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Methodological questions

Your action at the Christ the Saviour Cathedral evoked a wide range of reactions from inside and outside Russia. At the same time various interpretive models have been proposed by stakeholders, from you yourself, to journalists, the Patriarch and Putin. You have become almost saints in the tradition of yurodstvo [holy foolishness], but you have also become enemies who hate and insult Orthodox shrines and believers, as well as [being seen as] those financed by the Kremlin. Relationships within the group Pussy Riot and with [your] lawyers have also been subject to differing interpretations. Hence we have a methodological question: Do you think an adequate
understanding of ‘the other’ is possible – in this instance, of you as a group and of each one of you as an individual, and if ‘yes’, then how should we seek this understanding, given so many divergences in the interpretations?

Yes, of course it is possible. To seek understanding one should rely on facts and on knowledge of the exact context of the events in question. Of course, here you need to know a lot of true information in order to sort out what happened, and not blindly believe everything you read in the media or what is said by outsiders who were not directly involved in these events. I think some answers will appear after a while; ‘time will put everything in its place’, as the saying goes. And those who have decided to investigate the events in our story can contact the participants in events personally, and get first-hand information.

The interpretive range included, on the one hand, a perception throughout the world, even by Western liberals, of the Pussy Riot performance at the Christ the Saviour Cathedral as anti-religious, or even blasphemous. An entirely opposite view was, on the other hand, offered by the Orthodox. How did the association of your performance with the tradition of yurodstvo [holy foolishness] emerge? Did the members of Pussy Riot play any role in connecting the performance with yurodstvo? And arising from this: what connection do you see between Pussy Riot and the tradition of yurodstvo?

Honestly, when we were discussing this action, and when we were preparing this action, no one spoke out about the tradition of yurodstvo. No one talked about it at all and no one discussed it, everyone thought and discussed the action solely in terms of politically artistic context. We departed from the
tradition of Actionism and from the artist’s work with media.

The idea to link [to] the tradition of yurodstvo, as I understand it, appeared later, during the trial, and the idea did not come from us at all. But I find it interesting that such a reaction emerged amongst the Orthodox. I do not know who first began to associate our performance with the tradition of yurodstvo, I have no information about this, and I think that it is not important, perhaps, this idea was just hanging in the air.

The concept of Pussy Riot is anonymity. Your political protest was at the same time a search for dialogue, for example, with the ROC. You have repeatedly stated that you wanted a dialogue, while still wearing balaclavas, prior to your imprisonment, that is, before you ‘acquired’ faces and names. Paradoxically, the personalities hiding behind your balaclavas have proved to be too strong. Was there not an inner contradiction between your image of anonymity and the search for dialogue from the outset? Does this not confirm that dialogue is, by definition, something between specific people? And then, have you not become hostages of your own image?

The idea of anonymity is an artistic idea, it is part of the group’s image.

Real people are real people. I think the author (in our case, a collective author) and his personality should not completely coincide with his work. There is no point projecting all the qualities of an artistic creation onto the identities of its authors, otherwise this analysis will lack evaluation of the artwork itself.

Therefore the work differs from the personal characteristics of the author, otherwise we basically wouldn’t have had to create anything, or think anything up, but would have straight away от традиции акционизма и работы художника с медиа.

Идея связать традицию юродства, как я поняла, появилась позже, во время уголовного процесса и шла эта идея совсем не от нас. Но мне интересно, что у православных появилась такая реакция. Кто первым начал связывать наше выступление с традицией юродства я не знаю, у меня нет информации об этом, и мне кажется это не важно, возможно, эта идея просто висела в воздухе.

Концепт Pussy Riot - это анонимность. Ваш политический протест был в тоже время поиском диалога, например, с РПЦ. О том, что вы хотите диалога вы неоднократно заявили, еще в балаклавах, до вашего заключения, т.е. прежде чем вы «обрели» лица и имена. Парадоксально, личности, скрывающиеся за вашими балаклавами оказались слишком сильными. Не было ли изначально внутреннего противоречия между вашим имиджем анонимности и поисками диалога? Не подтверждается ли этим, что диалог по определению есть нечто между конкретными людьми? И тогда, не стали ли вы заложниками собственного имиджа?

Идея анонимности - это художественная идея, это часть образа группы. Реальные люди - это реальные люди. Мне кажется, автор (в нашем случае коллективный автор), и его личность не должен полностью совпадать с его произведением. Не стоит проецировать все качества произведения на личности его авторов, иначе в этом анализе не будет оценки самого художественного произведения. Поэтому произведение отличается от личных особенностей автора, иначе бы мы вообще могли ничего не создавать, и ничего не придумывать, а сразу начали связываться, например, с
started to connect with, for example, the same Gundyaev, and to try to explain something to him, and that would have looked ridiculous. Especially since explaining something to people like that makes almost no sense, theirs is a completely different world, in the case of Gundyaev – a mafia world, even. We had symbolic, rather than direct, dialogue in mind here.

The new protest art, particularly Pussy Riot and the group Voina [War], force us to radically revise the definition of art (not just the punk performances of Pussy Riot, but also, for example, their actions ‘Fuck for the Bear Cub Heir’ [group sex by Voina held in Moscow Zoological Museum as a protest against Putin making Medvedev – Russian ‘medved’ means ‘bear’ – president in 2008, and ‘How to Snatch a Chicken’ [a performance by Voina in St. Petersburg on 20-06-2010: a woman stole a chicken from a supermarket by stuffing it into her vagina]). When comparing these actions to your public statements and your letters from prison, or with the poems by Maria Alekhina, a difference of both form and depth (content) is evident, and hence, undoubtedly, of the potential viewer or reader. How do you assess the philosophical and poetic content of your other discourses in relation to the form and content of your performances as Pussy Riot, and to actions similar to those mentioned above?

I think, again, it is worth distinguishing the biographical lives of real people from fictional artistic images. Images are invented specially to remove the superfluous and to enhance the desired elements in an artistic work, and they are created to convey only certain ideas, and not all ideas at once. Therefore, face and biography were fully [cast aside] in the PR image, leaving only the ideas of feminism, anti-authoritarianism and left-wing
ideas. Although the criminal proceedings revealed the faces of three persons involved, their biographies do not in any way influence the original conception of the group’s image. How all this is perceived now in aggregate is, however, another matter.

With regard to the revision of art, art always tries to revise itself, it is practically obligatory for any artist to do so. How successfully this is done is a question for each particular case. Apart from PR and the group Voina [War], there are many other artists who are also radically changing the classical view of art, for example those same The Yes Men.

The tendency to change the view of art and to reconsider its role already emerged a long time ago, officially in the mid-nineteenth century, with the rise of photography. Thus, it turns out that all the artists engaged with this issue now are, in effect, merely continuing the tradition of twentieth century art, in other words, the idea of a new protest art is in itself not new at all.

_Punk protest is subject to what M. Bakhtin called ‘lowering’. Do you not think that in order to engage in dialogue (see above) it would be more effective to ‘elevate’ one’s interlocutor to a higher level?_ I do not agree with the interpretation of such art as lowering or reduction. Every appearance of a new approach to understanding the role of art is always seen as lowering, even as vulgarisation. But time shows that in the end it was the most appropriate response to the processes that were happening in society then. So I think it is not necessary to elevate anyone anywhere, you just need to continue to seek the most appropriate forms of artistic reactions to current life in society. Furthermore, a work of art is not a dialogue in the classic sense, where антиавторитарность и левые идеи. То что уголовный процесс раскрыл лица троих участниц, их биографии никак не влияет на изначальную задумку образа группы. Как теперь все это воспринимается вместе, это уже другой вопрос.

Что касается пересмотра искусства, искусство всегда пытается себя пересмотреть, это практически обязан делать любой художник. Как успешно это удается сделать, это вопрос каждого случая. Помимо ПР и группы «Война» есть много других художников, которые также радикально меняют классический взгляд на искусство, например, те же “The Yes Men”.

Установка менять взгляд на искусство и пересматривать его роль появилась уже давно, официально с середины 19 века, с появлением фотографии. Таким образом, получается что сейчас все художники, затрагивающие эту проблему, по сути всего лишь продолжают традиции искусства 20 века, то есть идея нового протестного искусства сама по себе уже давно не нова.

_Панк-протест подпадает под то, что М. Бахтин называл «снижением». Не считаете ли вы, что для того, чтобы вступить в диалог (см. выше) эффективнее собеседника «поднимать» на более высокий уровень?_ Я не согласна с интерпретацией такого искусства как снижение или понижение. Каждое появление нового подхода к пониманию роли искусства всегда встречалось как понижение, даже вульгаризация. Но время показывает, что это в итоге было самой адекватной реакцией на происходящие тогда в обществе процессы. Поэтому я думаю не надо никуда поднимать, нужно просто продолжать искать самые адекватные формы реакции в искусстве на сегодняшнюю жизнь в обществе. Потом, работа искусства это не диалог в классическом смысле,
you have to think in arguments and apply the technique of discussion, in this sense, nobody directly starts a dialogue, there is an expression of your own point of view and a development of art forms, and then a public reaction to this.

As Western scholars, we are confronted with a variety of methodological problems and questions, including the question of the legitimacy of studying a Russian phenomenon, concerning the Russian Orthodox Church, by scholars who are neither Russian nor Orthodox. However, during research on the Pussy Riot phenomenon (apologies for this objectification), we found the cultural, philosophical, musical and poetical boundaries of Pussy Riot discourse to be very blurred, sometimes explicitly and intentionally, sometimes implicitly and, most likely, unconsciously. This is already indicated in the name. In this regard, two questions, firstly: ‘What’s in a name?’, that is, why not a Russian name for the group? What is behind this, bashfulness, attracting global attention, or something else? And, secondly, do you think there are exclusively national or denominational phenomena in today’s world?

The group’s name is connected with the historical context of the feminist movement in the second half of the twentieth century. It incorporates the features of the second wave of feminism, which happened mainly in Europe and America in the 70s, and partly in the 90s. The group was created in the context of the third wave of the feminist movement, which inherits from the second wave and remakes its achievements and ideas. Therefore, this name.

где нужно мыслить аргументами и применять технику спора, в этом смысле напрямую никто диалог не устанавливает, происходит выражение своей точки зрения и развитие художественных форм, а дальше реакция общества на это.

Как западные ученые, мы сталкиваемся с различными методологическими проблемами и вопросами, среди которых вопрос о легитимности изучения российского феномена касающегося Русской Православной Церкви, учеными, не являющимися ни русскими, ни православными. Но, во время изучения феномена Pussy Riot (извините за это объективирование), мы обнаружили, что культурные, философские, музыкальные, и поэтические границы дискурса Pussy Riot очень сильно размыты, иногда эксплицитно и намеренно, иногда неявно и, скорее всего, неосознанно. Это задано уже названием. В связи с этим два вопроса: «что в имени?», т.е. почему не русское название для группы? Что за этим, стыдливость, привлечение глобального внимания, или что-то другое? И, второе, существует ли, по вашему мнению, в современном мире эксклюзивно национальные или деноминационные феномены?

Имя группы связано с историческим контекстом феминистского движения во второй половине 20-века. В нем заложены черты второй волны феминизма, которая проходила в основном, в Америке и в Европе в 70-х годах, частично в 90-х. Группа была создана в рамках третьей волны феминистского движения, которое наследует вторую волну и перерабатывает ее достижения и идеи. Поэтому такое название.
Some gender related questions

Have you received any letters supporting or criticising your actions and the performance of Punk Prayer from Orthodox women? If so, what has been the nature of the response from Orthodox women? Did that response (positive or negative) influence the way you yourself evaluate your action and its forms in retrospect?

Yes, I received several letters in the Detention Unit. The support was emotional, one could feel that these people wanted to do something to help and to support us. In general, the support was purely human, which, of course, was very nice. I, personally, did not receive any negative reactions. Evidently they did not dare or did not want to write, after all, that requires spending time and energy.

To write a letter to the Detention Unit is, of course, more difficult than to write a comment on the Internet. In principle, the letters had no impact on my assessment of the group’s activities, but while sitting in the Detention Unit they, of course, helped [me] not to be upset by what was said on television in April 2012, about how all Orthodox people were allegedly terribly outraged by our act. In this way, I received yet further confirmation that all that is simply false.

Pussy Riot is a feminist group. How primary are aspects of feminism in relation to, for example, the political and socio-religious protest of the group?

Feminism itself has emerged as a socio-political movement, and remains thus today. Therefore, it cannot be separated from politics and the social issues of the society.

No religious context was ever created for the band by its members;

Pussy Riot - феминистская группа. Насколько первичны аспекты феминизма по отношению, например, к политическому и социально-религиозному протесту группы?

Феминизм сам по себе возник как социально-политическое движение и таковым остается и сейчас. Поэтому его невозможно отделить от политики и социальных вопросов общества.

Религиозного контекста у самой группы участницами никогда не
outsiders started to ascribe it to the group only after the performance at the Cathedral of Christ the Saviour.

Had you ever read the works of any Western Christian feminist theologians (specifically theologians, not feminist thinkers in general)?

No, I have not.

The woman on the ambo became the symbol of the new role of women in the Orthodox Church. What kind of attitude would you like to see in the Russian Church towards women? What role could a woman play in the Russian Church?

I would want a respectful attitude both towards women and towards men.

The problem, of course, lies in the strict hierarchy which remains in the church.

The quite unpleasant context of the ROC Moscow Patriarchate (MP) is also added here. The activities of this organisation in general look awful.

For example, MP now builds neighbourhood churches in every district in Moscow, using the Moscow city budget, cutting down trees planted by Muscovites, or removing children’s playgrounds. Muscovites protest and ask that kindergartens and schools be built with Moscow budget funds, not modern replicas without any value. Patriarch Kirill just shrugs and calls the opinion of Muscovites ‘worthless provocation’. Mayor Sobyanin schemes with him and continues to ignore the opinion of the Muscovites. I would like to see the Moscow Patriarchate just show some respect for the opinions of individuals and the society in which it exists, regardless of whether they are believers or not. Thus far one sees only grasping business on the part of the MP, mixed with creating a situation, its originators only after the performance at the Cathedral of Christ the Saviour.

Читали ли вы какие-либо произведения западных христианских феминистских богословов (именно богословов, а не феминистских мыслителей в целом)?

Нет, не читала.

Женщина на амвоне стала символом новой женской роли в православном храме. Какое отношение к женщине вы бы хотели видеть в русской церкви? Какую роль женщина могла бы играть в русской церкви?

Мне бы хотелось уважительно отношения и к женщинам, и к мужчинам. Проблема, конечно, в жесткой иерархии, которая осталась в церкви.

Здесь еще добавляется совсем неприятный контекст РПЦ московской патриархии (МП). Деятельность этой организации вообще смотрится дико.

Например, сейчас МП в каждом районе Москвы пользуется бюджетом Москвы, строит церкви-однодневки, вырубая посаженные москвичами деревья или убирая детские площадки. Москвичи протестуют и просят строить на московский бюджет детские сады и школы, а не новоделы, которые не несут никакой ценности. Патриарх Кирилл просто отмахивается и называет мнение москвичей «мелкой провокацией». Мэр Собянин ему притворствует и продолжает игнорировать мнение москвичей. Мне бы хотелось, чтобы московская патриархия хоть как-то уважала мнение граждан и общества, в которой она существует, в независимости от того, являются они верующими или нет. Пока со стороны МП виден только алчный бизнес, смешанный с незаконностью использования гражданского
illegal use of the civic budget and a boorish attitude towards civil society.

As regards the role of women in the church itself, it seems to me that it should not differ from their role in civil, that is, secular, society. A woman should not be perceived as a person who has always to obey someone, to do or not to do something, basically, as a person who owes something to someone all the time. Even in civil society not everything is OK with gender rights for women, but still, owing to the huge efforts of the left-wing feminist movement the position of women in Russian society has greatly improved compared to past centuries. And if some of these achievements were brought into the Russian Orthodox Church, this would already be great progress.

A few theological and political questions

What would dialogue between the Church and contemporary artists be like in an ideal world? What would be the dream attitude of the Church towards the protest movement?

It seems to me that the issue is not really dialogue, but the basic attitude towards the individual person which the ROC is now promoting. It feels as if the Russian Orthodox Church, particularly the Russian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate, thinks that only the head of this organisation may be a human being and a personality, all the rest cannot be accepted in similar fashion, since it would signify equality with that same patriarch, which, as I understand it, contradicts the current principles of the Orthodox Church. As long as such an attitude holds, there will be no adequate attitude towards art and the protest movement.

И, несколько богословских и политических вопросов

Каким в идеале мог бы быть диалог между церковью и современными художниками? О каком отношении церкви к протестному движению можно было бы мечтать?

Мне кажется, дело не совсем в диалоге, а в изначальном отношении, которое пропагандирует сейчас РПЦ к личности человека. Такое ощущение, что РПЦ, особенно РПЦ московской патриархии считает, что человеком и личностью может являться только глава этой организации, все остальные не могут восприниматься также, так как это бы означало бы равенство по сравнению с тем же патриархом, что, как я понимаю, противоречит сегодняшним принципам РПЦ. Пока такое отношение будет оставаться в силе, никакого адекватного отношения к искусству и протестному движению не будет.
What most surprised you about the responses to Punk Prayer among believers?

I was surprised by the negative reactions that I saw online, in truth I am not sure that these are believers; at least, they called themselves so.

Here the inability to navigate through the different sources of information was surprising, believing everything that is said on television, or what this Kirill Gundyaev and other ‘authoritative’ people are saying, and not trying to understand the information with the help of logic and common sense, but with fear and hatred.

Your performance at Christ the Saviour Cathedral has become a litmus paper, revealing an entire spectrum of tensions in Russian society: social, political, religious, [and related to] worldview. In what respect do you see this litmus-paper effect as a prolepsis of (in other words, as anticipating) the litmus paper effect of current developments in Ukraine?

Our action has nothing to do with the events in Ukraine. I do not think that it is worth somehow connecting the two entirely different phenomena. It is better to consider the events in Ukraine as events in Ukraine, since as you know there were many causes of their own there: the corruption of the Ukrainian authorities, tension between speakers of different languages, and so on. These causes have nothing to do with the group PR.

Your attitude to current events in Ukraine, and in your opinion, is something like this is possible in Russia?

In Russia, sometimes everything is possible, but I and all my acquaintances feel as if, in our country, the screws are being strongly tightened. On television, Russians are being specially set against

Что удивило вас больше всего в реакциях верующих на панк-молебен?

Удивили негативные реакции, которые я видела в сети, я, правда, не уверена, что это верующие, по крайней мере, они себя так называли.

Здесь удивило неумение ориентироваться в разных источниках информации, верить всему, что говорят по телевизору или всему что говорит тот же Кирилл Гундяев и другие «авторитетные» люди и не пытаться разобраться в информации с помощью логики и здорового смысла, а не страхов и ненависти.

Ваша акция в ХХС стала лакмусовой бумагой, выявившей целый спектр напряжений в российском обществе: общественных, политических, религиозных, мировоззренческих. В каком отношении вы видите этот эффект лакмусовой бумаги как пролепсис (т.е. предвосхищение) эффекта лакмусовой бумаги текущих событий в Украине?

Наша акция никак не связана с событиями в Украине. Не думаю, что два совершенно разных феномена стоит как-то связывать. Лучше рассматривать события в Украине как события в Украине, ведь там было много своих причин: коррупция украинской власти, напряженность между носителями разных языков и т.д. К группе ПР эти причины никакого отношения не имеют.

Ваше отношение к текущим событиям в Украине и возможно ли, на ваш взгляд, нечто подобное в России?

В России иногда все возможно, но сейчас я и все мои знакомые чувствуем, что у нас в стране сильно закручиваются гайки. По телевизору специально настраивают россиян против
Ukrainians and frightened with war against who knows whom, while laws which are very dangerous for society are being quietly passed. For example, the law on meetings, which violates the Constitution of the Russian Federation, in essence now bans people from coming out to [protest] meetings under threat of criminal prosecution. Or the limitation of anonymity on the internet. And of course, the law that forbids LGBT-propaganda, which has already been widely discussed in the West.

As regards events in Ukraine, what is actually happening there is visible only to the Ukrainians themselves. I do not know who is really provoking the continuation of the war, but I would like to wish the Ukrainians the swiftest cessation of hostilities and restoration of peaceful life, which I’m sure all thinking people want. But it seriously worries me that, in our country, an entirely real harassment of Ukrainians is unfolding; they are called all manner of names here, as a result, a new wave of nationalism is emerging. I see this with my own eyes and, of course, all this greatly disturbs me.

Yet again, it is surprising how adult people so easily believe all the lies and dirt that comes from the Russian television screens about the inhabitants of Ukraine.

Do you see a connection between your Punk Prayer and the prayers of the protesters on Maidan? Their prayers were much more traditional. Still, might there be something in praying itself as a performative or ecstatic act that transcends (goes beyond the boundaries of) political power and control? Was this intentionally incorporated in the Punk Prayer?

I do not see a link between the Punk Prayers and the prayers on Maidan because, as far as I know, they were actually connected with real victims of war and not just the political situation. Ukrainians and frightened with war against who knows whom, while laws which are very dangerous for society are being quietly passed. For example, the law on meetings, which violates the Constitution of the Russian Federation, in essence now bans people from coming out to [protest] meetings under threat of criminal prosecution. Or the limitation of anonymity on the internet. And of course, the law that forbids LGBT-propaganda, which has already been widely discussed in the West.

As regards events in Ukraine, what is actually happening there is visible only to the Ukrainians themselves. I do not know who is really provoking the continuation of the war, but I would like to wish the Ukrainians the swiftest cessation of hostilities and restoration of peaceful life, which I’m sure all thinking people want. But it seriously worries me that, in our country, an entirely real harassment of Ukrainians is unfolding; they are called all manner of names here, as a result, a new wave of nationalism is emerging. I see this with my own eyes and, of course, all this greatly disturbs me.

Yet again, it is surprising how adult people so easily believe all the lies and dirt that comes from the Russian television screens about the inhabitants of Ukraine.

Do you see a connection between your Punk Prayer and the prayers of the protesters on Maidan? Their prayers were much more traditional. Still, might there be something in praying itself as a performative or ecstatic act that transcends (goes beyond the boundaries of) political power and control? Was this intentionally incorporated in the Punk Prayer?

I do not see a link between the Punk Prayers and the prayers on Maidan because, as far as I know, they were actually connected with real victims of war and not just the political situation.
of the conflict, with people who were killed, this is a very different context to the one we were dealing with. We did not go deeply into the tradition of prayer itself. Of course, performativity is visible in both prayer and in all sacred rites. This is an interesting topic. Besides, as far as I know, rites and their performativity were well established among the pagans, evidently the Orthodox Church appropriated these traditions. But I do not have the requisite education and extensive knowledge in the field of religion and religious practices, I think this question would be better posed to experts.

Nadezhda said in court that you are not against Christianity, but for true Christianity. What, then, is real Christianity for you? What values, ideas, are primary?

I hold left-wing atheistic views, I cannot say that I support the view that Christianity should have the leading role in people’s moral life, as representatives of the authorities love to say in Russia now.

I think moral and morality should be secular concepts. As I understood it then, Nadya meant the situation, when the ROC of the Moscow Patriarchate simulates particular values (love, humanity, and so on), while in fact, other values are visible (proximity to power, money, the ability to crush with force and to lie publically).

What values should be the primary is clearer to Christians themselves, but it seems to me that they should not differ from the values of secular society, that is individual liberty, equality, a fair distribution of resources and education.

How could the Western community help women in Russian prisons?

Frankly, I would like Russian society to help women in prisons. I am
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beginning to feel sort of embarrassed for my country, that we have this attitude towards prisoners, and that we find ourselves in a situation where citizens and organisations of other countries are helping us with the issue of human rights in prisons.

Of course, the Western community cannot practically have an impact on our bureaucracy, corruption and the desire of some members of the Federal Penitentiary Service to play the swindler.

Maybe the Western community can help Russian organisations that have decided to engage in human rights in prisons, because they see more clearly what is going on in our prison system, for example, one of the largest organisations is ‘Memorial’. Maybe Western organisations that have experience in their own countries could share their experiences with Russian organisations. But one has to ask these organisations themselves. Besides, as far as I know, such interaction between some human rights organisations already exists.

What are your personal plans for the future?

Together with my acquaintances from the feminist community, I am registering an NGO (non-governmental organisation) – ‘the Vera Ermolyayeva Foundation for the Support of Women’s Initiatives in the field of contemporary art’, to help female artists in need of support for their projects or in case of harassment by the authorities, as we believe that it is very important to support the arts and artists here, especially if they are women who often face gender discrimination and are simply crushed by the machismo art scene.

And, you know, if there were no such situation maybe we would see now some more feminist art groups like PR.

женщинам в тюрьмах. Мне становится как-то не ловко за свою страну, что у нас такое отношение к заключенным, и что нам приходится находиться в положении, когда граждане и организации других стран помогают в вопросе прав человека в тюрьмах. Конечно, западное, сообщество, практически не может повлиять на нашу бюрократию, коррупцию и желание мошенничать со стороны некоторых представителей ФСИН.

Может быть, западное сообщество может помочь российским организациям, которые решились заняться правами человека в тюрьмах, так как им виднее, что происходит у нас в тюремной системе, например, одна из самых крупных организаций это «Мемориал». Может быть, западные организации, имеющие опыт работы в своих странах, могли бы поделиться опытом с российскими организациями. Но здесь нужно спрашивать уже сами эти организации, к тому же насколько я знаю, - такое взаимодействие между некоторыми правозащитными организациями уже есть.

Какие ваши личные планы на будущее?

Я вместе с знакомыми из феминистского сообщества регистрируем свое НКО (некоммерческую организацию) – «Фонд поддержки женских инициатив в сфере современного искусства имени Веры Ермолаевой» для помощи художникам-женщинам, нуждающимся в реализации своих проектов, или [в] поддержке в случае преследования со стороны властей, так как считаем, что у нас очень важно поддерживать искусство и художников, особенно если это женщины, которые часто сталкиваются с гENDERной дискриминацией и просто оказываются задавленными на мачистской художественной сцене. А ведь если бы не было такой ситуации, может быть, мы бы увидели сейчас еще несколько феминистских арт-групп подобных ПР.