums in Kyiv recognized their influential role as leading social actors and realized their responsibility to continue responsive efforts - “at turning points in the history and cultural evolution of a nation, the works of its artists, writers, philosophers, and social and political thinkers, as a rule, reflect the processes of reassessment and reinterpretation of the national cultural and sociopolitical identity” (Stech 2009: 232).

Among the most notable has been the National Art Museum in Kyiv. It is worth mentioning that during the protests, the museum was located on the front line of the conflict. As smoke from tires filled the air, the staff slept in the museum to protect its collection. The experience likely influenced their subsequent responses. The first was to display treasures from former President Yanukovich's extravagant compound outside Kyiv in an exhibit called *Codex of Mezhyhirya*. It served to demonstrate the stark contrast between the meaningless luxury of the ruling elite and the authenticity of Euromaidan's vibrant and spontaneous art (Museum "Revolution" 2015). By setting up the exhibition as an account book with displays such as "The Book of Vanity" (portraits) and "The Book of Transparency" (glass vases), the museum showed Yanukovich's ill-gotten "treasures," in a way that brought a new level of attention to the protests' anti-corruption rhetoric (Lozhkina and Roytburd 2014).

However, before the country could recover from the protests, Russia annexed Crimea, and Ukraine found itself in a military conflict in the East. The Art Museum responded with *War Portraits* - a series of 11 large-scale photographic portraits accompanied



FIGURE 4 "WAR PORTRAITS" BY THE NATIONAL ART MUSEUM. PHOTO BY AUTHOR.

with interviews of wounded soldiers in their hospital beds at Kyiv's Central Military Clinical Hospital (fig. 4). This simple, spontaneous, low-budget installation brought the

reality of the war 700 kilometers away home to the capital. The exhibit also encouraged visitors to donate money in support of soldiers, another new form of museum response in Ukraine (Polataiko 2014).

For fall 2014, the museum launched an exhibit about the Maidan protests. It included space for visitors to share their perspectives and talk together, a public program with film screenings of current events, and a contemporary art installation. The exhibit was also one of the first forums for the public to discuss and consider a permanent Maidan museum for the future (Hrytsenko 2014).

The National Art Museum was not the only museum active in Kyiv following the protests. The Museum of the Great Patriotic War in Kyiv, which depicts a narrative of the Soviet triumph over Fascism in World War II, created a Maidan exhibit within its own context. Part of a temporary exhibition on contemporary issues, the exhibit consisted primarily of photographs from Maidan and the fighting in the East, with minimal text. In this way, the museum employed an explicitly peaceful and victim-focused message, tying the current conflict to a broader narrative about twentieth century conflict on the anniversary of World War II.

In November 2014, the Ivan Honchar Museum opened the exhibition, *Freedom of Creativity: (R)evolutionary Culture of Maidan*. Using objects collected during the protests, they displayed “creative” components of the protests, including Oleksander Melnyk’s *Eyes*, Volodymyr Svachiy’s murals, a reassembled piece of the *yolka*, and even Molotov cocktails, which curators displayed as creative constructions made from found objects. The opening featured singing, speakers, a bonfire, and free food, just as during the protests. Co-

curator Vlodko Kofmann explained that they did not seek to recreate the Maidan, but to recreate the mood in order to inspire reflection ("V Kyievi hotuyut" 2014). The exhibition also included space for visitors to share written comments about the future Maidan museum. Deputy Director Ihor Poshyvailo worked hard to provide extensive facilitation for the exhibition, which he felt was needed since responsive exhibits are so new to Ukraine (Poshyvailo pers. comm.).

THE FUTURE OF UKRAINE'S MUSEUMS: CHALLENGES OF COLLECTIVE MEMORY

Ongoing museum efforts include a discussion of how the protests themselves will be remembered. The idea for a Maidan museum has existed since the beginning of the protests, when museums not only responded with temporary exhibits and programming, but also through a "blitz museefication" in which they dedicated themselves to memorializing unfolding events and collecting the protest's artifacts, these "objects produced either individually or collectively, such as music, art, and literature, which stand alone in their materiality and are available to others after the initial behavior that produced them" (Museum "Revolution" 2015; Johnston 2009). Staff of the Ivan Honchar Museum documented the protests first by photographing objects that were still a living part of the protests, and later by collecting objects that they deemed artifacts of contemporary urban folklore and important for future narratives of Ukraine (Poshyvailo pers. comm.). Employees from the Center for Urban History in Lviv stopped their activities, went to Kyiv, and recorded interviews on the square to preserve the sounds and emotions on the

square as they occurred (Ostrishchenko pers. comm.). Artists also collaborated with museum professionals, creating work intended for later use in museum documentation (Mykoliuk 2014). Immediately following the protests, a Maidan Museum group formed and posted a call for objects for preservation (Griggs 2014).

Though Ukrainian museums clearly recognize their role in manifesting and manipulating Ukraine's complicated collective memory (Littoz-Monnet 2012:1185; Black 2009:132), the established precedent is to do so through a Soviet approach of presenting a single definitive curatorial voice and using museums as political instruments that control collective memory (Gurian pers. comm., Norris and Ostrovka 2011:58). In the ongoing debate concerning how Ukraine should address issues of contentious collective memory, how can museums approach a contentious past in a way that unites Ukraine instead of dividing it? According to Oxana Shevel of Tufts University, it is possible for an inclusive memory to emerge if political elites allow society to discover, without interference, the ways that competing visions of the past overlap (Shevel 20014:163). "Even on the most contentious issues, public attitudes may support the emergence of a mnemonic field where different views of the past and visions of history are perceived as legitimate, and holders of views opposite to one's own are not demonized and de-legitimized, but are engaged in dialogue" (Shevel 2014:153). Museums can be at the forefront of this effort by providing structured neutral spaces to build democratic discourse by mixing together people from a variety of perspectives in dialogue and understanding (Black 2009:137-141).

This context of memorializing contentious events and of the challenges of engaging in the past brings a new level of consideration to museums professionals as they determine

what a permanent Maidan museum could be. Leaders in the museum community consider how a permanent record can be presented in a way that is engaging and responsive: how it can be designed to serve community needs, strengthen community ties, energize citizens, make the difficult topics more digestible, and ultimately, become a center for empowerment and societal development (Weil 1999:236; Black 2009:129; Shepard 2011:8; ICOM 2007; Maximova pers. comm.; Poshyvaillo pers. comm.; Museum “Revolution” 2015). They question how a Maidan museum can be inclusive, allowing local meanings to flourish, and avoiding a resort to “official narratives.” (Black 2009:134).

Can a Maidan museum be uniting when Maidan itself was not a common experience for the country? Does such a museum, as a few initiatives outside Ukraine are exploring, have the potential to open a dialogue on other aspects Ukraine’s difficult past and reverse simplifications typical in museums of post-Soviet space?² Museum colleagues from the U.S. have joined the conversation as well. Elaine Gurian of the U.S Holocaust Museum says the Maidan museum narrative must also include those who did not support the protests (2014). Consultant Linda Norris suggests a dialogic museum for Maidan, a forum in which “documentation, meaning, and representation are acknowledged to be co-developed with those whom the history is of, for, and about” (Kou Wei Tchu, cited in Norris 2014a). In this way, museum professionals can “redefine their strategies

² The Polish History Museum and the National Museum of the Romanian Peasant have been noted as one of few examples that shift post-Soviet memory discourse towards “an ironical approach and modest criticism of the earlier concepts.” They invite the visitors to personally understand and question contemporary history (Apor 2012: 582).

representing the past and find space for marginalized memories” (Misztal, cited in Black 2003:133).

Some Ukrainian museum professionals stress that it is too early to think about the formal commemoration of Maidan. After all, memories of 20th century traumas are only recently resurfacing in the West. Others consider the discussion of a Maidan museum premature since the crisis in Ukraine is ongoing (Otrishchenko pers. comm.).

Advocates for the museum, however, emphasize the importance of latching on to the current momentum and serving Euromaidan participants who need a forum for engagement. One suggestion is to create a short-term and long-term plan in order both to provide for immediate needs and to allow time to negotiate something for the future that is larger than a documentation of events (Gurian 2014, Museums of Maidan 2014). The short-term plan could be a series of temporary exhibits that encourage dialogue and include the community in developing a long-term goal (Norris 2014a). The concept of temporary exhibits has already been used at the National Art Museum, the Ivan Honchar Museum, and other institutions (Museum of Maidan 2014, Ivan Honchar Museum 2014).

CONCLUSION

Regardless of how the official Museum of Maidan manifests, Euromaidan has been instrumental in releasing Ukrainian museums from their challenging Soviet legacies. The perspectives of multiple voices and engagement that resulted in the protests have offered a “small window of huge opportunity” for Ukraine’s museums to



FIGURE 5 A CITIZEN-ORGANIZED POP-UP EXHIBIT ON MAIDAN IN MAY 2014. COURTESY OF KATERENA KUKSENOK.

become lasting centers of civic engagements that support development of the democratic structures and systems that have been missing from civil society (Gurian pers. comm.). Citizen-organized pop-up exhibits on the open and level street were frequent during the protests and have continued since (fig. 5), demonstrating that museum professionals are no longer the only museum voices and museums are shifting from sites of authority to sites of mutuality. Even the temporary exhibits housed in museums since the protests have included forums for visitor engagement where the community could publicly consider what a future Maidan Museum might be (fig. 6). Furthermore, a Maidan museum has potential to offer a starting point for discussion of other divisive and unresolved narratives of Ukraine’s past (Norris 2014a).

For many museum professionals, the activities of museums on Maidan Nezalezhnosti and following the protests mark the beginning of a newfound commitment

to developing civil society, a commitment that museums share with the larger society. It could even be argued that in the Euromaidan protests, Ukraine encountered its first postcolonial revolution. It has been claimed that a nation “is born out of the



FIGURE 6 TALKBACK WALL AT IVAN HONCHAR MUSEUM. COURTESY OF THE IVAN HONCHAR MUSEUM.

resistance, ideally without external aid, of its nascent citizens against oppression [...], which serve to unite and strengthen resistance and render the resulting victory the more justified and the more fulfilling” (G. J. Ashworth, Brian Graham & J. E. Tunbridge, cited in Stuart and Zander 2010:53). While there was no coterminous or immediate previous Ukrainian state to be restored, through the revolution, a new, civic-based nation is emerging - it is now evident that people are “acquiring their own voice, and in the process of this self-assertive act they forge a new Ukrainian nation as a community of negotiated solidarity action by self-conscious individuals” (Gerasimov 2014:23). “It is as if Ukraine was sleeping,” says Ihor Poshyvailo, “We were independent but still dreaming, and now it seems that we are waking up” (pers. comm.). The World Giving Index offers evidence of the transformation. While in 2013, the World Giving Index ranked Ukraine 103 out of 157, that has changed. Between May and October 2014, 80% of Ukrainians donated their time, money, or property to the army or refugees from the occupied territories (Gerasimov 2014:31-32). In fact, according to Anders Aslund of the Atlantic Council, Ukraine’s

greatest strength today in fighting corruption and implementing reforms is its strong civil society (2015).

At a time when museums globally are being criticized as dated institutions that need to reevaluate their functions (Hooper-Greenhill 2000), the current events in Ukraine have inspired the country's museums to become more active in their roles. "Museums have realized that they are no longer cemeteries of dead objects" (Maximova pers. comm.) Eugene Chervony, from the Lviv Folk Architecture Museum, was motivated to become a museum professional because he saw it as the way to develop Ukrainian society (pers. comm.). And he was right. Despite, and perhaps because of, the many challenges they face, museum professionals in Ukraine are becoming inspiring examples for the western museums they often strive to emulate - examples of what it means to be responsive in crisis, to engage visitors creatively, and to include the community in developing a collective memory narrative.

REFERENCES

- Akinsha, K., Lozhkina, A., 2014. Icons on the Barricades: Incredible Ukrainian Protest Art. *ARTnews* [Online], 31 March. Available from: <http://www.artnews.com/2014/03/31/icons-on-the-barricades-2/> [Accessed 28 November 2014].
- Apor, P., 2012. Master Narratives of Contemporary History in Eastern European National Museums. *Great Narratives of the Past Traditions and Revisions in National Museums: Conference Proceedings from EuNaMus: European National Museums: Identity Politics, the Uses of the Past and the European Citizen*. 28 June – 1 July & 25-26 November 2011 Paris. Linköping University Electronic Press: http://www.ep.liu.se/ecp_home/index.en.aspx?issue=078. Pp. 569-585.
- Aslund, A., 2015. Ukraine Two Years After Euromaidan: What Has Been Accomplished? *Atlantic Council* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.atlanticcouncil.org/blogs/new-atlanticist/ukraine-two-years-after-Euromaidan-what-has-been-accomplished> [Accessed 2 December 2015].
- Balashova, O., 2014. “Khudozhniki i Revolyutsiya. Chast' 2 (Artists and Revolution. Part 2).” *Ukrayins'ka Pravda (Ukrainian Truth)* [Online]. 11 February. Retrieved from <http://life.pravda.com.ua/culture/2014/02/11/151985/> [Accessed 23 February 2014].
- Black, G., 2010. Embedding civil engagement in museums. *Museum Management and Curatorship* 25, 129–146.
- Bennett, T., 1995. *The Birth of the Museum : History, Theory, Politics*. Routledge: London.
- Burch, S., and Zander, U., 2008. Preoccupied by the Past: The Case of Estonian’s Museums of Occupations. *Scandia*, 74(2), pp. 53-73.
- Dean, D. and Edson, G., 1996. *The Handbook for Museums*. London; New York: London; New York: Routledge.
- Donadio, R., 2014. Ukrainians Turn to the Arts in a Time of Upheaval. *The New York Times* [Online], 29 April. Available from: <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/04/30/arts/design/ukrainians-turn-to-the-arts-in-a-time-of-upheaval.html> [Accessed 15 October 2014].
- Dovydaitytė, L., 2010. Which Communism to Bring to the Museum? A Case of Memory Politics in Lithuania. *Meno istorija ir kritika (Art History and Criticism)* [Online], 6. Available from: http://vddb.library.lt/obj/LT-eLABa-0001:J.04~2010~ISSN_1822-4555.N_6.PG_80-87 [Accessed 5 June 2015].

Gerasimov, I. 2014. Ukraine 2014: The First Postcolonial Revolution. Introduction to the Forum. *Ab Imperio*, 3/2014, pp. 22-44.

Griggs, M.B., 2014. Ukrainian Protesters Are Already Establishing a Museum for Maidan Artifacts. *Smithsonian* [Online], 27 February. Available from: <http://www.smithsonianmag.com/smart-news/ukrainian-protesters-create-museum-about-protest-180949914/> [Accessed 20 November 2014].

Groys, B., 1994. The Struggle against the Museum; or, The Display of Art in Totalitarian Space. In: D.J. & Rogoff, I. Sherman, *Museum Culture: Histories, Discourses, Spectacles*. London: Routledge, London. pp. 144-162.

Gurian, E., 2014. Pytannya, Yaki Stavlyat' Muzeyi (Questions that Museums Ask). *Muzeynyy Prostir (Museum Space)*, 1 (11), pp. 27-30.

Guttman, N., 2014. Holocaust Museum Urges Ukraine to Examine Its History of Anti-Semitism. *Forward* [Online]. Available from: <http://forward.com/news/world/200016/holocaust-museum-urges-ukraine-to-examine-its-hist/> [Accessed 6 June 2015].

Hieke, K., 2014. On the Role of Museums. *Museums, Politics, and Power* [Online]. Available from: <http://museumpoliticsandpower.org/2014/09/20/on-the-role-of-museums/> [Accessed 15 November 2014].

Hofland, C and Norris, L., 2015. On the Streets and in the Galleries: Responsive Exhibits in Ukraine. *The Exhibitionist*. 35 (1), pp. 22-26.

Hooper-Greenhill, E., 1992. *Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge*. Routledge, London; New York.

Hooper-Greenhill, E., 2000. *Museums and the Interpretation of Visual Culture*. London: Routledge.

Hrytsenko, E., n.d. Kody Svobody Vlodka Kaufmana (Codes of Freedom Vlad Kaufman). *Korydor: Zhurnal pro Suchasnu Kul'turu (Corridor: Journal of Contemporary Culture)* [Online]. Available from: <http://www.korydor.in.ua/ua/opinions/kodi-svobodi-vid-vlodka-kaufmana.html> [Accessed 14 November 2014].

Hyde, L., 2015. Ukraine to rewrite Soviet history with controversial “decommunisation” laws. *The Guardian*. 20 April. Available from: <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/apr/20/ukraine-decommunisation-law-soviet> [Accessed 9 May 2015].

ICOM International Council of Museums, 2007. *Museum Definition*. Available from: <http://icom.museum/the-vision/museum-definition> [Accessed 23 November 2014].

Ivan Honchar Museum, 2014. Tvorchist' Svobody: Revolyutsiyna Kul'tura Maydanu (Creativity of Freedom: Cultural Revolution on Maidan), [Facebook], 28 November. Available from: <https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.961093390586900.1073741965.173813635981550&type=1> [Accessed 1 December 2014].

Johnston, Hank. 2009. *Culture, social movements, and protest*. Farnham, England: Ashgate.

“Khudozhnyky, Kotorye Rysuyut Evromaydan (Artists Who Draw the Euromaidan).” 2014. *Ya Perevozhhu S Odnoho Bereha Na Druhoy (Translating from One Side of the River to Another)* [Online]. January 29. Available from: <http://perevozchik00.livejournal.com/26151.html> [Accessed 1 February 2014].

Kolcio, K., 2014. In Ukraine, a Utopian Mindset Toward Art. *Huffington Post* [Online]. 27 May. Available from: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/katja-kolcio/in-ukraine-a-utopian-mind_b_5399897.html?utm_hp_ref=fb&src=sp&comm_ref=false [Accessed 10 June 2014].

Kuzio, T., 2002. History, Memory and Nation-Building in the Post-Soviet Colonial Space. *Nationalities Papers*, 30(2), pp. 241-264.

Littoz-Monnet, A., 2012. The EU Politics of Remembrance: Can Europeans Remember Together? *West European Politics*, 35(5), pp. 1182-1202.

Lozhkina, A., & Roytburd, A. Exhibition View: Codex of Mezhyhirya. *National Art Museum of Ukraine* [Online]. Available from: <http://namu.kiev.ua/en/exhibitions/bills/view.html?eid=234> [Accessed 11 November 2014].

Mälksoo, M., 2009. The Memory Politics of Becoming European: The East European Subalterns and the Collective Memory of Europe. *European Journal of International Relations*, 15, pp. 653-680.

Marples, D., 2015. Open Letter from Scholars and Experts on Ukraine Re. the So-Called “Anti-Communist Law.” *Krytyka* [Online]. April. Available from: <http://krytyka.com/en/articles/open-letter-scholars-and-experts-ukraine-re-so-called-anti-communist-law> [Accessed 9 May 2015].

Message, K., 2006. *New Museums and the Making of Culture*. Oxford, New York: Berg.

Museum of Maidan to be opened in Ukraine, 2014. *Ukraine in Arabic* [Online], 28 November. Available from: <http://arab.com.ua/en/the-museum-of-maidan-to-be-opened-in-ukraine> [Accessed 1 December 2014].

Museum “Revolution”, 2015. Film. Directed by Nataliya Babintseva. Russia: KinoKi Studio Ltd. Available from: <http://antipode-sales.biz/movies/revolution-museum/> [Accessed 1 December 2015].

Mykoliuk, O., 2014.. What makes plywood stronger? Art is a weapon, prove artists by painting shields of Maidan guards. *Kiev Day* [Online], 11. Available from: <http://www.day.kiev.ua/en/article/time-out/what-makes-plywood-stronger> [Accessed 5 May 2014].

Myers, R., 2014. Rich Myers: Alexander, Co-Coordinator of the Open University of Maidan. *Voices of Ukraine* [Online] 17 February. Available from: <http://maidantranslations.com/2014/02/17/rich-myers-alexander-co-coordinator-of-the-open-university-of-maidan/> [Accessed 28 November 2014].

Norris, L., 2011. Where do New Ideas Come from? How do They Happen? *The Uncataloged Museum* [Online]. Available from: http://uncatalogedmuseum.blogspot.co.uk/2011_08_01_archive.html [19 November 2014].

Norris, L. 2014a. Stvoruyuchy Muzey Dialohu (Creating a Dialogic Museum of Maidan). *Muzeynyy Prostir (Museum Space)*, 1 (11), pp. 27-30.

Norris, L., 2014b. What We Learned in Our Ukrainian Workshops. *The Uncataloged Museum* [Online]. Available from: <http://uncatalogedmuseum.blogspot.co.uk/2014/10/what-we-learned-in-our-ukrainian.html> [19 November 2014].

Norris, L., 2013. Our History Museums Will Include the Events of These Days. *The Uncataloged Museum* [Online]. Available from: <http://uncatalogedmuseum.blogspot.co.uk/2013/12/our-history-museums-will-include-events.html> [Accessed 23 October 2014].

Norris, L., and Ostrovka, O., 2011. The Collective or the Individual? Considering Ukrainian Memorial Museums. *The Exhibitionist* [Online]. Available from: http://name-aam.org/uploads/downloadables/EXH.fall_11/12%20EXH_fall11_The%20collective%20or%20the%20individual_Norris_Ostrovka.pdf [Accessed 23 October 2014].

Polataiko, T., 2014. Taras Polataiko: War. 11 Portraits – VASYL’s STORY. *Voices of Ukraine* [Online]. Available from: <http://maidantranslations.com/2014/09/07/taras-polataiko-war-11-portraits/> [Accessed 11 November 2014].

Portnov, A., 2013. Memory Wars in Post-Soviet Ukraine (1991-2010). In: U. Blacker, A. Etkind, and J. Fedor, eds. *Memory and Theory in Eastern Europe*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 233-254.

Reed, T. V., 2005. *The Art of Protest: Culture and Activism from the Civil Rights Movement to the Streets of Seattle*. 1st ed. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Shepard, B., 2011. *Play, Creativity, and Social Movements: If I Can't Dance, It's Not My Revolution*. 1st ed. New York: Routledge.

Shevel, O., 2014. Memories of the Past and Visions of the Future: Remembering the Soviet Era and its End in Ukraine. In: M.H. Bernhard and J. Kubik. *Twenty years after communism: the politics of memory and commemoration*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 146 - 167.

Shevel, O., 2015. "De-Communization Laws" Need to Be Amended to Conform to European Standards. *VoxUkraine* [Online], 7 May. Available from: <http://voxukraine.org/2015/05/07/de-communization-laws-need-to-be-amended-to-conform-to-european-standards/> [Accessed 9 May 2015].

Skramstad, H., 1999. An Agenda for Museums in the Twenty-first Century. In: Anderson, G. 2004, *Reinventing the Museum: historical and contemporary perspectives on the paradigm shift*, Lanham, Md. ; Oxford : AltaMira, Lanham, Md.; Oxford, pp. 118-137.

Stech, M., 2009. Symbols of Transformation: The Reflection of Ukraine's 'Identity Shift' in Four Ukrainian Novels of the 1990s. In: L. Onyshkevych, L. Zales'ka Onyshkevych, and M. G. Rewakowicz, eds. *Contemporary Ukraine on the Cultural Map of Europe*. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, Inc., pp. 231-248.

Tonkin, S., 2015. *Using Museums as Strategic Non-Formal Education Partners*. Lecture. Fulbright Office, Kyiv, Ukraine.

"V Kyyevi hotuyut' vystavku iz artefaktiv Maydanu [In Kiev, preparing an exhibition of Maidan artifacts]." *YouTube*, 2:13. Posted by *24 Telekanal*, upload November 26, 2014. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IoptuRV36GE#t=101>.

Vozniuk, V., 2013. The River Styx of Lviv. *The Ukrainian Week: International Edition* [Online]. Available from: <http://ukrainianweek.com/Travel/91839> [Accessed 8 May 2015].

Weil, S.E., 1990. Rethinking the Museum: An Emerging New Paradigm. In: Anderson, G. 2004, *Reinventing the Museum: historical and contemporary perspectives on the paradigm shift*, Lanham, Md.; Oxford: AltaMira, Lanham, Md.; Oxford, pp. 74-79.

Weil, S.E., 1999. From being about something to being for somebody: The ongoing transformation of the American museum. *Daedalus*, Vol.128(3), pp. 229-258.

Witcomb, A., 2006. Interactivity: Thinking Beyond. In: Macdonald, S., ed., 2006. *A Companion to Museum Studies*. London: Blackwell, pp. 353-361.

Wulf, M., 2011. Changing Memory Regimes in a New Europe. *Academia* [Online]. Available from:
http://www.academia.edu/968404/Changing_memory_regimes_in_a_new_Europe
[Accessed 15 June 2015].

Wydra, H., 2007. *Communism and the Emergence of Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

PERSONAL COMMUNICATION

Brunova-Kalisetska, Iryna. Director, *The Integration and Development Center in Crimea*, Kyiv, Ukraine. 7 July 2015.

Che, Kateryna. Research Coordinator, *The Bohdan and Varvara Khanenko Museum of Arts*, Kyiv, Ukraine. 5 November 2014.

Chervony, Eugene. Deputy Director, *Museum of Folk Architecture and Rural Life*, Lviv, Ukraine. 20 October 2014.

Gurian, Elaine. Senior Consultant and former Deputy Director of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, *Elaine Huemann Gurian LLC*, Arlington, VA. 30 October 2014.

Herranz, Joaquin, Jr. Associate Professor of Public Affairs, *Evans School of Public Affairs, University of Washington*, Seattle, WA. 14 November 2013.

Maximova, Vira. Cultural Affairs Assistant, *US Embassy in Ukraine*, Kyiv, Ukraine. 2 November 2014.

Melnyk, Oleksandr. Fine Artist, Kyiv, Ukraine. 17 August 2014.

Norris, Linda. Independent Museum Professional, *The Uncataloged Museum*, Treadwell, NY. 29 October 2014.

Otrishchenko, Natalia. Research Coordinator, *The Center for Urban History*, Lviv, Ukraine. 4 November 2014.

Poshyvailo, Ihor. Deputy Director, *Ivan Honchar Museum: National Center of Folk Culture*, Kyiv, Ukraine. 21 August 2014, 5 November 2014.

Syachiv, Volodymyr. Fine Artist, Lviv, Ukraine. 14 September 2014.

Savchak, Ihor. Center for Cultural Management, Lviv, Ukraine. 15 July 2014.

Vorobiova, Irina. Deputy Director, *The Bulgakov Museum*, Kyiv, Ukraine. 2 November 2014.