

# Who was Maidan Snipers' Mastermind?

By [Adam Larson](#)

Global Research, June 05, 2014

[Oriental Review](#) 29 May 2014

Region: [Russia and FSU](#)

Theme: [Police State & Civil Rights](#), [US](#)

[NATO War Agenda](#)

First published by Oriental Review and Global Research on May 30, 2014

*The probe into the Maidan "snipers problem" – by the new Ukrainian government underwritten by it – continues. On May 13, the fascinating interim findings [were partly revealed](#), at a press conference called by parliamentary investigation head Gennady Moskal. Bullet forensics exonerated the previously blamed Berkut security force. Something in the findings also placed the unidentified shooters somewhere – unspecified – among "the ranks of the protesters." It could even have been the EuroMaidan militants, he admitted, but MP Moskal thought infiltrators from the government's security service SBU made more sense.*

He predicted decades of debate with no resolution, and a week later he [announced](#) that a number of key documents were destroyed, complicating the search. But whatever led the investigators to this apparently dead-end admission, it seemed like a break in the script that put the snipers in areas secured by the government of then-president Viktor Yanukovich. For those following the details, the May 13 revelation seemed like a bit of realism creeping in.

But then the current Secretary of the National Security and Defense Council – [Andriy Parubiy](#) – stepped forward, hinting at a divergent probe delving further into fantasy. His investigation blames Russia and Vladimir Putin for the snipers, even though it was Parubiy – not Putin – who was supposed to secure the "EuroMaidan" where, the evidence increasingly says, the problem snipers operated.

Sniper Commandant?



Andriy Parubiy

While he insists he's not a fascist, Andriy Parubiy co-founded the Nazi-inspired Social National party, now Svoboda, in the 1990s. Outwardly, he went mainstream early on, and joined Yulia Tymoshenko's Fatherland party, running security operations on the Maidan for the 2004 "Orange Revolution."

In 2013-14's more violent regime-change "protests," he was given the same responsibility. As Euromaidan Commandant and head of the Self-Defense Committee, he was in charge of security for areas where the mob's authority had overridden the government's.

We now know (partly from MP Moskal) that – on the pivotal day of February 20, which will remain the main focus of this report – sniper shots first hit police forces, and came from buildings Parubiy controlled. Ukraine's previous head of the Security Service (SBU)

Alexander Yakimenko [said so in March](#), after fleeing to Russia. When the Commandant proved unable to stop the sniping, which everyone claimed to be against, Yakimenko says he offered to send in a unit to help. He only needed a guarantee his men wouldn't be shot by Parubiy's, but he says that was denied. From all this, the SBU chief deduced the snipers were under Parubiy's command and protection.

In truth, this failure to stop the killing could be due to malice, or incompetence, or some mix. Whatever the case, the resulting bloodshed was all but necessary for the Kiev Cabal to finally take over. And considering his eminent competence, they made Parubiy security chief for all of Ukraine as soon as they could.

Sniper Investigator?

[Reports](#) from early March, before the Yakimenko accusations, spoke of a parliamentary investigation Parubiy himself was selected to lead. The apparent conflict of interest may, or may not, be why MP Moskal now seems to be in charge of that.

But in a [May 21 interview](#) for *Euractiv*, Parubiy speaks of a probe that sounds different, a probe blaming Russian Special forces – Spetsnaz – for penetrating his security cordon. Asked about the snipers, with the note “you must have first-hand information,” he sidestepped his own direct knowledge and told *Euractiv*:

“Now that we are conducting investigations, we have found that 18 Spetsnaz, including snipers, were in Maidan. The investigation will reveal from which points they were shooting, but I can already say that they did everything they could to spill blood and provoke civil unrest.”

...

“We have a working hypothesis which would be confirmed or rejected by the investigation, that in the most difficult days they shot equally – at Berkut and at the Maidan activists. Their aim was to instigate a more violent civic unrest ... that Russia could warm its hands at this fire.”

...

“We know that Russian snipers shot at both sides.”

As Washington's Blog [noted](#) in March, “everyone agrees that the snipers were false flag terrorists sewing chaos and confusion. ... they only disagree about *who* the responsible party is.” This is another example, and (as we'll see) the worst theory yet. And just look at who is trying to feed it to us.

Master Thug

From February 18-20, security forces and civilians were, as Parubiy says, killed somewhat “equally” by these snipers to create “violent civic unrest.” But there was a telling pattern to how different parts of that were timed.

First, consider how ten unarmed policemen were shot dead the night of February 18th, forcing a decision to bring in armed security forces. That allowed later killings to be realistically blamed on them, [as happened](#). (Were these the same provocateurs present a day and a half later, or a different shift?)

By the 20th, a force was assembled on the Maidan adequate to stomp the police out by noon and shoot the Berkut out of their nearest posts by 12:45. They even blocked the train bringing in the Army support, and readied to march up to the central government's buildings and stomp whomever they wished. This force was under Parubiy's leadership no later than his announcement early on the 21<sup>st</sup> that "all the leaders of the hundreds are declaring their consent to coordinated action, including the hundreds of the Right Sector ... We're in control of Kiev. We have seized control of the government quarter."

It was only at that shift in power that Parubiy "Spetsnaz snipers" unleashed their main killing spree. On video and within bare minutes, they picked off at least 30 unarmed civilians sent in behind the Hotel Ukraine, to top off "Heaven's Hundred." That is, this un-ambiguous, unforgivable "Yanukovych crime" was delivered as soon as the natural punishment for it had been placed.

Commandant Parubiy, who oversaw the distribution and timing of much of that violence, couldn't deny its pattern helped them, as he said to *Euractiv*, "oust Yanukovich." That prompted the question:

Q: So you recognize that you ousted Yanukovich?

A: Yes. He ran away.

Q: But he ran away because he was afraid for his life?

A: Yes of course. After so many deaths and such national tension, he understood that if he didn't run away, the personal consequences could be very bad.

Under this plausible threat, the president fled. An 1:36 pm announcement from the Maidan ordered members of Parliament to meet at 3:00 to vote him out for good. They were given "a guarantee that the Parliament would not be stormed during the session." The "hundreds" just snatched that option, but promised not to use it – unless maybe they were provoked by a wrong vote. In the end most of Parliament was willing to show up on the 22<sup>nd</sup> instead, and those agreed *unanimously* to impeach Yanukovych – and not be stomped. After all, Parubiy's Maidan machine still controlled Kiev.

### Confirming Yakimenko's Charges

When he spoke on May 13, investigation head Gennady Moskal did not specify any sniper perches, just implied that they were behind the lines Parubiy was in charge of. By noon on the 20<sup>th</sup>, this had expanded to include at least the Maidan at large, the Trade Unions Hall (Maidan HQ), the Conservatory, and Hotel Ukraine. The October Palace and unknown other buildings fell into his hands just after noon.



Former SBU chief Yakimenko said in March the first shots “came from the Philharmonic Hall,” probably meaning the (musical) Conservatory. After that, “many have witnessed 20 people leaving the building” with their sniper gear in bags. These “split into two groups – 10 men each.” One of these “took a position at the Ukraine hotel,” right next-door, and “the Security Service lost track” of the other sniper team.

Parubiy must know by now where the snipers were, but he doesn’t want to tell us yet. The probe “*will reveal* from which points they were shooting,” he promises.

Yakimenko said “no weapons could be brought to Maidan without Parubiy’s permission. Hand guns, rifles, scopes – he had to agree to all of that.”

In one report, Parubiy gave a rough count of those armed with handguns – about 100. But he said “those people are not ours, they are unorganized,” just like the snipers. “This is kind of a problem.” This when he also said “we created a headquarters in the Maidan and we will not tolerate any action without coordinating with it.”

As mentioned above, Yakimenko says he offered to help Parubiy flush out the gunmen, but was rebuffed. If true, that suggests either a criminal denial of his incompetence, or the commandant’s active approval of the killing.

The SBU chief has a 20-man sniper team in Parubiy’s turf. The man who would know might refer to the same group when he speaks of “18 Spetsnaz, including snipers.” Maybe 20 was a visual estimate, and the “Russians” split up into groups of nine?

One might expect Parubiy to be embarrassed that his own secured buildings were so infiltrated, but he puts the villains “in Maidan.” The original claims of February had the snipers in or on government-held buildings further southeast. Why can’t he just say that now? Why openly claim such a humiliating security breach unless the alternative is even worse?

Parubiy even claims he failed to stop the snipers on the way back out. After sneaking in and unleashing this mayhem, they walked away from the Maidan undetected, and “I think they escaped from Ukraine,” he told *Euractiv*.

But it was reported at the time that two snipers *were caught by his teams*, one at least in the Hotel Ukraine. At mid-day on the 20th, [an official tweet said](#), “members of Maidan Self-Defense captured one of the snipers. He is currently in Maidan headquarters.” But a different “Maidan commandant” – Stepan Kubiv – [said](#) he was just there and didn’t hear any such thing. A [message](#) of the 21<sup>st</sup> said a “sniper was caught on the 10th floor of the Hotel Ukraina ... Personality to be identified,” but it never was. A later one heard that “maydan activists caught two snipers” total, but the [source](#) said nothing about their fate or identities.

If they were caught red-handed, why doesn’t Parubiy mention these snipers now? Did they even exist, outside these vague reports? Were they real, but managed to escape? Or did Parubiy order them released? The balance of reasons suggests the killers were under his command and protection, as Yakimenko said, and as the evidence always suggested.

Clearly Commandant Parubiy, of the February “Failures,” is not the best one to be speaking about the Maidan snipers. Expect the May interview to be his last word on that bloodshed.

## Postscript: “Ensuring Peace and Safety”

In more promising areas, Andriy Parubiy remains the go-to guy. As the head of Ukraine’s National Security and Defense Council, he’s now tasked with the brutal and confusing “anti-terrorist” operation in eastern Ukraine, and apparently in Odessa. This he wages with a “National Guard” that grew out of his murky Maidan machine, against those Ukrainians who dare to vote against the Kiev Cabal, pushing Ukraine deeper into civil war territory with violence he always blames on “Russian terrorists.”

Helping overturn two popular votes for Yanukovich, ensuring a third overthrow will never be needed, plus his new “security” work, has earned Parubiy friends in the “Democratic” West. He spoke to *Euractiv* while in Brussels, he said, “to participate in a session of the Ukraine-NATO working group” regarding the Russian “hybrid war” against Ukraine. As he explained it:

“When we speak about fighting terrorists, the best way is to find their centre of coordination, of financing. In this case, this centre is one person, it is Putin. That’s why I say – we have no crisis in Slavyansk, in Donetsk, in Luhansk. We have a crisis in Putin’s head. ... if Putin succeeds in Ukraine, nobody can tell where his tanks will be tomorrow. ... To stop Putin is not only Ukraine’s major goal. It should be the goal of the entire civilized world.”

In Parubiy’s dangerously unhinged thinking, even the massacre at the Trade Unions building in Odessa on May 2 “was a classic provocation in which pro-Russian groups had to seize the administration buildings in the same way it happened in Donetsk and Luhansk.” But this time, the anti-Putsch activists were clearly chased in, and followed in, by an ultra-nationalist lynch mob. He also contradicts himself by claiming the building was already “a kind of headquarters for the separatists,” where “the substance that provoked the blaze” was brought in by them “a long time ago.”

That’s why, he says, “when Molotov cocktails were thrown from the fourth floor at the participants of the Ukrainian rally, the substance inflamed” and an “explosion happened.”

Of course, on-site video and photos prove this was terrorism, and it seems the mob torched the building largely to hide their brutal murder of [perhaps 272 citizens](#). That Parubiy was there to help coordinate it, after [attending a top-level April 24 meeting](#) to plan the Odessa “counter-terrorist” operation, makes it seem like state-sponsored terrorism. A former deputy head of the Odessa police, now fled to Donetsk, [blames Parubiy](#) for personally organizing the massacre. He was seen there on April 29<sup>th</sup>, [delivering bulletproof vests](#) to one Mykola Volkov – [a criminal](#) deputized as a “sotnik” (the term used for commanders of “hundreds” on the Maidan). Volkov was later [seen shooting a pistol](#) at the Trade Unions building, wearing a bulletproof vest, and phoning in a false story – possibly to Parubiy himself.

With Ukrainians all united but Moscow’s agents everywhere, the “security” chief told *Euractiv*, they needed an “overhaul” of “the entire security and defense sector,” and maybe civil society too, including “criminal groups” and “ethnic groups.”

The NATO allies had just heard the same and understood, [promising](#) “extensive support to the Ukrainian delegation” – including this false-flagging fascist thug – considering their

“crucial role in ensuring peace and safety in Europe and the world.” Further, they “expressed readiness” to help in “reform” of the Parubiy’s defense and security sectors.

Events in Odessa, Maruipol, and elsewhere might have convinced the Cabal’s double-speaking Western allies that civil society “overhauls” are best left to Parubiy and his “Ukrainian rally” types.

The original source of this article is [Oriental Review](#)

Copyright © [Adam Larson](#), [Oriental Review](#), 2014

---

**[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)**

**[Become a Member of Global Research](#)**

Articles by: [Adam Larson](#)

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)