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Abstract: Aerial drone photography has become popular throughout the first decade of the 21st century, with the technology getting ever more affordable and easy-to-use. It is employed for a variety of goals, ranging from military and surveillance tasks to the so-called drone and citizen journalism, from sports coverage to artistic usages and even product delivery. In the present article I analyse the usage of aerial drone photography as a means to monitor, document and survey political protest movements, taking the Bulgarian #resign movement as a case study. After a short sketch of the Bulgarian protest movement of the year 2013, which has received less coverage in European and international media and academia than the comparable events in Russia 2011-2012 or the Euro-Maidan in Ukraine 2013-2014, the case study explores a sample of protest videos, focusing on their artistic composition which combines a “bird’s perspective” with the specific photographic technique of the fisheye lens distortion effect. My argument is, that aerial drone photography as a means to document protest movements evolves from a pragmatic tool of alternative informational footage to an instrument for shaping visually the self-perception of the protesting crowd.
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In June 2013 an unmanned flying object unsettled participants of an anti-government protest rally in Bulgaria’s capital Sofia by circling above their heads.1 The surprised protesters

---

1 This paper was first presented at the International workshop on ‘Digital Creativity in Times of Crisis: Bulgarian Networked Culture in Global Contexts’, held in November 2013 at the Centre for Advanced Study in Sofia, which generously supported the event. I am thankful as well for the valuable comments of two anonymous reviewers of the article and Andrew Chapman.
experienced a mix of curiosity and suspicion. Who was watching them? Police forces, intelligence services? Was there any danger, in case the “ufo” would drop into the crowd?

What had stunned protesters was an Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV), a drone—more specifically: a quadcopter—equipped with a digital camera and navigated by thirty-years old Iasen Dzhabirov, a professional graphic designer, who had studied at the National Academy for Theater and Film Arts “Krŭstio Sarafov” (NATFA) in Sofia, co-founder of the private media and advertisement company MaxMedia\(^2\). Throughout the Bulgarian anti-government protests 2013, directed against corruption and nepotism in Bulgarian politics, Dzhabirov shot eleven videos, most of which rely on elements of aerial drone photography. In his statements on the video platform Youtube\(^3\), as well as in TV interviews\(^4\), Dzhabirov does not express any clearly defined political or party affiliation. He motivates his activities with the fundamental opposition and alienation between the political elite and the population.\(^5\) The videos were circulated via Youtube and other video sharing platforms, such as VBOX\(^6\). Dzhabirov’s declared intention was to monitor the protests, as a kind of alternative visual statistics, thus documenting the real dimensions of the protest marches and at the same time expressing his solidarity with the protesting people, as can be witnessed from one of his explanatory comments in his Youtube channel:

MaxMedia: We continue to document the protests from the air. Not for the media, not for the political parties or for money, but for the people, so that everyone can see the real scope of the protest. www.skymedia-bg.com\(^7\)

Aerial drone photography, as shall be shown in this case study, fulfills a variety of functions: It is a creative response to (real or assumed) media restrictions imposed by the State or oligarchy-governed mass media (Bulgaria is the lowest ranked country in the EU concerning freedom of the press, see Greenslade 2014). It is a means of alternative monitoring of protest movements intended to serve as a kind of complementary visual statistics when official and unofficial accounts of the number of protesters vary. Such usage of aerial photography as a means of alternative monitoring is evidently ambivalent, as it can be identically used for sur-

\(^2\) MaxMedia, according to the About section on the company’s homepage, is a joint venture of different companies, working in the field of media and PR, http://maxmediabg.com/about-company/. Within this consortium Skymedia.bg is specialized in the field of aerial photography with drones (survey of hardly accessible places; search of lost objects) or aerial advertisement with dirigibles (http://maxmediabg.com/skymedia/).

\(^3\) Each video posted on Youtube is accompanied by a short information indicating the date and the place where the video has been recorded as well as offering a personal statement by cameraman Iasen Dzhabirov.

\(^4\) See video No. 12 and 13 in Table No. 1 in the Appendix.

\(^5\) Such a non-party affiliated protest is typical for large parts of the protesters who deem all parties of the Bulgarian political system as either propagating their own interests instead of those of the society as a whole, or as being overtly corrupt (see Gueorguieva 2015, Krastev 2013).

\(^6\) http://vbox7.com. For an analysis of the videoportal and its significance for political communication in Bulgaria see Iordanova (2014).

\(^7\) ‘MaxMedia: Prodŭlţhavame da otraziavame protestite ot vŭzdukha. Ne za medii, partii ili pari, a za grazhdane, za da se vidi realnia mashtab na protesta. www.skymedia-bg.com.’ All commentaries, if not indicated otherwise, are cited from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Qs6HCBhpH6U. In an answer to a commentary Dzhabirov explains, that he works mostly on his own, although it is technically preferable to work in a team of two.
veillance of public protest by official institutions. Apart from ‘counting the crowd’ aerial drone photography, as maintained by the central argument of this article, contributes to shaping the self-image of the protesters since it offers a new perspective—in the literal sense—of contemporary protest crowds. Aerial drone photography and the circulation of its —often artistically estranged—representations of the crowd have entered the visual imagination of the protest movements. The bird’s perspective of aerial drone photography complements the ‘giant “public eye”’ (Szostek 2014: 9), formed by the myriads of smartphones, which report from ground, from within the crowd. Like the countless smartphone videos and selfies from the entertainment arenas and war sites alike, drone photography is popularised largely on the Internet and via the social media.

#resign [ostavka]: the Bulgarian protest year 2013

2013 saw a year of unprecedented civil protest in Bulgaria. For the first time since the transformation period of the 1990s, tens of thousands of people gathered on the streets and squares. Rallies were organised not only in the capital Sofia, but also in the regional metropolises, such as Plovdiv, Veliko Tărnovo, Varna in order to protest against the government and, in a more general sense, against politics deemed corrupt and serving the interest of mafia groups rather than the population living in economic dire straits. Although huge in number, lasting for months and having effectively lead to the resignation of two governments, the Bulgarian protests did not manage to get much attention worldwide, as well as within the European public sphere. Bulgaria lacks the geopolitical significance of Russia. It already belongs to the European Union, with the reputation of being its poorest member state. In popular opinion, it is seen as exporting poor working migrants, rather than disposing with a politically engaged population with a critical and creative civil society (Hewitt 2014). Protests, with some minor exceptions, did not involve bloodshed, as at the Maidan in Ukraine, and thus did not make it into the breaking news.

The Bulgarian protests of the year 2013 developed in two waves. The first wave from January to March, labeled the ‘anti-monopolist protest’, was largely motivated by issues of economic necessity. As a consequence of privatization in the energy sector, electricity prices soared and large parts of the impoverished Bulgarian population found themselves under the threat of being unable to pay for heating. Protest rallies took place in Sofia as well as in the regional centres gathering tens of thousands of participants. As a dreadful expression of total economic hopelessness a wave of self-immolations took place, following the tragic example of the Tunisian Tarek al-Tayeb Mohamed Bouazizi, who by burning himself gave rise to one of the first revolutions of the so called ‘Arab spring’. Between February and March 2013

---

8 Andrew Uroskie in his essay “‘Far Above the Madding Crowd’: The Spatial Rhetoric of Mass Representation’ describes how visual technology has been historically used for ‘counting crowds’, often perpetuating a notion of objectivity (Uroskie 2006: 307-309).
9 Previously, the year 1997 witnessed a protest movement of comparable scope. Protests at that time were motivated by severe financial crisis, hyperinflation and high living costs. The protests escalated in an effort to storm the parliament, put down by police forces and resulting in incidents of violence (Dawson 2014).
10 For an overview of the protests and their media coverage see Spasov (2014) as well as Smilov and Vaisova (2013).
eight cases of self-immolation were reported, five of them with a lethal outcome. Most of the self-immolators were men, among them young political and environmental activists, explicitly linking their self-destructive acts with a political agenda (Hannun 2013). Thus, the 36-year old, Varna born and based Pavel Goranov demanded political measures against the allegedly criminal economic corporation TIM (Khristova and Krustev 2014). As a reaction to these radical gestures of self-destructive social protest the central-right government headed by the GERB (Grazhdani za Evropeisko Razvitie na Bulgaria / Citizens for the European Development of Bulgaria) politician Boiko Borisov resigned. The early elections that followed in May 2013 resulted in forming a government, led now by the Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP), in coalition with the Turkish-ethnic party DPS (Dvizhenie za prava i svobodi / Movement for Rights and Freedoms) and supported by the nationalist party Ataka (Attack). Financial expert Plamen Oresharski (finance minister from 2005-2009 in a Socialist-led coalition), was elected as Prime Minister of this minority government.

The second wave of protest started in June 2013, when the newly elected government and its Prime Minister designated Delian Peevski, a lawyer and media manager, ‘considered a symbol of the shady power brokerage that has impoverished Bulgarians’ (EurActiv 2014), as chief of the State Agency for National Security (Dbirzhavna agentzia za Nacionalna Sigurnost DANS), which is the Bulgarian authority responsible for coordinating the campaigns against corruption. According to the public opinion, the newly elected government set a fox to keep the geese. People, disillusioned about the potential of the political system to reform itself, returned to the streets. Peevski as a result of the protests resigned, but the Oresharski government stayed in power. For weeks and months, ten of thousands of people continued to voice their protest and demands for a moral reorientation of politics on the streets. In October 2013 with the protests calming down, students from Bulgarian universities took over (see Junes 2013). The so-called Ranobudnite studenti [Early rising students] added a new dynamic to the decreasing protest movement, by staging actions like the occupation of central university buildings and occasional blockades of the Parliament (see Gueorguieva 2015). At the same time counter-protests supporting the Oresharski government took place. Counter-protesters were accused of being manipulated and paid. Such accusations of paid protest meanwhile have been constantly voiced by all involved players: Protests are allegedly supported either by the two big players in domestic Bulgarian politics, the GERB party and the Socialist party, and, on the geopolitical level, by two opposing global political powers, the US and Russia.\footnote{The country relies heavily on gas imports from Russia. Moreover, Bulgaria played a central role as a transiting country for the Russian pipeline project South Stream, which would have allowed Russia to supply its gas to Europe by circumventing Ukraine. While the BSP Socialist party with its communist past and historically strong ties supported South Stream, the conservative right party GERB with its pro-European position opposed it, and it was finally cancelled with the re-election of Boiko Borissov in early 2015. Similar conflicts surround the (re-)construction of the—only—nuclear energy plant in Belene, with the help and the financial support of Russian energy companies (Hope 2014). The alleged influence from the US and specifically the American patron and sponsor George Soros with his Open Society Institute, suspected of supporting regime change in the countries of the ex-Socialist bloc, is expressed in a prototypical way in a comment by user EYZEBIO to video No 4 (see table No 1 in the Appendix): ‘how many sheep ... shall Soros feed them :) ’ / ‘kolko mnogo ovce...soros da gi pase :).’ For the political context of such allegations see Ivancheva (2013).}
In November and December 2013, protests gradually faded away with the approaching winter and with regard to the steadfastness of the government, although the political situation remained volatile. The European Parliament elections in spring 2014 brought about severe losses for the ruling BSP Socialist party (see EurActiv 2014). Representatives from Protestna mreža [Protest network; a loosely institutionalized network of activists from the protest12] as well as from the GERB party, who won the highest number of votes, accused the Oresharski government of a lack of legitimacy. In July 2014 the Oresharski government finally resigned. The new elections on 5 October 2014 brought Borisov’s party, GERB, back to power, though without a sufficient majority.

The complicated story of the Bulgarian elections 2013/2014 reflects the complicated political situation in the country, which is grounded in a fundamental alienation between the general public and the political elites. This in turn impedes the formation of new political players, who would be able not only to challenge the existing formations, but to produce a new political agenda.13


Source: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=eslnJuSFp-U

But let me come back to the protest movement of the year 2013. The two waves of “anti-monopolist / anti-Borisov” and “anti-corruption / anti-Oresharski” protests were not only distinguished by their agendas and their actors, but also by their aesthetics and “protest performances” as well. While the first wave was seen to be motivated by existential social needs and expressed in individual gestures of self-sacrifice, the second wave was understood as

---

12 http://www.protestnamreja.bg: ‘BULGARIAN PROTEST NETWORK. It is a place and an instrument for self-organization of active citizens with their own position, protesting against any injustice, regardless of gender, race and political affiliation. PM is designed to be a corrective for any government.’

13 For an account of the dynamics of the Bulgarian protest movement see as well Krastev (2014a).
Henrike Schmidt

being characterized by ethical considerations and articulated through creative performances with high artistic appeal. Under the hashtags #ostavka [#resignation] and the more playful slogan #DANSwithme [an allusion to the Bulgarian acronym of the National Security Agency DANS], dancings and theatrical street performances were staged, often with participation of the students of the National Theatre Academy (NATFA).

The dichotomy between the protest waves and their labels as ‘poor and ugly’ (bedni i grozny) versus ‘beautiful and smart’ (krasivi i umni) sparked discussions in the Bulgarian media and among intellectuals (see Smilova and Vaisova 2013; Petrova 2014: 31-32; Ivancheva 2013). The ‘dancing’ revolution of the young and ‘beautiful’ is, on the one hand, interpreted in positive terms as the politicisation of the middle class, which is taking over political responsibility beyond its own economic needs. On the other hand, it is also seen as an egocentric endeavour into a new ethics while ignoring the basic needs of the economically weaker parts of the population. Additionally, the decidedly informal character of the Bulgarian protest movement was largely criticised as proving to be ineffective of initiating long-term changes (Georguieva 2015).

These patterns of interpretation remind of similar discussions concerning the protest movements in Russia and Ukraine\(^{14}\), or—on a more global scale—the uprisings of the Arab spring, being a ‘middle class’ project, promoting a new ethics while neglecting the basic needs of the lower social classes. Last but not least, they depend on middle class lifestyle gadgets as smartphones and social media literacy out of reach for the socially deprived parts of the population. The political scientist Ivan Krastev embeds the Bulgarian protests with all their local specificities into the global protest movements of the early 2010s:

\[
\text{What these vastly different protest movements have in common is that they trust neither the business or political elites. They captured the public imagination without bringing to life either a new ideology or charismatic political leaders. They will be remembered for videos, not manifestos; happenings, not speeches; conspiracy theories, not political tracts. (Krastev 2013, no page; see as well Krastev 2014a/b)}
\]

Such a public image and visual icon, which will be remembered of the 2010s global protest movements, is the view of the protesting mass as seen from above, from a bird’s perspective, turning the global protests into a global vision and generated with the help of aerial drone photography, as shall be demonstrated in the following analysis of a sample of protest videos.


\(^{15}\) For a different, more positive view on the apolitical nature of global protest see Manuel Castells’ Networks of outrage an hope: social movements in the internet age (2012).

*Source:* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2B8GFT0ycdg

**As seen from above: the usage of aerial drone photography in Sofia protests 2013**

**Video production and composition**

Between February and June 2013 *Youtube* user MaxMedia / Skymedia.bg uploaded thirteen videos onto the multimedia platform, documenting protest meetings in the Bulgarian capital Sofia. Eight videos are filmed using a remote controlled drone, equipped with a digital camera, and five of these videos feature a fisheye lens effect, with its typical distorting effects, discussed in more detail below. Two of the videos are related to the early protest cycle in spring, the so-called anti-monopole protests, while nine provide coverage of the mass protests in their most active period from June to July. Two further videos present documentary features originally broadcasted on Bulgarian National Television (BNT). User Max Media is Iasen Dzhabirov, a professional designer and photographer, working for the Skymedia agency, which produces aerial photography for commercial customers, with a special focus on sports events (racing), urban art (street art, skating) and urban aesthetics. The mission of the producer of the video clips MaxMedia, aka Iasen Dzhabirov, is expressed in the accompanying info on the platform. Every video is provided with a short, often very personal and always decidedly polemical statement. Dzhabirov strongly identifies with the agenda of the protest movement. In his mission statement cited above Dzhabirov underlines, that he works on his own initiative, without any political or commercial ‘order’. He understands his video coverage of the protests as a sort of alternative media coverage of the events, or even a form of counter-surveillance, intended to outweigh the unreliable coverage in the official media (see the programmatic title of video No. 8 ‘How many people were there on day 20th of the protest? I don’t know, here they are – they are many’). His mission statement and further
Explanations relate to discussions summed up in the previous chapters concerning ‘paid protest’ and interference or even manipulation of the protests by established political parties and players.

Aerial photography as such is nothing new. It developed parallel to the invention of photography, first with the help of balloons or kites, later using planes. But while aerial photography from a plane or today with the help of a satellite has been, regarding costs as well as technical complexity, restricted more or less to official or commercial players, easy-to-use and cheap UAVs nowadays potentially ‘democratize’ the view from above (Tremayne / Clark 2014: 233). Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, mostly drones or small hectocopters, are equipped with HD cameras producing photographs and videos from a bird’s perspective. They are controlled from the ground with the help of remote control devices and GPS technology:

A series of technological innovations lie behind these new devices, a lot of them developed for mobile phones and tablets. Improvements in battery technology now give drones greater power, lift, range and endurance. Cameras are now tiny and highly capable, and the chips that run them are both intelligent and fast. (Dunn 2013: 1240)

In a comment on his Youtube account, Dzhabirov estimates the cost for the drone and camera technology he is using at approximately 2,000 Bulgarian leva, that is $1,110. While being an impressive sum for the ordinary Bulgarian, with an average income in 2013 of 770 leva ($430, see novinite 2013), it is still extremely cost-saving if compared to the usage of heli-copters or even satellites.

The bird’s perspective of the drone is sometimes combined with the specific photographic effect of the so-called fisheye lens. Such ultra wide-angle lenses are employed to produce wide panoramic or hemispherical images. They are used since the 1920s, first for mainly scientific goals, for example in meteorology (Kingslake 1989). In the 1960s they gain massive popularity and since then their specific distorted appearance is valued as an artistic effect (Sweetow 2002: 85). Typical usages of fisheye technology include flight simulators, cinematic usages (IMAX), documentation of sports events (especially Skateboarding), as well as scientific usages in the field of geography. With regard to the documentation of protest movements, the usage of the fisheye lens is motivated on a pragmatic level through the need to include as much of the protesting mass and its environments into the picture as possible. The wider scope of the lens as a side effect leads to the typical distortion of the perspective, the curved lines and circular modes of representation. The circular shape in turn, I argue, suggests the crowd being part of a global, essential totality.


'ts pravena ramka e i poruchvani chasti. Leti s dve baterii okolo 10 min. na 1,5 km. ot distancionnoto. kǔm 2000u lv. e do tuka' / 'with a self-made frame and ordered prefabricated parts; flies with two batteries around 10 min at 1.5 km from the remote device; apr. 2,000 leva until now'. (Commentary to Video No 2, Table No 1 in the Appendix).

Regardless of the growing popularity of UAVs legislative regulation is in many countries still under way (Gonzalez 2014; Solmecke 2014). For Bulgaria, to my knowledge, in 2014 no legal regulations exist (see as well Economy.gb 2014, Ianeva 2014).

Source: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2B8GFT0ycdg


Source: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G0wm30s5_MY
**Image 5:** Aerial drone photograph with fisheye effect. Protest meeting in Sofia, 18 June 2013. Operator: Iasen Dzhabirov.

![](https://www.digitalicons.org/issue13/htt/www.youtube.com/watch?v=2B8GFT0ycdg)

*Source:* https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2B8GFT0ycdg

The Dzhabirov videos are on the average from four to six minutes long, with the shortest one being 30 seconds (in fast motion) and the longest one 16 minutes. The following analysis is based on the eleven original videos by MaxMedia, the two TV features and the 292 comments relating to the overall totality of videos 1-13. Although positioned by their producer Dzhabirov as documentaries giving visual evidence of the protests, the videos present artistically carefully composed clips. For example, in addition to the specific fisheye lens effect, ground level and aerial perspectives are constantly changed, with the camera moving from the faces of individual protestor to the entity of the protesting crowd as whole. The videos as well record the reactions of the protesters when confronted with the drone, their surprise, suspicious or playful approach and specifically their taking photos of the drone with their smartphones, thus engaging with the new technology.

---

19 For a detailed overview of the thirteen videos with regard to clicks, likes, commentaries and artistic composition see Table 1 in the Appendix.
**Image 6:** The ground level of local protest. Sofia protest rally with fisheye lens effect. 20 June 2013. Operator: Iasen Dzhabirov.

Source: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WjsLkq7dsAE

**Image 7:** Protesters photographing the drone operated by Iasen Dzhabirov. Sofia, 20 June 2013. Operator: Iasen Dzhabirov.

Source: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WjsLkq7dsAE

The video footage does not only picture the protest and its scope, or the protesters in their interaction with the new technology, but inscribes the protesting crowd into the wider urban context. The documented protest rallies take place in the center of Sofia, with the mass of protesters thus embedded into the urban landscape with its national and touristic landmarks.
(The St. Alexander Nevsky Cathedral, the Parliament, the St. Kliment Okhridski Sofia University, the Monument to the Tsar Liberator). The specific fisheye lens effect with its curved lines offers a spherical view of the city, as part of the globe with the protesting crowd at its center.


*Source: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vJnZv_llgCw*

Besides from the visual perspective and photographic technique (bird’s eye, fisheye lens, ground perspective, aerial perspective) the soundtracks of the videos contribute to their aesthetic functioning. Seven out of eleven videos offer the ‘original sound’ of the protest: slogans as the famous #ostavka (#resign), songs, short interviews. The other four clips, among them the most popular ones, are accompanied with music: the old Bulgarian anthem ‘Shumi Maritsa’ as well as popular Bulgarian folk songs and marches. Viewers often comment on the music and underline its specific emotional mobilization (Darina Marinova, Cveti Pavlova, vlazavlazal).^{20}

*User reactions to the videos on the Youtube platform*

The audience of the videos is quite homogeneous and shares a predominantly positive opinion of the protest. Only 10 percent of the roughly 300 comments are openly critical. The communicative style of most discussants is rather polite. Only a comparatively small number uses vulgar or aggressive language.

^{20} Delia Hallberg (2013) in her Bachelor thesis *Bulgarian national awakening in Europe. The protest movement in Sofia 2013* analyses the specific historical and mythological symbolism referred to in the #resign movement and comes to the conclusion, that the 19th century period of National revival is commonly referenced as the period of ‘real’, ‘authentic’ Bulgarian values (fight for freedom, enlightened patriotism).
Videos 1 to 6 are the most popular among the sample, while showing quite a specific dynamics. Approximately 11,000 users watched the first video, and the number doubled with the second one, attracting more then 26,000 clicks. The third clip receded to 4,200 views. The fourth video skyrocketed to more than 100,000 viewers, while the following ones dramatically lose viewer attention, ending up with a mere 500 or 600 users interested in ‘the music of protest’ on 12 July. The period of highest attention coincides not only with the early, euphoric phase of the summer protests, but also with the coverage of the Dzhabirov drone photography on TV, what supposedly generates the following hype of attention. If so, this would once again underline the significance of the interplay between ‘traditional’ media and online media and social networks. Another possible conclusion would be, that the videos are – contrary to the declared intention of their producer – perceived less as a daily alternative monitoring, but rather as an aesthetic artifact. It would then consequently be less important to watch all the videos, as they appear on the platform, but to participate in the discussion of the most popular or characteristic one.

Within these discussions, some central topics can be isolated. A significant number of comments relate to technological questions and legal regulations of aerial drone photography. Safety aspects are an especially important concern. Dzhabirov in his answers underlines, that official regulations in Bulgaria concerning the usage of UAVs are still lacking, probably due to the still limited usage of the technology in the country (see Economy.bg 2014), but that he is taking safety measures himself.\(^{21}\) The politics of protest are of course a main issue. Arguments in the sense of a clearly expressed political agenda/rationale are nevertheless rarely expressed. Reactions – quite typical for the social media in a broader sense – affirm or contest the protest, like or dislike it. A central question discussed among commentators is the capability of aerial drone photography to give an objective picture of the protests. Dzhabirov himself expresses a strong belief in the objectivity of the camera eye, as can be witnessed from his mission statement and commentaries cited above, a belief which is further strengthened by the specific elevated perspective from above, which anthropologically conveys a feeling of overview and orientation. The notion of objectivity and authenticity is voiced as well in some of the commentaries (italics mine):

Nikdesign: Bravo!!! This is what we needed! Authentic coverage, without manipulations, the real situation and the exact number of the protesters!!! Bravo, Iasen!!!\(^{22}\)

Andrew Uroskie in his essay on the ‘Spatial Rhetoric of Mass Representation’ describes the ‘trope of the “view from above”’ as the ‘modern equivalent of the god’s-eye view’ and shows, how the elevated perspective of the spectator from the sky from the turn of the 20th century until today affects our understanding of truth and authenticity, as ‘an ultimately de-
tached perspective that could separate fact from fiction, sort through the competing discursive claims, and establish a final metaphysical ‘truth’” (Uroskie 2006: 314, 327)

Other users at contrary contest such a notion and engage in critical discussions concerning the possibility of a correct visual account of protesters with the help of aerial footage. They do so on a pragmatic level – revising downward the number of protesters – and on a more conceptual level, denying principally the objectivity of visual evidence. Another line of argument in forum discussions focuses on the aesthetic appearance and perception of the protest (italics mine):

Anton Lozev: I watched some of the clips, very good, bravo!!!! :))) This way one can see how many people are there and the shots are very beautiful! Can you make a flight all along the protest march???? :)))

i4eee: How can anyone look at this without getting the goose bumps? ;x

LARI Namaste: Beautiful protest!

The emphasis on the specific beauty of the protest can be situated in the overall context of the protest movements of the early 21st century with creativity being one of the main resources of affects of mobilization. It coincides with Ivan Krastev’s argument cited earlier in this text, that these new protest movements are characterized by aesthetics and symbols, videos and happenings rather than by political manifestos and agendas.

The notion of the objectivity of the camera eye, on the one hand, and the appreciation of the specific beauty of the protest, which generates an effect of affective/emotional mobilisation, on the other, do not forcibly exclude each another. They rather mark the different poles of aerial drone usage as being a part of citizen journalism and counter surveillance on the one hand (objectivity) and the discourse of the revolt of the ‘smart and beautiful’ on the other hand (protest aesthetics as a mobilizing factor and identity marker).

The Bulgarian protests being part of the global resistance movements is another asset discussed among people watching the videos on Youtube. A significant number of users from other countries, who are active in the forum, express their solidarity and draw parallels between other protest movements in Syria, Turkey, Brazil or Russia. The idea of a global solidarity among the protesters is expressed clearly by Iassen Dzhabirov himself (italics mine, HS):

MaxMedia: I put an explanation in English in the clip info. Good luck to all of us. Things are changing everywhere on Earth. Now we have the power of instant free communication [sic]. They can't fool us any more.

---

23 See the comments by streetzford, George Alex, Alex Voikov to video No 1 (Table 1): streetzford: ‘So this is the protest of the thousands?! A turbo folk concert has a bigger audience :D’ / ‘E tova li e mnogokhiliadni protest ?? Na koncertite na Painer khodi povche hora :D’.
24 Anton Lozev: Izgledakh niakolko klipa ot protesta,mnogo dobri,bravo!!!! :))) Taka si lichi kolko mnogo khor-a ima i kadrite sa mnogo krasivi! Mozhetse li da napravite polet po dulzhinata na protesta???? :)))
25 ‘Kak da go gleda chovek tova i da ne nastruhne? ;x’
Juliet Yelverton: Very inspiring that hundreds of thousands of people in Turkey, Bulgaria and Brazil are now peacefully protesting, despite government violence, against injustice, inequality and corruption. I hope that the entire planet follows suit. Nothing can stand against the power of a true heart.

My argument here is that the idea of the ‘beautiful protest’ is purported on the level of visual technology by the specific combination of bird’s eye perspective and fisheye lens effect, generating a visually globalizing effect. This visual image in turn correlates with the idea of a global or even ‘planetary’ protest in the second decade of the 21st century. The textual tropes expressed in the comments coincide with the visual rhetoric of the videos.

“Face to face with themselves”: aerial drone photography and power discourses

Aerial drone photography thus combines two politically sensitive aspects: remote control of unmanned flying objects and visual technology. Both aspects can be related to theories of technology and control, power and representation. Aerial (drone) photography is currently discussed primarily in its relation to surveillance issues and the targeting of military goals, as in recent US American drone war (DeShaw Rae 2014, Dunn 2013, Enemark 2014, Gardner 2013). Paul Virilo has put this relationship in a kind of rhetorical shortcut, when he writes about the ‘deadly harmony that always establishes itself between the functions of eye and weapon’ (1989: 69).

Within this theoretical field of media theory and surveillance studies (see Hier and Greenberg 2009) and its political implications, Mark Tremayne and Andrew Clarke position the usage of unmanned aerial vehicles as oscillating between surveillance and sousveillance (understood as ‘observation from below’). Based on a qualitative study of aerial drone usage in the years 2010-2012 they come to the conclusion that the Do-it-yourself drones can contribute to a ‘democratization of surveillance’ (Tremayne / Clarke 2014: 233, referring to Kiss 2009). The authors portray drone usages in the US, France, Poland and Russia in their relationship to citizen journalism (and partly protest movements) and argue that they are able to revert Foucault’s panoptic gaze: ‘the watched become the watchers and the surveillance is synoptic’ (Tremayne / Clarke 2014: 233). The usage of drone photography in the Bulgarian #resign movement can clearly be placed in this context and be understood as such an act of deliberative sousveillance, which is—a nice paradox—technologically enacted by capturing the elevated viewpoint often assigned to the official authorities.

26 The relationship between (often initially military) technology, cultural communication and visual representation has been explored by thinkers as Walter Benjamin (Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit / The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction, 1936) and Siegfried Kracauer (Das Ornament der Masse / Ornament of the Masses, 1927), Paul Virilo (La guerre pur / Pure war, 1983; Guerre et cinema / War and Cinema, 1984/1991), Jean Baudrillard (La Guerre du Golfe n’a pas eu lieu / The Gulf War Did Not Take Place, 1991) and Friedrich Kittler (Grammophon Film Typewriter, 1986), just to name some.

27 For the connection of new media and sousveillance see as well Mann and Ferenbok (2013); Saint Amour (2011).

But aerial drone photography, I want to argue here, is effective as well in another, less pragmatic sense, in so far as that it conveys a picture of the protesting self, of the protesting crowd as a subject. The crowd on the ground perceives itself from within through its physical (co-)presence, as described by Elias Canetti in *Crowds and Power* (1984)\(^{29}\), but is unable to perceive itself as a whole without the help of technology. Walter Benjamin has described the specific interplay between the mass, representation and technology for the beginning of the 20\(^{th}\) century, when flight and camera technologies experienced a first period of rapid technological innovation\(^{30}\):

Mass reproduction is aided especially by the reproduction of masses. In big parades and monster rallies, in sports events, and in war, all of which nowadays are captured by camera and sound recording, the masses are brought *face to face with themselves*. This process, whose significance need not be stressed, is intimately connected with the development of the techniques of reproduction and photography. Mass movements are usually discerned more clearly by a camera than by the naked eye. A bird's-eye view best captures gatherings of hundreds of thousands. (Benjamin 1936, 1968: 251; italics mine, HS)

Andrew Uroskie in his already cited essay on the ‘Spatial Rhetoric of Mass Representation’ argues accordingly, that in the era of modernism the problem of the representation of the crowd stands for the problem of representation in general. The fact, that the crowd for its visual self-perception relies compulsory on an ‘elevated, distanced, detached position’, to Uroskie, means that this detached perspective on a psychological level is linked to the process of ‘identification and disidentification’ (Uroskie 2006: 315).\(^{31}\)

Aerial drone photography as presented in the case study of the Bulgarian #resign movement achieves the effect of bringing the masses ‘face to face with themselves’. At the same time they are enabled to perceive themselves as part of a global environment, a global movement. The bird’s eye perspective is the dialectical complementary to ground shooting and collective footage of protests and bottom-up manifestations multiplied by smartphone users, citizen journalists or amateur producers.\(^{32}\) In the protest videos shot by Dzhabirov both perspectives are constantly alternated, in the first instance for purely technological reasons: The batteries of the drone have a capacity of ten minutes, so that the UVA has to come down to the ground regularly in order to recharge. As a significant side effect, the combination of ground shooting and bird’s perspective leads to a constant oscillation between identification and disidentification, between immersion into the action on the street and a distanced gaze.

\(^{29}\) See Roberts (1996).
\(^{30}\) See as well Gospodinov (2005).
\(^{31}\) Fair and Parks (2001) as well draw attention to the fact, that the view from above does not only broaden the scope of attention, but that the specific vertical perspective shapes what and how we see, not only concerning natural phenomena, but crowds as well. Their case study is concerned not with protesting political crowds though, but with refugee camps. They stress how far the view from above can dehumanize and deindividualize the perception of the individual as well.
\(^{32}\) As Andrew Chapman has shown, such amateur video materials are also recently included into documentary films produced by professional artists and film directors in order to generate new modes of engagement with new media, politics and protest (see Chapman 2014).

Global visions of local protest: aerial drone photography in Bulgaria, Russia and Ukraine compared

Similar to the case of the Bulgarian #resign movement, camera equipped drones have been used in a variety of contexts and countries in order to document the political protest movements of the second decade of the 21st century, sometimes in the form of videos, and some-

33 In December 2011, when Stanislav Sedov was taking his “planetary views” of Russian protesters on Bolotnaia Square, the Occupy Wall Street protestor Tim Pool used a Parrot AR drone – wittily called the ‘Occucopter’ – in order to remotely access and film police-restricted areas. Pool posted his life-stream videos digitally on this personal Timcast TV (see Sharkey and Knuckey 2011, Culver 2014: 54). Aerial (counter-)surveillance with the help of drones is thus becoming a common activity for the monitoring of protest movements all around the world. Turkey’s Gezi Park movement and anti-government protests in Thailand in 2013 have been documented and ‘sousveilled’ in similar ways by different activists. The Gezi park protest, for example, has been videotaped by an activist with the nickname jenk 1907 as a form of counter surveillance, in opposition to the supposedly misleading and distorted representation of the protest in mainstream media (Occupy.com 2013). The photographs of the Thai anti-government protest in 2013, on the contrary, have been commissioned by the newspaper The Nation (Wongsatayanont 2013) – moving thus from individual drone activism, as in the case of Bulgarian drone photographer Iasen Dzhabirov, to professional drone journalism.

Source: http://rccam.livejournal.com/tag/Болотная%20площадь
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times in photographs. A famous photograph, which has been circulated on the internet during the political protests in Russia in the years 2011-2012, brings the typical combination of the bird’s eye perspective and the fisheye lens effect, as described above, to an extreme.

The photograph (image 9) has been taken by Stanislav Sedov, a professional photographer, working for the Russian non-commercial Internet platform Airpano, specialized in aerial photography, 3D panoramas and sferichnye snimki (spherical panoramas). Vlad Strukov has analysed the picture in his essay on ‘Networked Putinism’ and has shown how it works on a multiplicity of conceptual levels: It refers to the distortion of the political process in its mediated phase; it demonstrates the scale of the protest as well as the role of the ‘perspective’—whether photographic or political—in the framing of the events. Last but not least, the square is on the one hand portrayed as a globe, and at the same time, ‘the anthropomorphic effect of the image signifies the reflective, dualistic quality of the events whereby the observers are being observed by the very thing they aim to observe’ (Strukov 2012: 113). Sedov has taken another cycle of photographs from the Euromaidan protests in Kyiv in Winter 2013. The effect of the fisheye lens pushes the artistic effect here even further, when the photograph is once again transformed into a miniature globe in the literal sense, with the protests occupying the heart of the city, the country, the earth, with the Ukrainian Independence Column positioned right in the middle.

---

34 The evolution from photograph(y) to film is interpreted by Uroskie as equalling the fundamental opposition between stasis and motion, and as such it is intimately linked with the phenomenon of the crowd, always assembling and disassembling. To Uroskie throughout modernism the ‘problem of representing the crowd [was, HS] thus standing for the problem of representation as such’ (Uroskie 2006, 327).
35 Airpano produces and presents on its Internet platform panoramic views of scenic landscapes, architectural sites and contemporary megacities, from the Niagara Falls to the Pyramids of Gizeh, from the Russian Kremlin to the Isle of Kamchatka, from Moscow to Dubai. The Airpano project has been awarded in 2012 the Runet Award and has been since 2013 supported by the Russian Geographical Society, which is headed by President Vladimir Putin.
36 It is noteworthy in this sense, that Stanislav Sedov for his photographic series of the Bolotnaya protests cooperated with the Russian platform for citizen journalism Ridus (Ridus 2011). Sedov’s photographic Bolotnaya cycle made Ridus famous at the time, with about a million clicks within only a few days. The German weekly Die Zeit (Jagodin 2011) as well as Der Spiegel (Bidder 2011) reported on the initiative as an example of efficient alternative media coverage, using innovative technology as drones and hexacopters in order to overcome political restrictions. Russian journalists, as Irina Borogan and Andrey Soldatov (2012), at contrary suggested, that Ridus and his founder Varlaamov would work on state order and money from the Presidential administration. Ilya Shepelin in an article at Lenta.ru in 2013 states that Ridus.ru since then indeed has been transformed from an independent into an Orthodox-State oriented medium, with changes in the editorial team and the financial investors. And he tellingly uses the metaphor of the drone as unmanned flying object in order to illustrate the arcane nature of today’s media policies and mediated politics. After their initial publication on Ridus, the photographs were republished by numerous blogs and news outlets as well as on the Airpano website, from where they have since then been removed. At the moment of writing, the pictures are at least partially available in Sedov’s private blog: http://rccam.livejournal.com/tag/Болотная%20площадь.
37 I am grateful to Mariya Ivantcheva for drawing my attention to these photographs, which have originally been displayed at Airpano (http://www.airpano.ru/360Degree-VirtualTour.php?3D=Ukraine-EuroMaidan) but are recently unavailable and at display only in the photographer’s private blog: http://rccam.livejournal.com/tag/киса.


The (re-)presentation of the protests in Bulgaria, Ukraine and Russia by Dzhabirov and Sedov ‘as seen from above’, with the combined efforts and effects of bird’s perspective and fisheye lens, results—as I argue here—in a carefully constructed visual argument, placing the protesting crowd within its spatial dimensions. It portrays the protesting crowd as a social, in this case urban, phenomenon and at the same time as a phenomenon of almost natural power and grandeur. The protesting crowd is depicted as a global, even cosmic entity, evoking as a visual citation the ‘Blue Marble’, the famous photograph of the Earth, taken on 7 December 1972, by the crew of the Apollo 17 spacecraft. At the same time the ‘globalized’ images of the local protests allude to the anthropomorphic image of a head, thus giving the protests a human shape and an intellectual scope.

Towards the end of the year 2014, global protest entered its post-utopian stage: The “Arab spring” is seen as leading to a breakdown of totalitarian, but stable nation states in the Arab world, involuntarily promoted even the rise of terror regimes such as the Islamic State. The ‘Russian Winter’ did not have the power to change Putin’s politics of vertical power and has been followed by a new wave of neo-authoritarian rule and heightened suppression. The EuroMaidan successfully ended the Yanukovich rule, but was followed by economic crisis and – undeclared – war with Russia. From Brazil’s Movimento Passe Livre (Free Fare Movement) to the Turkish Gezi park protest, disillusion and disenchantment have taken
place. The same is true for the Bulgarian #resign protests, which managed to force two governments to step down. But political instability and economic crisis in the country still persist, with only a low level of post-protest institutionalization. Researchers as Valentina Gueorguieva diagnose a failure of the protests which neither succeeded to establish new political players nor a new morally-based ethics in Bulgarian politics, but instead led to a complete split up of the country into two opposing blocs, into a ‘black and white Bulgaria’ (Gueorgieva 2015: 46). It should not be forgotten either that aerial drone photography, detailed here in its use for citizen journalism, can also be employed as a means of surveillance by police and secret services.

The civil experience and new visual perspective of aerial drone photography—as I want to argue here—may nevertheless have a long lasting effect on the level of the public imagination. The new emerging technology and the visual effects it generates almost instantly inscribed themselves into the global protest imagination, as can be seen from a citation from an essay written by the Ukrainian author Andrij Ljubka:

> The most beautiful thing with these protests is, that we started to like ourselves. Finally we like our country, our people. Finally we believe that we can change something. [...] I am convinced that by the first signal, a million people will gather once again, the national anthem will be sung in the subway once again, the protest march will once again be so long, that even seen from above with a camera you will hardly be able to capture it. Here-in lies our strength. (2014: 21-22, translated from German, italics mine)

The new visual perspective is transformed into a semantic interpretation. The perspective is the message, to rephrase Marshall McLuhan’s (1964) famous dictum. The specific combination of the bird’s perspective and the fisheye lens, besides from pragmatic issues of counter-surveillance or sousveillance, intends and achieves effects of emotional mobilization and affective identification, generating a global vision of local protest as an ‘instance of subjectification’ of the protesting crowd (Uroskie 2006, 308).

References


http://www.digitalicons.org/issue13/henrike-schmidt/
toring 2013. Sofia: Fonatsia “Mediina demokratsia” v sūtrudnichestvo s fonatsia “Kon-

Ridus (2011, 10 December). ‘Fotografii moskovskogo mitinga “Za chestnye vybory” s vert-
toleta’ / ‘Photographs of the Moscow Meeting “For Fair Elections” from helicopter’. 

Roberts, David (1996). ‘Crowds and Power or the Natural History of Modernity: Horkhei-

photomosaic’. Theory, Culture & Society, December 2011 vol. 28 no. 7-8: 241-269, doi: 
10.1177/0263276411423938.

Sharkey, Noel and Sarah Knuckey (2011, 21 December). ‘Occupy Wall Street’s ‘occucopter’ 
– who’s watching whom?’ The Guardian. 
http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/cifamerica/2011/dec/21/occupy-wall-street-

Shepelin, Ilya (2013, 11 April). ‘Agenstvo pravoslavnoi zhurnalistiki’ / ‘Agency for Ortho-
dox Journalism’. Lenta.ru, http://lenta.ru/articles/2013/04/11/ridus/ (accessed 4 Dece-
ember 2014).

Smilov, Daniel and Lea Vaisova, eds. (2013). #PROTESTYT. analizi i pozitsii v bŭlgarskata 
presa – liato 2013 / #PROTESTS. Interpretations and positions in the Bulgarian press – 

Solmecke, Christian (2014, 18 February). ‘Civilian drones and the legal issues surrounding 
their use’. Wilde Beuger Somecke Rechtsanwälte Homepage. https://www.wbs-
law.de/internetrecht/civilian-drones-legal-issues-surrounding-use-50459/ (accessed 4 De-
cember 2014).

‘The year when information got crazy: Protests, elections, media’ in hashtagat sreshtu 
medite: Politicheskiat văskhod na socialnite mrezhi. Bŭlgarski medien monitoring 2013 / 
hashtag versus the media / The political rise of the social networks. The Bulgarian media 

Strukov, Vlad (2012). ‘Networked Putinism: The Fading Days of the (Broadcast) Era’. Di-
gital Icons: Studies in Russian, Eurasian and Central European New Media, 7: 111-123. 
http://www.digitalicons.org/issue07/files/2012/06/7.5.1_Strukov.pdf (accessed 4 Decem-
ber 2014).

Stuart, Allan and Einar Thorsen (eds.) (2009). Citizen Journalism: Global Perspectives. Vol-

Stuart, Allan and Einar Thorsen (eds.) (2014). Citizen Journalism: Global Perspectives. Vol-


### Appendix

**Table 1**: Videos devoted to the Bulgarian Protests 2013, published on *Youtube* by User MaxMedia | MXM Video | Skymedia (Iasen Dzhabirov)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Views</th>
<th>Likes / Unlikes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Artistic Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.02.2013</td>
<td>11.683</td>
<td>128 / 0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2:43 min; Aerial perspective, fisheye lens effect, background noise of the quadcopter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Protest sreshtu monopolite ot vŭzdukha Sofia</em> [Protest against monopolists from the air Sofia]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VnZv_lLgCw">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VnZv_lLgCw</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.02.2013</td>
<td>26.285</td>
<td>271 / 4</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4:00 min; Aerial perspective, fisheye lens effect, original sound track (recorded from ground)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Protest v Sofia ot vŭzdukha 17.2.2013</em> [Protest in Sofia from the air]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G0wm30s5_MY">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=G0wm30s5_MY</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.02.2013</td>
<td>4.277</td>
<td>13 / 1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7:47; hand-held camera, original sound track of the protest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Buntŭt v Sofia ot pŭrva linia 19.2.2013</em> [Riot in Sofia from the front line 19.2.2013]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xss4rzOZa60">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xss4rzOZa60</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Views</th>
<th>Likes / Unlikes</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Artistic Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.06.2013</td>
<td>100.358</td>
<td>824 / 10</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>2:20 min; Aerial perspective, musical arrangement, „Boiat nastana“ [The Fight begins], patriotic song based on a poem by Bulgarian classic writer Ivan Vazov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.06.2013</td>
<td>7.146</td>
<td>82 / 0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5:50 min; Aerial perspective, fisheye lens effect, original sound track, sounds of protest (songs, slogans), musical arrangement; “Shumi Maritsa” [Maritsa rushes], old Bulgarian national anthem (1886-1944)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.06.2013</td>
<td>7.128</td>
<td>62 / 2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5:23 min; Aerial perspective, fisheye lens effect, musical arrangement, “Viatür echti, Balkan stene” [Wind is rumbling, The Balkans are moaning], patriotic song from the National Revival period, based on a poem by Dobri Chintulov, “Tich bial Dunav“ [The Serene White Danube], patriotic Marsh from the National Revival Period, based on a poem by Ivan Vazov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.06.2013</td>
<td>3.818</td>
<td>36 / 0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18:19 min; Aerial and ground perspective, original sound track of the protest (songs, slogans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.07.2013</td>
<td>1.332</td>
<td>15 / 0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0:33 fast motion / time lapse (35 minutes real time), musical arrangement, “Vůrvi narode vůzrodeni” [March ahead, o revived people], patriotic song of the National revival period, author Stoian Mikhailovski (1892)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.07.2013</td>
<td>1.024</td>
<td>25 / 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5:35 min; hand-held camera; original sound track of the protest; interviews with protesters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Protest sreshtu mafiata i prestŭpnoto upravlenie den 5/ Fifth day of protests in Sofia [Protest against mafia and criminal government day 5] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2B8GFT0ycdg

Protest ot vůzduха den 7 – Sofia [Protest from the air day 7] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WjsLkq7dsaE

Protest ot vůzduха i zemiata den 9 - София / Protest in Sofia day 9 [Protest from the air and from the ground day 9] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=улт3E8JSKEI

Kolko khora imashe na den 20 ot protesta? Ne znam, eto gi – mnogo sa [How many people were there on day 20th of the protest? I don’t know, here they are – they are many] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W4SALE5rrXY

Den 25 protest v Sofia. Nai-mnogo 2-3000 choveka spored mediite [Day 25th of the protests in Sofia. At most 2-3000 people according to the media] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vRFbd8VfxFg
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