

CDDRL

WORKING PAPERS

Number 59
May 2006

Importing Revolution: Internal and External Factors in Ukraine's 2004 Democratic Breakthrough

Michael McFaul

Center on Democracy, Development, and The Rule of Law
Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies



This working paper was produced as part of CDDRL's ongoing programming on economic and political development in transitional states. Additional working papers appear on CDDRL's website:
<http://cddrl.stanford.edu>.

Center on Democracy, Development,
and The Rule of Law
Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies
Stanford University
Encina Hall
Stanford, CA 94305
Phone: 650-724-7197
Fax: 650-724-2996
<http://cddrl.stanford.edu/>

About the Center on Democracy, Development and the Rule of Law (CDDRL)

CDDRL was founded by a generous grant from the Bill and Flora Hewlett Foundation in October in 2002 as part of the Stanford Institute for International Studies at Stanford University. The Center supports analytic studies, policy relevant research, training and outreach activities to assist developing countries in the design and implementation of policies to foster growth, democracy, and the rule of law.

About the Author

Michael McFaul is the Director of the Center for Democracy, Development, and Rule of Law at Stanford University. He is also a Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution, an Associate Professor in the Department of Political Science at Stanford University, and a non-resident Senior Associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

3-17-06

Draft. Not for Citation.

**Importing Revolution:
Internal and External Factors in Ukraine's 2004 Democratic Breakthrough**

Michael McFaul

Presented at the conference
*Waves and Troughs of Post Communist Transitions:
What Role for Domestic vs. External Variables?*
Center on Democracy, Development, and the Rule of Law, Stanford University
28 and 29 April 2006

The fall 2004 Ukrainian presidential election triggered one of the seminal moments in that country's history. Initially, the campaign and election results resembled other tainted and fraudulent votes in semi-authoritarian regimes around the world. The incumbent president, Leonid Kuchma, and his chosen successor, Prime Minister Viktor Yanukovich, deployed all available state resources, national media and private funding from both Ukrainians and Russians to defeat opposition candidate, Viktor Yushchenko. When this effort to win the vote failed, Kuchma's government tried to steal the election, allegedly adding more than 1 million extra votes to Yanukovich's tally in the second round of voting held on November 21, 2004. In response to this perceived fraud, Yushchenko called upon his supporters to come to the "Maidan," the Independence Square in Kyiv, and protest the stolen election. First thousands, then tens of thousands, then hundreds of thousands answered his call. They remained on the square, with some living in a tent city on Khreshchatyk, Kyiv's main thoroughfare, until the Supreme Court annulled the official results of the second round on December 3, 2004, and set a date for the rerunning of the second round for December 26, 2004. In this vote, Yushchenko won 52 percent of the vote, compared to 44 percent for Yanukovich. Although most domestic and international observers declared this third round of voting to be freer and fairer than the first two, Yanukovich nonetheless contested the results in the courts but with no success. On January 23, 2005, the Supreme Court affirmed the validity of the December 26th vote, and Yushchenko took the presidential oath of office. The victors in this dramatic struggle memorialized this set of events by calling it the Orange Revolution.

These events in Ukraine inspired most people living in the free world. Ukrainian citizens stood together in the freezing cold to demand from their government what citizens in consolidated democracies take for granted: the right to elect their leaders in free and fair elections. But not all observers of Ukraine's "Orange Revolution" were so elated. Instead of democracy's advance, some saw a U.S.-funded, White House-orchestrated conspiracy aimed at undermining Ukrainian sovereignty, weakening Russia's sphere of influence and expanding Washington's imperial reach.¹ In reaction to the Orange Revolution, autocratic regimes in Belarus, China, Ethiopia, Kazakhstan, Russia, Uzbekistan, and Zimbabwe have initiated crackdowns on civil society organizations and further constrained the freedom to maneuver for independent political actors more generally.

What role did external actors and the United States in particular, play in fostering the factors that led to the Orange Revolution? An answer to this question is not only important as a factual response to the critics of the Orange Revolution. The case is also an important one to be studied by those interested in understanding how external actors can influence democratization. Tracing the causal impact of democracy assistance programs on the consolidation of liberal democracy is very difficult, since the process of liberal democratic consolidation is incremental, complex, and long-term. The Orange Revolution, however, is a defined, concrete outcome, which therefore can be more easily explained. This essay attempts to offer such an explanation, with special attention

¹ Jonathan Steele, Patrick Buchanan, Anatol Lieven, The Nation pieces, Chavez,

devoted to isolating the distinctive contributions to the Orange Revolution of programs funded by the U.S. Agency of International Development.²

To structure the analysis, this essays is organized as follows. Section one begins by characterizing the nature of the regime in Ukraine on the eve of the 2004 presidential elections. The argument in this section is that Ukraine’s semi-autocratic regime created the permissive conditions for the Orange Revolution to occur.

Section two then catalogues the proximate causes of the Orange Revolution: an unpopular incumbent, a successful opposition campaign, the ability to create the perception of a falsified vote, the means to communicate information about the falsified vote, the ability to mobilize masses to protest the fraudulent election, and sufficient divisions among the “guys with guns” to cast doubt about the success of repression. To this list of necessary conditions for success are then added three facilitating conditions: an independent parliament, a relatively independent Supreme Court, and a roundtable negotiating effort that included Yushchenko, Yanukovych, and Kuchma. After the importance of each of these proximate causes is identified, a discussion of the role of external actors and the United States in particular in facilitating the development of these factors follows.³

Section three pushes the story back one step further in the causal chain and analyzes the deeper, structural features that may have produced the proximate causes

² In focusing on the causes of the Orange Revolution, this essay does not assume that the struggle to consolidate liberal democracy in Ukraine is over. Such a claim would be absurd. Rather, the focus here is only to explain this one outcome, motivated by the more modest claim that the Orange Revolution or “democratic breakthrough” in Ukraine will have a positive impact on democratic development in Ukraine more generally.

³ To date, the inordinate focus on the American role is only a function of research completed. Further work requires a more full accounting of all external actors.

outlined in section two. Here the analysis focuses on broader, bigger variables such as economic growth, the rise of the middle class, the development of civil society more generally, and educated and informed electorate, and the role of ideas and culture. This section then also attempts to map the potential international contributions to the structural factors outlined. As this analysis is far removed from the actual events of the Orange Revolution, the conclusions are more suggestive of future research rather than definitive in making causal claims.

Section four concludes.

I. Semi-Authoritarianism as a Permissive Condition for Democratic Breakthrough

The literature on democratization contains several different arguments about the relationship between the kinds of autocracy on the one hand and the probability of successful democratic regime change on the other.⁴ Of course, all autocratic regimes are vulnerable to collapse at some point, but which kinds of autocracies are more vulnerable than others? To date, the debate has not been resolved. Some posit that semi-autocratic or competitive authoritarian regimes better facilitate democratization than full-blown

⁴ Juan Linz, and Alfred Stepan, *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996). Jeane Kirkpatrick, *Dictatorship and Double Standards: Rationalism and Reason in Politics* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982).

dictatorships.⁵ Others argue that semi-autocracies or partial democracies actually impede genuine democratization to a far greater degree than more rigid autocracies because liberalized autocracies can partially diffuse societal pressures for change and thereby avoid regime collapse more effectively than more rigid dictatorships.⁶ Scholars also disagree about which autocratic institutional arrangement is most conducive for political liberalization.

To this debate, Ukraine offers confirming evidence that semi-autocracy, competitive autocracy, or partial democracy can be conducive to democratic breakthrough. These are regimes in which the formal rules of democracy and especially elections were never suspended and competition, to some degree, still mattered.⁷ They are also regimes in which some political institutions and organizations had some autonomy from the autocratic ruler. This particular regime type allowed pockets of pluralism and opposition within the state, which proved critical to democratic breakthrough.

In Ukraine, President Leonid Kuchma constructed a semi-autocratic or semi-democratic regime, which was neither a full-blown dictatorship nor a consolidated democracy. Kuchma aspired to construct a system of “managed democracy” – formal democratic practices, but informal control of all political institutions -- similar to Putin’s

⁵ Michael McFaul, “Transitions from Postcommunism,” *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 16, No.3 (July 2005), pp. 5-19.

⁶ Daniel Brumberg, “Liberalization versus Democracy,” in Thomas Carothers and Marina Ottoway, eds., *Uncharted Journey: Promoting Democracy in the Middle East* (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2005) pp. 15-36.

⁷ On this regime type, see Larry Diamond, “Thinking about Hybrid Regimes,” *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 13, no. 2 (April 2002), pp. 21–35; and Steven Levitsky and Lucan Way, “The Rise of Competitive Authoritarianism,” *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 13, no. 2 (April 2002), pp. 51—65

in Russia. But the Ukrainian president never achieved as much success as his Russian counterpart.⁸ Because Kuchma in his second term never enjoyed the overwhelming public support that Putin garnered in the first years of his rule in Russia, the Ukrainian president was more constrained when trying to limit political autonomy and opposition. In addition, Kuchma's inept and blunt attempts to squelch opposition voices – be it his alleged collusion in ordering the murder of journalist Giorgy Gongadze, his jailing of former energy minister Yulia Tymoshenko, or his dismissal of the successful and popular Prime Minister Viktor Yushchenko – served to mobilize even greater opposition. This societal response to bad and autocratic government is what most distinguishes Ukraine from its Slavic neighbors. The “Ukraine without Kuchma” campaign from December 2000-March 2001 and the results of the March 2002 parliamentary elections demonstrated that Ukrainian society was active and politically sophisticated. Especially after the electoral success of Our Ukraine in the 2002 parliamentary vote, Ukraine's opposition also had a foothold in an important institution of state power. As discussed below, a Rada speaker not totally loyal to the president, and opposition representation within the Rada, proved to be critical factors in diffusing the political stalemate during the Orange Revolution. Finally, Ukraine's business tycoons or oligarchs were not completely united by the *ancien regime*.⁹ Ukraine's three largest oligarchic groups did back Kuchma and wielded their media and financial resources on behalf of Kuchma's

⁸ Michael McFaul, Nikolai Petrov and Andrei Ryabov, *Between Dictatorship and Democracy: Russian Post-Communist Political Reform*, (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2004).

⁹ Anders Aslund, “The Ancien Regime: Kuchma and the Oligarchs,” in Anders Aslund and Michael McFaul, *Revolution in Orange: The Origins of Ukraine's Democratic Breakthrough* (Washington: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2006), pp. 9-28.

candidate in the 2004 presidential election, but significant if lesser oligarchs did decide to back Yushchenko, as did tens of thousands of smaller business people, meaning that Ukraine's economic elites were divided, not united in the fall of 2004. The regime, in other words, had elements of competition and pluralism, which created the space for the mobilization of an effective democratic, opposition.

II. The Proximate Causes of the Orange Revolution and External Facilitators of these Causes

In this case of democratic breakthrough, there are several necessary factors *necessary* for success. None were external actors. Ukrainians made the Orange Revolution. This obvious observation cannot be stressed enough. Equally as important, for almost all external actors involved in Ukraine, there was not an explicit goal to foster "revolution." Rather, the focus for most Western organizations was to make the 2004 presidential election as democratic as possible and/or to promote democratic development more generally. It is difficult to assign credit (or "guilt", depending on one's perspective) to an actor for an outcome if that actor was not seeking to achieve that outcome. At the same time, external factors did influence -- both positively and negatively -- the ability of Ukrainians to make the Orange Revolution successful.¹⁰

¹⁰ The Kremlin coordinated and sponsored various activities aimed at helping Yanukovich win the election and create the impression that he won the election. At the urging of the Kremlin, Russian businesspeople contributed to Yanukovich's campaign, Russian PR consultants worked for several factions within the Yanukovich campaign, and Putin personally traveled twice to Ukraine in the fall of 2004 to help Yanukovich. The Ukrainian prime ministers and his financial backers also hired American law firms and

1. Unpopular Leader and Unpopular Regime

An unpopular regime was a necessary condition for democratic breakthrough in Ukraine in the fall of 2004. This factor may seem obvious, but it also a feature that distinguishes these cases from countries such as Russia where President Putin is still popular, or countries like Mexico during the heyday of semi-authoritarian rule when the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) could manufacture electoral victories without major voter fraud.¹¹

Leonid Kuchma won presidential elections in 1994 and 1999, which were judged to be relatively free and fair by the standards of the region. Moreover, during Kuchma's second term in office, Ukraine witnessed record economic growth, reaching a 12% increase in GDP between 2003 and 2004. However, high levels of corruption in Ukraine denied Kuchma the popular support that twelve percent growth should have generated for him. When asked on the eve of the 2004 presidential vote, only 8.4 percent of Ukrainian voters assessed Kuchma's tenure in a positive manner, while 62.2 percent gave him a negative assessment.¹² Kuchma's unwillingness to fight corruption was a central factor

public relations specialists to help with the campaign, including Barbour, Rogers, and Griffith and DBC Public Relations Experts. A Russian-sponsored election-monitoring group also observed the Ukrainian vote and declared the first and second round free and fair. Due to space constraints, however, anti-democratic external actors are not fully examined here. See Petrov and Ryabov, ???, in Aslund and McFaul, eds., *Revolution in Orange*, pp.

¹¹ Get cite from Diaz.

¹² Razumkov Centre Sociological Survey as reported in "2004 Presidential Elections: How Ukrainians Saw Them," *National Security and Defence*, No 10, 2004, p. 19.

driving his unpopularity, but another important factor in his low public approval ratings had to do with the murder of journalist Giorgy Gongadze, the founder of the internet publication, *Ukrainskaya Pravda*. Tapes of conversations between Kuchma and subordinates leaked to the press strongly suggested that the Ukrainian president played a role in ordering Gongadze's execution. More than any other single event, Gongadze's murder exposed the illegitimacy of Kuchma and his allies.

Kuchma's failures as a president could only adversely affect the popularity and legitimacy of his regime if his actions were communicated in some way to the voters. Any media reporting, think tank publication, Our Ukraine press release, or parliamentary hearing that provided an objective analysis of the Gongadze affair or corruption played some role in decreasing popular support for the Kuchma regime. During the campaign period itself, several civic groups took direct aim at Kuchma in their GOTV publications and activities. Black Pora organized the most famous of these anti-Kuchma campaigns, called "Kuchmizm"; Yellow Pora pushed the slogan, "Time to understand – they lie".

Kuchma was not running for office in 2004, but his handpicked presidential candidate, Prime Minister Yanukovich, did little to inspire hope for a break with past corrupt practices. Yanukovich was a convicted criminal, who still maintained ties with criminal circles in his hometown region of Donetsk. Had Yanukovich become president, it is not at all certain that he would have maintained the delicate equilibrium between Kuchma's presidential office, the parliament, and the oligarchs. Yet, among voters, he was perceived as the candidate who would preserve the status quo, not change it.

In the rerun of the second round of the presidential election held on December 26, 2004, Yanukovich captured more than 44 percent of the popular vote. This significant

level of support reflects both the success and limits of the Yanukovich's campaign strategy. The prime minister and his campaign consultants deliberately tried to accentuate ethnic and regional divisions within Ukraine, mobilizing the Russian-speaking voters in the East against the Ukrainian-speaking supporters of Yushchenko in the West.¹³ In large measure, although aided of course by fraud, the campaign strategy worked. For instance, in the eastern regions, Yanukovich won smashing victories in the December round of voting in a few eastern regions, winning 93.5% of the vote in Donetsk, 91.2% in Luhansk, and 81.3% in Crimea. Conversely, in the Western regions of Ternopil, Ivan-Frankivsk, Lviv and Volyn, Yanukovich failed to break into double digits. However, this strategy of fostering regional polarization did not help Yanukovich win votes in the center of Ukraine, including Kyiv, which swung decidedly toward the challenger, Yushchenko. In the capital, for instance, Yushchenko won 71.1% of the vote, compared to 17% for Yanukovich. Given the economic boom underway throughout Ukraine in 2004, but especially in Kyiv, this strong popular support for change suggests a deep, genuine rejection of the regime constructed by Kuchma in the 1990s.

External Facilitators of an Unpopular Ancien Regime

Kuchma's own actions and an independent media monitoring and reporting on these actions contributed most directly to the decline in popularity of his government. Indirectly, and though difficult to document, Western reactions to Kuchma's behavior did

¹³ Author's interview with Mikhail Pogrebinsky, Director of the Kiev Center for Political Studies and Conflictology, November 2005.

contribute to his image as an illegitimate and criminal leader. Most importantly, Bush Administration officials strongly denounced the manner in which Kuchma handled the investigation into Gongadze's murder.¹⁴ When Oleksandr Moroz released tapes implicating Kuchma in Gongadze's murder, the U.S. government granted the producer of these tapes, Yuri Melnichenko, asylum. Miroslava Gongadze, Gongadze's widow, as well as his two children, also received asylum. After the murder, the Bush administration never invited Kuchma to the United States, and tried hard to avoid and marginalize Kuchma at international gatherings. For instance, at a NATO meeting to which Ukraine was invited, U.S. government officials deliberately requested that the French spelling of countries be used so that Bush would not have to sit next Kuchma. The Bush Administration further downgraded contacts with the Kuchma regime after it became known that the Ukrainian government had tried to sell its Kolchuga air defense radar system to Iraq.¹⁵ Kuchma did receive some praise from the White House for his decision to send Ukrainian troops to Iraq. However, the general message coming out of Washington and the American embassy in Kyiv was that Kuchma and his regime were not held in high regard.

As already stressed above, media reporting, think tank publications, Our Ukraine press releases, and parliamentary hearings that provided an objective analysis the Gongadze affair or corruption played some role in decreasing popular support for the Kuchma regime. This list of critical sources of reporting on the Kuchma regime included several organizations that received Western technical assistance or financial support,

¹⁴ Pascual.

¹⁵ Michael Wines, Report of Arms Sale by Ukraine to Iraq Causes Consternation, *New York Times*, November 7, 2002

including *Ukrainskaya Pravda*, the Razumkov Center, and the Rada.¹⁶ Freedom House provided direct assistance to Znayu and indirect assistance to Yellow Pora and the Freedom of Choice coalition, by sponsoring and helping to organize a summer camp for Yellow Pora activists (as well as for activists from other organizations). Another USAID grantee, the U.S.-Ukraine Foundation, funded and organized the major portion of the Znayu campaign. Indirectly, all of these efforts contributed to more critical coverage of the Kuchma regime and a lowering, therefore, of his government's popularity.

In addition, independent analysis and reporting from these sources helped to inform US government officials and analysts, who in turn influenced the way that their own government perceived Kuchma.¹⁷ For instance, an article about corruption would be published in *Ukrainskaya Pravda*, which would be read by an analyst at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in Washington, who in turn might speak out on television, in the op-ed pages, or briefings to government officials about corruption in Ukraine, and thereby influence the way that the Bush Administration or the U.S. Congress thinks and acts on Ukraine. Such information flows also influenced Ukraine's Freedom House scores, which in turn helped to shape Western assessments of the Kuchma regime. This pattern in the trajectory of media influence is regularly observed during the last years of the Kuchma administration. Ukrainian publications, which had the resources to translate a portion of the work into English, including *Zerkalo Nedelya*,

¹⁶ The Indiana University Parliamentary Development Project facilitated the development of professional hearings within the Rada, which in turn helped to generate information about corruption within the Kuchma government.

¹⁷ This is the boomerang effect discussed in Sikkink,

Ukrainskaya Pravda, and Razumkov's journal, *National Security and Defence*, were especially effective in reinforcing US campaigns to expose Kuchma's illegitimacy. During the final weeks of the campaign and then during the Orange Revolution, emails sent and websites operated by the CVU, Pora, Our Ukraine, Internews-Ukraine, and several others also helped to inform the outside world about the machinations of Kuchma and Yanukovich.

2. Organized Opposition

A strong and well-organized opposition – or the perception of a united front – was a second precipitating factor crucial for democratic breakthrough in Ukraine in the fall of 2004. In the previous decade, Ukraine's democratic forces had struggled with division and disorganization. Opposition unity was complicated by the presence of strong and legitimate Socialist Party, which made cooperation with Ukrainian liberals difficult. For many years, there also was not a single, charismatic leader of the opposition who stood out as an obvious first among equals with the sufficient wherewithal and political cache to unite the opposition and rally public support. Ironically, Kuchma helped to create such a leader when he dismissed Viktor Yushchenko as his prime minister in 2001. At the time, Yushchenko cut an image of a technocratic economist, not a stump politician. Those who knew him best did not believe that he had the drive or temperament to become a national political leader. But he was a popular prime minister with a record of achievement while in office and an image of not being corrupt, making him a dangerous opponent to the party of power.

The first critical step for forging a united front was the 2002 parliamentary election, which in effect acted a primary for aspiring presidential candidates. To participate in these elections, Yushchenko succeeded in creating a new electoral bloc, Our Ukraine, which captured a quarter of the popular vote in the 2002 parliamentary elections. Our Ukraine's success in 2002 made Yushchenko the focal point of a united front for the presidential election in 2004. Most importantly, Yulia Tymoshenko – an opposition leader with more charisma than Yushchenko but also more baggage—agreed not to run independently for president, but instead backed Yushchenko.¹⁸ Socialist Party leader Alexander Moroz did decide to participate in the presidential vote, but won only 5.8% in the first round, after which he quickly endorsed Yushchenko for the second round.

Unity behind a single candidate, especially after the first round, was an essential ingredient for electoral success in 2004 for Ukraine's opposition. Without electoral victory in the second round of the presidential election, there would have been no Orange Revolution. Beyond acknowledging the importance of unity behind a common candidate, however, assessing the relative salience of other ingredients for Yushchenko successful electoral campaign is more difficult. The second round of the vote essentially became a polarized referendum on the *ancien regime*.¹⁹ Compared to parliamentary votes, presidential elections with runoffs are structurally polarizing in that they force voters to make a choice between two candidates. But this election was especially polarized, as it was not so much a contest between opposing campaign promises about

¹⁸ Interview with Tymoshenko, February 2006.

¹⁹ Compared to parliamentary votes, presidential elections with runoffs are structurally polarizing in that they force voters to make a choice between two candidates.

the future but a referendum on the past performance of Kuchma and his regime.²⁰ As already mentioned, the vote was polarized first and foremost along geographic lines. The most robust predictor of voting behavior in the second (and third) round of voting was not age, education, wealth, or the rural-urban divide, but geographic location: the farther west one lived, the more likely one supported Yushchenko, while the farther east one lived, the more likely one supported Yanukovich.²¹

Therefore, while always difficult to trace in normal elections, measuring the causal impact of campaign messages and techniques in this election is particularly difficult. In *normal* elections, the success of a campaign is measured by assessing the deployment of campaign assets such as effective party organization, the personal appeal of the candidate, targeted messages, and the financial resources to pay for national television airtime, campaign staff, leaflets, and get-out-the-vote activities.²² Without question, Yushchenko and his campaign staff deployed these kinds of resources in a manner sufficient to win in 2004.

By 2004, Our Ukraine had developed into a national organization, with party representatives throughout the country, even if its local party organizations were much weaker in the east than the west. The organizational reach of Our Ukraine was deeper than any other pro-reform political organization in Ukraine since independence.

²⁰ Morris Fiorina, "Economic Retrospective Voting in American National Elections: A Micro-Analysis," *American Journal of Political Science* 22 (1978): 426-443

²¹ Razumkov Centre Sociological Survey as reported in "2004 Presidential Elections: How Ukrainians Saw Them," *National Security and Defence*, No 10, 2004, p. 9. See also Taras Kuzio, ???, in Aslund and McFaul, *Revolution in Orange*.

²² For an attempt to measure these variables in a Russian electoral cycle, see Timothy Colton and Michael McFaul, *Popular Choice and Managed Democracy: The Russian Elections of 1999 and 2000*, (Washington: Brookings Institution Press, 2003).

Yushchenko was not a fiery campaigner. But in electoral terms, he had a very appealing biography, including his birthplace and work experience, an impeccable reputation for not being corrupt (despite having worked for Kuchma for many years), and a handsome appearance. His enemies ruined his physical appearance when they poisoned him in September 2004; but this event, however painful and tragic for Yushchenko personally, did help to bolster his appeal as a tough and embattled candidate.

After the Orange Revolution, it seems as if no other leader could have united the opposition and toppled the regime. But this “fact” only seems obvious after success. The pivotal role of Yushchenko as an individual is not easy to discern.²³ Only months before victory, several leaders within the Ukrainian democratic movement questioned whether Yushchenko had the political and campaign skills to win.²⁴

Regarding messages, Yushchenko on the campaign trail did not push a comprehensive agenda of policy changes.²⁵ Rather, his campaign messages attempted to cast the vote as a choice between two different systems of governments, one which corrupt, authoritarian, and criminal, and his regime which would be “for the truth,” “for freedom,” and “for our rights.” Printed and broadcast campaign messages explicitly stated that he and his team were “against the bandits in power,” yet Yushchenko personally tried to keep his own speeches positive. The use of the word Tak!, (Yes!) and

²³ On the misplaced emphasis on leaders more generally in such situations, see Kurt Schock, “Nonviolent Actions and Its Misconceptions: Insights for Social Scientists,” *PS: Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 36, No. 4 (October 2003) pp. 705-712.

²⁴ Author’s interviews with Our Ukraine campaign officials, November 2005.

²⁵ Of course, he did have a program, including a list of presidential decrees that he promised to enact should he be elected. These actions of the future, however, were not emphasized. For instance, after the election, two thirds of the electorate reported that they had never heard about these decrees. See Razumkov Centre Sociological Survey as reported in “2004 Presidential Elections: How Ukrainians Saw Them,” *National Security and Defence*, No 10, 2004, p. 10.

the color, orange, were positive symbolic images. Detailed statements about policy changes were not used. To the extent that a negative message developed, it was to say *enough* of the current regime.

Geographically, the Yushchenko campaign concentrated on the center of the country. In contrast to both the far west and far east, campaign officials believed that these regions, including Kiev, were home to Ukraine's swing voters, that is voters who may have voted for Kuchma in the past but could be persuaded to vote against his candidate and his regime after a decade in power.

Voter mobilization was also a factor in Yushchenko's success. In the second round of the presidential elections, voter turnout reached an amazing 80.4%; in the rerun of the second round (the third time Ukrainians were asked to go to the polls that fall), turnout was still very high, 77.2%. The Yanukovich and Yushchenko campaigns both devoted serious resources to get-out-the-vote activities. In addition, several non-government organizations made voter participation a central focus of their fall 2004 activities. NGO leaders and party activists interviewed by the author singled out the Znayu campaign (supported by the U.S.-Ukraine Foundation and Freedom House) in particular as the most extensive, non-partisan effort to get out the vote.²⁶ Black Pora, Yellow Pora and its closely affiliated Freedom of Choice Coalition, and the Committee of Ukrainian Voters (CVU) also organized extensive get-out-the-vote campaigns, while groups such as Internews-Ukraine, the Center for Ukrainian Reform Education, Freedom House, and ABA/CEELI placed public service announcements on television educating

²⁶ This essay is informed by over a 100 interviews done mostly in Ukraine in March 2005, November 2005, and February 2006, listed in Appendix One. But I did not have the time before this conference, to systematically cite these interviews in the appropriate places in the text. This will be forthcoming.

Ukrainian voters about their electoral rights, which indirectly was also a method for increasing voter turnout.

It is often asserted that those more democratically inclined are more likely to vote. However, the role that democratic ideas played in mobilizing voters (for either candidate) is not easy to determine. In several interviews conducted by the author, several Yushchenko supporters claimed that his electorate was more enthusiastic supporters of democratic ideas than Yanukovich supporters. The hypothesis seems plausible, but difficult to prove.

External Facilitators of an Effective Opposition

Assessing the role of external actors on the formation of an effective opposition in Ukraine is a most difficult task, in part because of the nature of the work and in part because of the sensitivity of the work. The nature of the work is difficult to evaluate because the process of making an impact occurs over extended periods of time, indirectly, and in parallel with many local inputs. The transfer that takes place between groups like the International Republican Institute (IRI) and the National Democratic Institute (NDI) on the one hand and Our Ukraine on the other is essentially one of ideas and know how, the most difficult variables to trace systematically. Assessing this work is sensitive, because Ukrainian actors do not want to taint their reputations or legitimacy by reporting that Western actors contributed to their domestic success, while Western actors want to protect their partners and also maintain a claim of acting as non-partisans. With

these huge constraints recognized, several observations about the role of external actors on the development of Ukraine's opposition coalition can still be made.

First, there is no evidence that NDI, IRI, or any other American NGO supported by USAID contributed financial resources directly to the campaign of Viktor Yushchenko and Our Ukraine.²⁷ Claims to the contrary are based on false information or political motivations. Our Ukraine did receive financial contributions from citizens living in the United States and Canada, though the greatest source of foreign funding for the Yushchenko campaign came from Russia. (Yanukovych also received financial support from abroad, including first and foremost, Russia). The Yushchenko campaign hired American and Russian campaign consultants; Yanukovych also hired Russian *and* American consultants. No US government group paid for the professional public relations specialists hired by Yushchenko.²⁸

As discussed above, the Our Ukraine campaign had greater organizational reach than any other party in Ukraine. Our Ukraine leaders accomplished this feat primarily on their own through years of hard work. At the same time, Our Ukraine political leaders reported that the development of their organizational capacity benefited from years of close relationships with the National Democratic Institute and the International Republican Institute.²⁹ Well before the formation of the Our Ukraine Yushchenko bloc in

²⁷ Authors' interviews with IRI and NDI officials and Our Ukraine campaign organizers

²⁸ Aristotle International did some work for the Yushchenko campaign. The head of NDI's office in Kyiv, David Dettman, used to work for Aristotle International. In the 2006 parliamentary election, however, this company worked for Kuchma's former chief of staff, Viktor Medvedchuk. Likewise, Yanukovich and his Party of Regions dumped the Russian consultants for the 2005 contest and hired one of the Washington's most prominent Republican firms, Davis Manafort, which had previously worked for Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush. See Jeremy Page, "Revolution is reversed with a little spin from the West," *The Times*, March 28, 2006.

²⁹ Interviews with Stetskiv; Katarynchuk.

2002, IRI and NDI also worked closely with many of the individuals who later assumed senior positions in the Our Ukraine organization and campaign. After the creation of the party, NDI and IRI provided additional party training assistance, though using different strategies. IRI conducted multi-party training programs focused almost exclusively on regional party leaders outside of Kyiv. NDI provided trainers to programs organized by Our Ukraine, a service they provided to other parties as well. In contrast to IRI, NDI staff also focused more of their efforts at working with Our Ukraine's senior leadership in Kyiv. The close ties between NDI staff and senior Our Ukraine leaders were apparent during interviews conducted with Our Ukraine officials. Measuring the results of these interactions, be it NDI's engagement with senior party officials or IRI regional training efforts, was simply beyond the scope of this study.

In other countries, NDI and IRI have helped their counterparts develop campaign techniques, providing technical assistance for everything from how to conduct a focus group, to how to make television ads. IRI and NDI most certainly did provide these kinds of technologies to party organizers in Ukraine at some stage in Ukraine's transition from communism. By the time of the 2004 presidential campaign, however, Our Ukraine leaders had constructed an experienced and professional team of campaign experts. In the expert community, no one interviewed for this project was particularly impressed with the components of Our Ukraine's campaign, but as discussed above, clever slogans, well targeted messages, or slick television ads were less important in the campaign than in normal elections because this vote was more a referendum about regimes types than a contest of ideas, platforms, or even personalities. Nonetheless, no one believes that Our

Ukraine ran a truly bad campaign and some innovations, like the color orange, were striking. (By contrast, no one could explain the importance of the horseshoe as a symbol, though it was pervasive in all Our Ukraine materials).

Indirectly, both NDI and IRI also helped to increase the respectability of Yushchenko in Washington. IRI organized a trip to Washington for Yushchenko and his senior staff in February 2003, at which time the Ukrainian presidential candidate met with key Bush administration officials and members of Congress, including Senator Lugar who would eventually play a key role in helping to undermine US endorsement of the second round result of the 2004 vote. Former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, chair of NDI's board, traveled to Ukraine in February 2004 to meet with Yushchenko and other Our Ukraine officials. Upon her return to Washington, she also spoke favorably about Yushchenko as a candidate. These kinds of contacts helped to assure the Bush Administration that the Ukrainian opposition was viable and worth supporting – a reputation that other opposition movements have failed to nurture in similar pivotal elections (i.e., in Azerbaijan in the fall of 2005).

Forging the Our Ukraine coalition was a difficult feat that did not survive the Orange Revolution. NDI staff seemed particularly involved in helping to maintain the coalition during the 2004 campaign (as NDI had been involved in a similar effort in Serbia in 1999). Measuring the impact of such efforts, however, is nearly impossible or to date, beyond the analytic skills of this author.

Turnout in regions supportive of Yushchenko were much higher in this election than in previous elections. Several American organizations, including IRI, NDI, Freedom

House, Internews, and the Eurasia Foundation contributed directly and indirectly to get-out-the-vote projects organized by their Ukrainian partners.

3. Creating the Perception of a Falsified Vote

A third condition critical to success of the Orange Revolution was the ability of non-governmental organizations to provide an accurate and independent account of the actual vote quickly after polls had closed. While several organizations, including international groups, monitored the vote count, the Committee of Ukrainian Voters (CVU) played the central role in monitoring all rounds of the 2004 presidential vote. CVU also conducted a parallel vote tabulation during all three rounds. Yushchenko's party, Our Ukraine, also tried to organize a parallel vote tabulation. In addition, the Ukrainian NGO, Democratic Initiatives, coordinated the National Exit Poll (NEP), conducted by four polling firms: The Kyiv International Institute of Sociology (KMIS), the SOCIS Center, the Social Monitoring Center, and the sociological service of the Razumkov Center.³⁰

These Ukrainian organizations had years of experience; CVU had ten years of experience, while the Democratic Initiatives Foundation orchestrated the first exit polls in Ukraine in the 1998 parliamentary elections.³¹ At the same time, compared to earlier

³⁰ The Ukrainian Institute of Social Research, a government sponsored organization, and the Russian firm, Foundation for Social Opinion (FOM) also conducted exit polls. FOM discontinued its exit poll if the first round because more than forty percent of all voters asked were refusing to reveal how they voted. See Tetiana Sylina, "Exit Poll: A Long Ordeal," *National Security and Defence*, No. 10 (2004) pp. 24-28.

³¹ <http://www.dif.org.ua>

elections, these groups also faced a much more sophisticated voter manipulator in 2004. Kuchma and his allies executed successfully two novel methods for obscuring the actual tally, which frustrated attempts by independent actors to expose fraud. First, Kuchma's regime falsified the vote at the level of precinct, and not between the precinct level and higher levels of counting where fraud traditionally occurs.³² A parallel vote tabulation (PVT) attempts to expose fraud by sampling the actual vote count at the precinct level. But if the precinct numbers are already fraudulent, then a PVT will also reflect the result of the falsified vote, an outcome that the Committee of Ukrainian Voters had to face. Because the CVU figures from their PVT did not expose significant fraud, they did not release their second round results.

Second, the legitimacy of the National Exit Poll came into question when two firms in the consortium decided to use a different tallying method from the other two. As a response to the intense polarized atmosphere of the 2004 presidential vote, pre-election opinion polls recorded very high no-response rates, exceeding 70% in some regions and over fifty percent nationwide. As a corrective to this unacceptable no-response, two consortium partners, KMIS and the Razumkov Center, agreed to switch from the face-to-face method of asking exiting voters how they voted and instead to adopt the more anonymous method of collecting exit poll data by using, in essence, a second ballot box placed outside the polling station into which voters could report on how they voted without the interviewer seeing how they voted. However, the SOCIS Center and the Social Monitoring Center refused to adopt this new method. Not surprisingly, the two

³² Author's interviews with Igor Popov, chairman of the Committee of Ukrainian Voters, Kyiv, Ukraine, March 10, 2005; and Yevgen Poberezhny, Deputy Chairman of the Board Committee of Voters of Ukraine November 15, 2005.

methods produced different results: using the more anonymous method, KMIS and the Razumkov Center reported higher levels of support for Yushchenko than the results collected by SOCIS and the Social Monitoring Center using the open method. The consortium dissolved for the second round of the vote. In this second round, results released by KMIS and Razumkov showed that Yushchenko received 52% of the vote compared to 44.2% for Yanukovich, while the official CEC results released claimed that Yushchenko won only 46.6% of the vote while Yanukovich won 49.5% of the vote. This discrepancy played a key role in mobilizing citizens to come to Maidan to protect their votes.

When these quantitative or macro methods for exposing fraud yielded ambiguous results, qualitative, micro-methods came to the rescue. Individual election monitors, fielded by Our Ukraine, CVU and other NGOs, reported hundreds and hundreds of instances of irregular procedures. So too did international monitors (discussed in detail below). Their efforts to gather evidence of falsification were facilitated by the multi-party composition of the local election commissions. This method of forming election commissions put Our Ukraine members and supporters in the room in most election districts (but not all) in the country when counts were taking place. In addition, turnout levels in some regions in the east were so outrageously high that election analysts knew they could not be true.

This combination gave a few members of the Central Election Commission the courage to not certify the final count, sending the issue to the parliament. The parliament did not ratify the official results, but instead sent the issue to the Supreme Court.³³ The

³³ Author's interview with CEC member, Roman Knyazevich, Kyiv, Ukraine, March 12, 2005.

Court then used evidence of fraud collected by the CVU and others NGOs to overturn the official results on December 3, 2004 and call for a replay of the second round of the presidential election late that month.

It is unlikely that either the defecting members of the CEC or the majority of the Supreme Court would have acted the way they did if hundreds of thousands of protestors were not on the streets by the time of their deliberations.³⁴ In a different political context with no major societal mobilization, the Supreme Court might easily have responded very differently to the handful of cases regarding fraud brought before them.

External Contributions to Exposing Fraud

Many of the Ukrainian activities that contributed to the exposure of fraud had significant assistance from external actors. In fact, The West's central contribution to the Orange Revolution was to this critical factor. This took the form of long-term support and cultivation of voters' rights groups, think tanks, youth groups and other civil activist organizations, and media organizations that would be instrumental in monitoring, polling, PVT, disseminating information about voters rights and violations of those rights especially during the second round of voting.

Even with the mixed results of the parallel vote tabulation, CVU still played a leading role in exposing fraud (and creating the perception of electoral fraud) during the second round of the presidential vote, first through its network of 10,000 monitors (this is the number cited in CVU press releases), second through the legal actions that CVU

³⁴ Ibid..

lawyers initiated that helped to challenge the legitimacy of the official results, and third through the evidence of falsification gathered by CVU officials and used then by the Our Ukraine legal team before the Supreme Court. Based on its experiences first in the Philippines and later in other countries in post-communist Europe, NDI provided the original idea for a Ukrainian election monitoring organization, and then provided substantial technical and financial assistance to CVU throughout its development, including support for the 2004 election.³⁵ In 2004, other Western donors, including most importantly the International Renaissance Foundation, also contributed major financial resources to CVU.

CVU was the largest and most visible NGO effort supported by Western funds dedicated to exposing fraud, but not the only effort. At the end of its voter education and voter mobilization campaigns, the Znayu campaign (supported by the U.S.-Ukraine Foundation and Freedom House) also turned to exposing fraud, including one leafleting campaign which warned/threatened CEC officials about the legal consequences of committing electoral fraud. Yellow Pora, Black Pora, Chysta Ukraina, and hundreds of smaller NGOs also used various tactics to expose fraud. Through its small grants program, Freedom House funded many of the NGO activities at the regional level through its Citizen Participation in Elections in Ukraine program. A key effort was an emergency round of grants made before the third round of elections to prevent fraud by ensuring that the public was educated about changes in the election laws that had been made after the second round.

³⁵ On the evolution of this technology, see Eric Bjornlund, *Beyond Free and Fair: Monitoring Elections and Building Democracy* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004).

Our Ukraine also worked hard to expose fraud, first by training its party representatives serving on CEC commissions on the rules for voting counting and mechanisms for recording irregularities in the process, and second by organizing a parallel network of election monitors. NDI played a major role in the training of Our Ukraine monitors.

Democratic Initiative's exit poll, which also played a critical role in undermining the legitimacy of the official results in the second round, was funded almost entirely by a consortium of Western donors, including the Eurasia Foundation, Counterpart, and Europe XXI Foundation.³⁶

In addition to Ukrainian poll watchers, IRI, NDI, and the U.S.-Ukrainian Foundation deployed international election monitoring teams to observe the Ukrainian election. The United States government also funded American participants in the 600-person observer mission fielded by the OSCE. And most innovatively, NDI and Freedom House cooperated to bring to Ukraine the European Network of Election Monitoring Organizations (ENEMO), which was comprised of 17 electoral monitoring organizations from countries in the former communist world. After reviewing initial international observational plans, it was the U.S. ambassador, John Herbst, who called upon USAID and its grantees to generate an additional 1,000 international volunteers. ENEMO was the creative and efficient response -- creative because it brought to Ukraine trained electoral monitors experienced in exposing post-communist vote rigging (and many of these foreign observers also spoke Russian) and efficient because 1,000 volunteers from neighboring countries could be brought to Ukraine at a fraction of the cost that it would

³⁶ Get Euro supporters here.

have taken to bring Americans in. All of these international teams released critical reports about the election process, which in turn played an instrumental role in generating a unified condemnation of the voting procedures from Europe and the United States.

Another successful innovation in the Ukrainian observation efforts was the presence of special envoy representing President Bush personally, Senator Richard Lugar. A moderate Republican, experienced foreign affairs specialist, and the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Lugar had the international authority to make his judgments meaningful in Washington and European capitals. USAID did not support his trip directly but USAID grantees, especially IRI, informed his assessments. His press statement on the vote was scathing, which in turn bolstered the negative evaluation and tone of Secretary of State Colin Powell's first remarks on the vote. Powell was unequivocal in declaring the official results illegitimate. In interviews, Our Ukraine leaders and NGO activists reported that Powell's statement provided a major boost of inspiration for the Maidan demonstrators. The statement also raised doubt within the president's entourage about their ability to make the official results stick.

4. A Modicum of Independent Media

As discussed in greater detail below, the creation of a foothold for independent media was another important ingredient in creating momentum for the Orange Revolution years before the 2004 presidential vote. Independent media played a facilitating role, conditioning the public for the development of many of the Orange

Revolution precipitants, including the weakening of popularity of incumbents and strengthening the support for the opposition.

During the 2004 campaign, Kuchma's regime controlled or enjoyed the loyalty of most national media outlets. By 2004, Ukraine boasted several independent television networks, but all the major channels were owned or controlled by oligarchs loyal to Kuchma and Yanukovich. Russian television stations ORT, RTR, and NTV, which enjoy considerable audiences in Ukraine, also gave favorable coverage to Yanukovich. In 2003, a wealthy Yushchenko ally, Petro Poroshenko, acquired the rights to a small television station and then transformed it into Channel 5. Unlike all other networks, Channel Five did provide positive (or they would say, "objective") coverage of the Yushchenko campaign, but Channel 5's audience was much smaller than the major channels, roughly 8 million viewers, while its signal reached only approximately 30% of the country.³⁷ Regarding radio, Radio Era did provide news that was not shaped by the government. External stations such as Radio Liberty, the BBC, and Voice of America were also important channels of independent news for those with the ability to receive short wave broadcasts – a small fraction of the Ukrainian population.³⁸ Some important print newspapers such as *Zerkalo Nedeli*, *Ukrayna moloda*, *Vecherny visty* and *Silsky visty* (controlled by the Socialist Party), as well as internet news outlets such as *Ukrainska Pravda* (the independent online publication founded by Gongadze) and Telekritika -- a web-based forum for discussing television coverage of the campaign --

³⁷ Adrian Karatnycky, "Ukraine's Orange Revolution," *Foreign Affairs* Volume 84, Number 2 (March/April 2005).

³⁸ Some FM stations, such as Radio Continent, Radio NART, and Radio Takt in Vinnytsia did rebroadcast Radio Liberty. Radio Liberty officials claimed that 8% of the Ukrainian population was listening to their broadcasts, a very high number, See Olena Prytula, "The Ukrainian Media Rebellion," in Aslund and McFaul, eds., *Revolution in Orange*, pp. 113-115.

also provided sources of news about the election campaign not controlled by the state or oligarchs closely tied to the state. But all had limited circulations. It should be noted that internet access is still too expensive for the average media consumer in Ukraine, and much of that audience – just over 55% - is in Kyiv.³⁹ Every region also had at least one opposition newspaper, including such famous regional papers as *Kafa*, *Hrviyna*, and *Vechirney Cherkassy*. The media playing field for the 2004 was skewed in favor of Yanukovich, but independent and pro-Yushchenko outlets did exist.

If the impact of independent media outlets on the campaign results are difficult to measure, their role in facilitating popular mobilization after the vote was much more obvious. Independent media played a positive and critical role in communicating news about the falsified vote and helping in turn to mobilize popular opposition to the regime after the vote. Channel 5 played the central role, first in communicating the results of the exit polls and in reporting on the hundreds of cases of electoral fraud. Channel 5 then served an especially vital function of providing live, 24-hour coverage of the events on Maidan, broadcasts that helped to encourage others to join the protests, especially when viewers saw the peaceful, festive nature of the crowds.⁴⁰ By the end of the demonstration, Channel Five catapulted from 13th to 3rd in the national ratings. Channel 5 coverage also put pressure on the other channels to stop spewing their propaganda. By the fourth day of protests, the staffs at most other stations had joined forces with the

³⁹ Media Sustainability Index 2004, (IREX: Washington, DC), p. 208-209, 11; <http://www.irex.org/msi/2004/MSI-2004-Ukraine.pdf>

⁴⁰ One poll showed that ten percent of the people in Maidan Square had no political motives whatsoever but came instead just to enjoy the party.

street demonstrators. Radio Era, and Radio Kyiv, and Radio Gala also provided around the clock reporting from Maidan.

Compared to the previous electoral breakthrough in Georgia 2003, Ukraine's opposition had one major advantage – the internet. In fact, the Orange Revolution may have been the first in world history organized in large measure on the Web. During the critical hours and days after the second round vote, *Ukrainskaya Pravda* displayed the results of the exit poll most sympathetic to Yushchenko as well as detailed news about other allegations of fraud. The website also provided all sorts of practical information to protestors. During the second round of voting, *Ukrainskaya Pravda* readers grew to 350,000 readers and one million hits a day.⁴¹ Other portals also provided critical information that helped to make the Orange Revolution. The Maidan site was a clearinghouse of information and coordination for protestors. The student group Pora and Our Ukraine also had up important websites and webmasters that blasted informational and motivational emails to supporters and observers all over the country and all over the world (including to this author) during the critical moments right after the vote. Telekritika was also a popular cite for independent journalists during the campaign, which then played an instrumental role in pressuring journalists working at Kuchma friendly outlets to withdraw their support once tens of thousands had mobilized on the streets. As a technology of mobilization and coordination, text messaging was an essential device for those on Maidan and in the tent city where people did not have access to email.

⁴¹ Prytula, "The Ukrainian Media Rebellion," p. 110.

External Contributions to Independent and Professional Media

The development of a cadre of independent-minded, professional journalists in Ukraine contributed over time to the exposure of corruption and crimes committed by the Kuchma regime, which in turn made it possible for Yushchenko to win the 2004 presidential vote. Training programs conducted by Internews-Ukraine, in partnership with IREX (U-Media Program), the Ukrainian Newspaper Publishers Association, and Telekritika nurtured the emergence of this professional class over years of work. Internews also helped to organize the Independent Association of Broadcasters (IAB), which has played an instrumental role in defending professional journalists against state attacks since its formation. USAID implementers also helped the development of the Ukrainian Association of Press Publishers (UAPP) and a network for 24 regional press clubs, run by the Center for Ukrainian Reform Education, both which have also helped to develop and defend independent media. In this long period of nurturing independent journalism, Internews and its partners such as IAD, UAPP, the IREX/Legal Defense Education Program and the Media Law Institute also helped to provide the legal framework for defending independent media outlets against state attacks (such as revoking licenses) and bringing Ukrainian media practices into line with international standards.

During the campaign, Internews subsidized and supported a whole series of activities, including the production of public service announcements, television talk shows, press conferences around the country, and funds to support local coverage of the

national campaign and voters' rights in the print media. It must be stressed, however, that these activities only occurred in the margins of the national campaign since pro-Kuchma forces still dominated the national electronic media.

During the Orange Revolution, several journalists, including Andrei Shevchenko and Roman Skrypin at Channel 5 and Natalia Dmytruk, the famed official sign-language interpreter for state-run television, assumed heroic roles in their coverage of the campaign and the civic resistance triggered by the fraudulent voter.⁴² At various stages in their careers, many of these people had contact with USAID-funded media projects. As already discussed, *Ukrainskaya Pravda* played a central role in the Orange Revolution and this internet publication received major support from the National Endowment for Democracy (not USAID). Telekritika, an internet publication sponsored by Internews, was also cited by many as useful source of information and debate during the 2004 campaign and its immediate aftermath. Discussions on Telekritika were especially instrumental in spurring the "journalists rebellion" on October 28, 2004, when forty journalists from five different television stations declared that they would no longer obey the secret instructions (temniki) that the Kuchma administration provided them.

6. Popular Mobilization to "Protect the Vote"

⁴² When translating the spoken broadcast into sign language, Dmytruk told her viewers through her hands that the announcer was not telling the truth. Her deviance was a pivotal moment in spurring other journalists to deft dictates from the state.

Months in advance of the presidential election, Our Ukraine campaign leaders made plans to organize street demonstrations in the likely (in their view) event that the election results would be falsified.⁴³ At the last minute, the location of their protest changed. And some planned tactics of mobilization, such as a planned parallel vote count to be conducted in the tents on Maidan Square, did not succeed. However, the central idea of calling on Yushchenko supporters to come to the streets and then remain there until the fraudulent vote was overturned did succeed. Several components produced success.

First, after initially considering the streets outside of the Central Election Commission as ground zero of the protest, Our Ukraine leaders decided instead to make their stand on Maidan Square, since policemen occupied the space surrounding the CEC. Early in the morning that day after the second round of voting, Our Ukraine MPs were swinging hammers to build a stage on Maidan. Amazingly, no one tried to stop them (though MPs were assigned this task specifically because they have immunity). Truckloads of tents, mats, and food supplies soon appeared as well, clearly demonstrating the opposition's preplanning.

Second, Our Ukraine leaders coordinated with Yellow Pora activists to set up a tent city downtown. This act created a quasi-permanent presence in downtown Kyiv immediately. The tent city and Maidan, became as much major symbols of the revolution as the color orange.

Third, Yushchenko appeared on television to denounce the results of the second-round election and call upon his supporters to come to Kyiv and occupy the square.

⁴³ Interviews with Stetskiv, others.

Strangely, Yushchenko's first post-election speech was covered on all major Ukrainian television stations. Later in the process of mobilization, as already discussed, independent media outlets helped to encourage demonstrators to come to Kyiv and also helped to coordinate the massive logistics required to keep a million people fed and warm.

Fourth, NGO's that focused on get-out-the vote activities during the campaign also played an important role in urging voters to "protect their vote" after election day. The Znayu information campaign devoted particular attention to educating voters about their responsibility to insure that their vote was accurately counted. This kind of message was widely distributed. Other NGOs developed and distributed similar messages during the campaign, helping indirectly to mobilize civic resistance to fraud after the official results of the second round were announced.

Fifth, regarding the logistics of Maidan, Yushchenko and his team benefited tremendously from the support of Kyiv city government and the city's mayor, Oleksandr Omelchenko. Had political leaders loyal to the *ancien regime* been in charge of the capital, the capacity to sustain the Orange Revolution would have been severely constrained.

Sixth, civil society and the "middle class" more broadly speaking helped to swell the numbers on Maidan from the several thousand who planned to show up to the million or so who spontaneously joined the protest. Our Ukraine and its partners made preparations for tens of thousands to protest a rigged election. They did not anticipate that their act of civil disobedience would swell to hundreds of thousands and eventually over a million people. To provide for such large numbers required the volunteer work

and donated supplies from thousands of individuals, who had no direct relationship with Our Ukraine previously.

Finally, a central feature of the mobilization's success was a commitment to non-violence and negotiated solution to the crisis. Our Ukraine organizers and Pora activists did not take any measures to prepare for an armed conflict. There were no guns in Our Ukraine headquarters and no pro-Yushchenko militias waiting in the wings in the event of violence. On the street, where protestors and soldiers stood eye to eye for days, Pora demonstrators used humor to defuse tension. Young women with flowers were deliberately asked to stand on the frontlines opposite the police as a method of making violence less likely.

At several moments during the seventeen-day standoff, some political leaders, including allegedly Yulia Tymosehko and Yellow Pora leaders wanted to end the crisis by storming the president's office.⁴⁴ They calculated, not without reason, that the government's armed forces would not stop them, Kuchma and his team would flee, and they could therefore seize power with a minimum amount of violence as the Serbian and Georgian oppositions had done in 2000 and 2003 respectively. Yushchenko, however, categorically rejected these tactics and no one was prepared to act against the wishes of their leader.

External Facilitators of Mass Mobilization to Protect the Vote

⁴⁴ Interview with Kaskiv.

Our Ukraine planned the first actions of civic resistance immediately after the second round of voting. There is no evidence that they received any Western assistance in making these preparations. Nor did U.S. government sources support their tremendous, two-week operation on the Maidan. The assertion that demonstrators were paid a daily wage for their efforts is a complete myth. There is no evidence whatsoever to support this claim.

As discussed above, NDI and IRI did contribute, however difficult to measure, in the expanded organizational capacity of Our Ukraine. Indirectly, therefore, one might argue that these Western organizations played some role in helping to make the Our Ukraine portion of the protest successful.

Yellow Pora worked closely with Our Ukraine in coordinating their efforts on the Maidan, and Yellow Pora did have significant contacts with civic resistance activists from Slovakia, Serbia, and Georgia, through the facilitating efforts of Freedom House and the German Marshall Fund. In their training programs, Znayu also used trainers from Serbia and Georgia. Exactly what knowledge about non-violent resistance was transferred in these interactions is difficult to trace. That Ukrainian activists received inspiration from successful civic organizers from other countries is without question, and was reported frequently in interviews with participants in these training programs.⁴⁵ Moreover, nearly all of these training programs concerning civic mobilization received at least partial funding from Western sources, including the International Renaissance Foundation, Freedom House, the U.S-Ukrainian Foundation, the German Marshall Fund, NDI, The Westminster Foundation, SIDA, and grants from Western embassies in Kyiv.

⁴⁵ Interviews with Potekhin, Kosuchev, Kaskiv, Zolotarev.

7. Divisions among the “Guys with Guns”

In Ukraine, communications between opposition leaders and intelligence officials helped to remove violent suppression as an option for the Kuchma regime.⁴⁶ The defections of several Ukrainian police and intelligence units made clear that the guys with the guns – that is, the military and special forces with the intelligence services and police -- could not be trusted to carry out a repressive order.⁴⁷ A week into the Maidan protest, special troops from the Ministry of the Interior did arm and mobilize, with the intention of clearing the square. But Orange Revolution sympathizers from within the intelligence services warned the Maidan organizers of the impending attack, and then commanders within the regular army pledged to protect the unarmed citizens if these special forces tried to march into the center of town. These splits helped to convince Kuchma to call off the planned police activity, even though Yanukovich and his associates were urging the Ukrainian president to take action.

Divided loyalties within the security forces are closely intertwined with mass mobilization. Had there only been a few thousand demonstrators on the streets, Kuchma

⁴⁶ C.J. Chivers, “How Top Spies in Ukraine Changed the Nation’s Path,” *New York Times*, January 17, 2005, p. 1.

⁴⁷ The causes of these divisions were many and predated the Orange Revolution. See Julie Anderson and Joseph Albini, “Ukraine's SBU and the New Oligarchy,” *International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence*, Volume 12, Number 3, 1 July 1999, pp. 282-324.

might have been less reluctant to use force. Major mobilization also means that police and soldiers are more likely to have a relative on the square.

External Facilitators of Divisions within the Security Services

Identifying a direct Western impact on division within the security forces is difficult. Some have claimed that those soldiers who participated in NATO's Partnership-for-Peace programs were more likely to support the demonstrators than those who did not⁴⁸. To date, however, the evidence marshaled to support for this claim is far from convincing.

Western actors did contribute indirectly to keeping the peace during the standoff between armed forces and the Orange demonstrators. Well before the election, U.S. diplomats explicitly warned officials in Kuchma's government of the pariah status they would earn should the vote turn out to be not free and unfair. Ambassador Herbst called upon visiting American dignitaries, such as Madeleine Albright, Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Tom Pickering, and Richard Holbrooke to communicate threatening messages about the negative consequences of bad behavior should the election process become tainted.⁴⁹ As a signal of seriousness, the U.S. government denied a visa to Ukrainian oligarch Hryhoriy Surkis to warn Kuchma and his family (including most importantly, his son-in-law, TV media mogul and billionaire Viktor Pinchuk) that

⁴⁸ See, for instance, comments of Major General Nicholas Krawciw, U.S. Army, retired made at American Enterprise Institute event (Washington, DC), "Ukraine's Choice: Europe of Russia?" December 10, 2004 during panel discussion entitled, "Ukraine's Armed Forces: On the Way to Join NATO?"

⁴⁹ Interview with Herbst, November 2005.

they too could face a similar fate of persona non-grata status in the West. In the end, these threats did not prevent Kuchma and his team from trying to steal the vote. Yet, the threats and warnings against using violence against the peaceful demonstrators did continue throughout the standoff, including a late night phone call from Colin Powell to Kuchma (which Kuchma refused to take) on the night when security forces were getting ready to try to clear the square. The U.S. embassy learned of these troop movements from an anti-Kuchma source within the SBU.⁵⁰ Throughout the crisis, Pinchuk was a consistent and accessible channel of communication for U.S. government officials when wanting to get a message to Kuchma. Again, measuring the impact of these efforts is difficult. Even if impossible to measure how helpful, several participants in the standoff did report that the American interventions were helpful. Nevertheless, the number of protesters on the streets was the decisive deterrent to violence, not a phone call from Washington.

USAID and its grantees played very little role in these elite interactions. Individual Americans (some of whom were working on USAID grants) took advantage of their close ties with senior leaders in Our Ukraine to urge them to keep their demonstration non-violent. In times of crisis, these personal relationships between internal opposition leaders and their external supporters can be morale boosters for those in the middle of the revolutionary situation. On the other side of the barricade, it does not appear that any foreign individuals were urging Ukrainian police, soldiers, or their bosses to show restraint.

⁵⁰ Interview with Herbst, November 2005.

8. Institutions and Mediation Efforts that Provided a Process for Peaceful Resolution of the Standoff

A final factor in the success of the Orange Revolution was the combination of a set of institutionalized procedures for finding a peaceful solution to the standoff and a process for mediating the crisis.⁵¹ On November 23, Viktor Yushchenko stood in the Rada and took the presidential oath of office. At that moment, Ukraine had the essential ingredient of a revolutionary situation: two sets of political forces each claiming sovereign authority over the same territory.⁵² In response to Yushchenko's actions and the demonstrators on the streets of Kyiv, several regions leaders in eastern Ukraine threatened to declare their independence from Ukraine and establish their own country. A few Russian leaders, including Moscow mayor Yuri Luzhkov, endorsed the idea and pledged to help the effort. Historically, these kinds of revolutionary situations are resolved when one side reasserts its authority over the other, often through the use of violence.

Ukraine avoided violence and civil war, however, in part because of a set of laws and institutions in place that helped to diffuse the crisis and provide a mechanism for resolution. First, in contrast with leaders of full-blown autocracies, President Kuchma

⁵¹ Whether this set of facilitating factors was necessary for breakthrough is disputable. For instance, in an interview with the author (February 2006), Timoshenko argued that the Western anchored mediation efforts was not central to the outcome and actually tied the opposition's hands after breakthrough.

⁵² Charles Tilly, *From Mobilization to Revolution* (Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1978), chapter nine.

did not control the parliament (the Rada), or its speaker, Volodymyr Lytvyn. This institution, therefore, had the independence and authority to vote to reject the official CEC results of the second round of the presidential vote. The electoral law in place also gave the Rada the legal authority to rule on the CEC elections results, another critical element to a positive outcome based on procedure and not simply political will. As elected officials, members of parliament were also particularly influenced by the crowds on the streets of Kyiv when making their decisions about the official vote tally.

Second, President Kuchma also did not have the Supreme Court fully under his thumb. Although many Yushchenko backers feared that these Court officials would be bribed and pressured into serving the will of the president, a majority of Court members voted on December 3rd to annul the results of the second round of voting and called for rerun of this election. This decision was absolutely critical in diffusing the standoff, since this solution did not come from the Yushchenko or Yanukovych camp, but instead from a third party and was therefore considered acceptable to both sides. Of course, Yanukovych and his allies wanted a different decision from the Court but they were more willing to acquiesce to a process for ending the crisis coming from a third party than they would have been had the proposal come from the Yushchenko camp.

Explaining why the judges voted the way they did is an important and complex question beyond the scope of this study. Most certainly, some judges were more democratically inclined and prepared to do the right thing. In interviews with the author, participants in the Court's procedures also speculated that the size of the crowds and the tense situation on the streets of Kyiv also played a role in influencing their deliberations. Without question, however, we do know that a necessary condition for the Court's

decision was hard evidence that the results had been falsified. The results of PVTs or exit polls could not be used. This evidence came from Our Ukraine election monitors and commission members, CVU monitors, and several other NGOs. The effort to first document and record violations and then take legal action to prosecute offenders was much greater in this vote than in previous Ukrainian elections. This legal preparation to protect the rights of Ukrainian voters proved critical to the case presented by Our Ukraine lawyers before the Supreme Court.

In parallel to the law-based procedures followed by the Rada and the Supreme Court, a negotiation between Yanukovich, Yushchenko, and Kuchma also helped to end the standoff. With the assistance of international mediators (discussed in detail below), Ukraine's leaders eventually did agree to negotiate, a pacted arrangement by which Kuchma and his side allowed the second round of the presidential election to be rerun and in return Yushchenko and his side agreed to changes in the constitution that would give the parliament and prime minister more powers and the president fewer. At the time of these roundtable talks, some leaders of Ukraine's opposition wanted to end discussions, follow the example of the Rose Revolution, and simply seize power. Less radically, others called on Yushchenko to simply stop participating in these talks, since both Kuchma and Yanukovich had no legitimacy to changing the constitution. Yushchenko, however, rejected these calls for storming government buildings or boycotting the roundtable talks and insisted instead on the negotiated path. It is hard to know if Yanukovich and Kuchma would have agreed to a rerun of the second round of elections if this constitutional compromise had not been reached beforehand.

External Contributions to the Process of Crisis Mediation and Resolution

The first state institution that had the potential to play a heroic role was the Central Election Commission. As an institution, it did not. Instead, dozens if not hundreds of CEC officials, including a majority of the commissioners who ratified the official results, played a direct role in falsifying the vote. Assessing the positive contribution of the CEC's Western partners, therefore, is nearly impossible.⁵³ When push came to shove, many CEC officials did break the law and falsify the electoral results and no Western training program could stop this behavior. International actors can do little to help the cause of reform inside another country if they do not have willing domestic partners committed to reform. A critical mass of committed democrats (with a small d) within the CEC seemed to be missing in 2004.

As discussed above, according to Ukraine's electoral law, the CEC's vote count had to be approved by the Rada. But as the number of demonstrators on the streets of Kyiv began hovering near 1,000,000, a majority of MPs in support of the CEC's official tally could not be constructed. Indirectly, a number of American activities contributed in the margins to the independence of the Rada. Over many years, the Indiana University

⁵³ This observation is not a criticism of the goals or strategies pursued by Development Associates and its Strengthening Electoral Administration in Ukraine Project (SEAUP), the USAID implementing partner that worked most closely with the CEC officials. On the contrary, data collected by the author in interviews with DA employees and others familiar with their work, as well as DA documents and publications suggested that the attempt at working with the CEC to make the 2004 election freer and fairer was a serious one, especially the work on cleaning up election registrars. DA/SEAUP's efforts were industrial in scale, including the training of 5,000 Territorial Election Commissioners and 100,000 precinct level commissioners, and the publication of 450,000 copies of training and instructional materials. Moreover, DA employees (to the best of this reviewer's knowledge) did not attempt to whitewash the work of their Ukrainian government partners after the official results were released, a clientitis observed in other countries and other projects.⁵³ What is also true is that a majority of CEC local commissions probably did report the vote accurately. It is also true, as discussed above, that a few CEC federal commission members refused to endorse the official results.

Parliamentary Development Project has contributed the professionalism of the Rada and its staff. Tracing a direct link between this project's activities and the decision of the Rada to not ratify the CEC official results is impossible. Western organizations that worked to strengthen the organizational capacities of Our Ukraine, the Yulia Tymoshenko Bloc, and the Socialist Party, also contributed indirectly to the Rada's ability to make an independent judgment about the vote, since it was these parties who voted not to approve the CEC's official results.

The U.S. embassy also sponsored a visit to Washington for Rada speaker Lytvyn, right before the election. The message hammered home to Lytvyn during his visit was 'do the right thing' if the Rada has a role to play in insuring the freeness and fairness of election.

The third institution to contribute to the process of annulling the official results of the second was the Supreme Court. Again, it is simply not possible to trace a direct causal link between a US-sponsored program and the Supreme Court's historic decision on December 3rd to annul the second round results and call for a rerun of the second round. Several Court members had long, positive, and developed relationships with ABA-CEELI, for instance, but it is not possible (at least with the data collected by this researcher) to trace a direct causal role between these Western training programs and the CEC decisions.

In parallel to these activities was a mediation effort between Kuchma, Yanukovych and Yushchenko that was facilitated immensely by Presidents Aleksander Kwasnewski of Poland, Valdas Adamkus of Lithuania, and Javier Solana of the European Union. Kwasnewski was especially influential in pressing for a negotiated but "right"

solution to the crisis; Solana followed his lead. The Bush Administration deliberately did not seek a public role in the negotiations, but stayed closely involved behind the scenes through contacts with Kwasnewski as well as Solana and Adamkus.

III. Long-Term Sources and the External Facilitators of the Orange Revolution

Sources of Semi-Authoritarianism

The United States government and USAID grantees played an indirect role in sustaining competitive authoritarianism and preventing a full-scale dictatorship from consolidating in Ukraine. Kuchma was a ruthless leader who erected a corrupt and criminal regime, but he refrained from attempting to construct a truly repressive tyranny because he wanted a cooperative relationship with Washington. Assistance and moral support provided by USAID grantees helped to sustain pockets of pluralism within the regime and independent, opposition actors outside of the state. Russian leaders and organizations, to varying extents, played the exact opposite role and encouraged autocratic methods as an effective strategy for holding on to power. Programs and activities that helped to sustain both the idea of checks and balances and the actual institutions that checked executive power were especially important in maintaining semi-authoritarianism and preventing full-blown autocracy.

Within the state, the independence of the Rada was an especially critical component for checking executive power. Technical assistance provided by the Indiana University Parliamentary Development Project helped to make this institution more effective. Party development efforts by IRI and NDI were also critical in helping to insure that Kuchma's party did not win an overwhelming majority of seats in the parliament as occurred in the Russian Duma during the Putin era. NDI and IRI worked with *several* parties, which won representation in the Rada, and in turn helped to maintain this institution's independence from the presidential administration. But neither IRI nor NDI worked with *all* parties, official claims of non-partisanship notwithstanding. Given the asymmetries of resources between those tied to the Kuchma regime and those not, as well as the extreme variation in commitment to democracy between those tied to Kuchma and those not, the decisions about selective engagement made by IRI and NDI seem entirely justified if the central objective of their work is to promote democracy (and not just simply party development).

Beyond strengthening the capacity and independence of the Rada, the effectiveness of other efforts by external actors to promote democracy through working with state institutions is difficult to measure.⁵⁴ Over the years, USAID has sponsored several projects designed to strengthen the capacity and independence of the courts, yet the role of this third branch of government in checking the rise of authoritarian power is hard to document. The same must be said about technical assistance programs that engaged the various institutions and bureaucracies of the executive branch. Therefore,

⁵⁴ Regional legislative governments provided another soft check on executive power, but a serious analysis of their work (and the work of democracy assistance programs working with them) was beyond the scope of this study.

the decision by USAID to offer up for bid two RFPs (requests for proposals) – one for activities dealing with the state and another for working with society -- was not only appropriate but necessary for working in Ukraine in the run up to the 2004 presidential vote.

Stimulating the Emergence and Persistence of Civil Society

The factors described above, which precipitated the Orange Revolution, did not appear overnight. Rather, they crystallized after years and years of nurturing. Even those new groups such as Black Pora, Yellow Pora, or Znayu benefited from the efforts of civic organizations that had formed several years earlier. Some of the leaders of these Orange Revolution groups got their initial start in civic organizing in other NGOs, which may have played only an indirect role in the events in 2004. At a most general level, then, the emergence and development of civil society during the 1990s provided an enabling environment for the construction of organizations that led the Orange Revolution in 2004.

Indirectly, then, all Western sponsored programs that promoted the development of civil society contributed in some way to the Orange Revolution. However, without using survey instruments, explaining how is nearly impossible. Nonetheless, in interviews conducted by the author with civil society leaders, a few general themes did emerge about the donor community's role in nurturing civil society. First, because Ukraine had developed a rather mature civil society over the fifteen years since independence, direct financial assistance in the forms of small grants was the most effective mechanism for sustaining and nurturing civil society; technical assistance matter

less. Second, external actors played a vital role in networking Ukrainian NGOs with each other and with other actors and institutions committed to deepening democracy. For instance, Internews played a direct and critical role in helping to form the Independent Association of Broadcasters of Ukraine (IAB) and the Ukrainian Association of Press Publishers. Grant money given to Znayu organizers, the CVU, and Democratic Initiatives in turn gave these organizations leverage to convince others to cooperate with them. This is a crucial function which Ukrainian actors are either unwilling to initiate or lack the contacts and resources to do it effectively. Third, programs focused on promoting advocacy, concrete outcomes, and partnership with constituencies stimulated a particular kind of vibrant civil society in Ukraine.

At the same time, only a small portion of the NGOs supported by Western aid played any role – direct or indirect—in the Orange Revolution. These were the organizations described above in the discussion about precipitants. The vast majority remained focused on their individual projects and local concerns, and did not aspire or attempt to play a role in the events surrounding the Orange Revolution. General support for civil society development did not produce electoral breakthrough in Ukraine and is unlikely to do so in other countries. Rather, electoral breakthrough requires support for very specific kinds of activities described above.

On an anecdotal level, there does appear to be some correlation between those Ukrainians that studied in the West and those that became NGO leaders. Dozens of people working in the third sector interviewed by the author had spent some time studying in the United States and Canada or had participated in some sort of exchange program.

Economic Reform, Economic Growth, and the Rise of the Middle Class

In commentary and analysis, the rise of the middle class is frequently cited as a contributing factor to the Orange Revolution. The hypotheses about the role of the middle class in undermining the Kuchma regime are many. The middle class contributed in greater amounts to the Yushchenko campaign; the middle class voted in greater numbers for Yushchenko; the middle class participated in greater numbers on Maidan; and the middle class contributed directly to the financial and material support of the demonstrators on Maidan. A final hypothesis about Western aid therefore follows: if Western programs helped to nurture the rise of the middle class in Ukraine, then these programs also played a role in the Orange Revolution.

The first set of hypotheses about the causal relationship between the rise of the middle class and the Orange Revolution can be tested empirically using survey data. Regrettably, such survey data does not exist.⁵⁵ This said, there is most certainly anecdotal evidence that the middle class, buoyed by several years of economic growth, did contribute to the Our Ukraine campaign. The evidence of in kind and financial contributions to the Maidan demonstrations is even clearer. The effort was simply too massive and too decentralized to be funded by billionaires or coordinated by a single authority. Evidence about middle class voting behavior is thinner. On average, voters in the industrial East are richer than voters in the more rural West, yet Yanukovich captured the majority of votes in the East, and Yushchenko captured the majority of votes in the

⁵⁵ Has anyone seen such data????

West. The pivotal regions were in the center of the country, where growth was also highest in recent years. But Kuchma and Prime Minister Yanukovich presided over the recent period of economic growth. If voters were simply casting their ballots based on pocketbook assessments, then those in the richer central regions should have voted in greater proportion for Yanukovich. Obviously, factors others than economic prosperity or even class-consciousness played a role in determining voter preferences.

Even if a causal link could be identified between the rise of the middle class and the success of the Orange Revolution, tracing the role of Western assistance programs on the rise of this middle class is fraught with complexity. In interviews with organizations involved in economic reform issues such as Padco, Center for Social Welfare “Dobrochin” (Chernihiv), Local Economic Development project (administered by Chemonics), Centre for Ukrainian Reform Education , and Ukraine Land Titling Initiative in Chernigiv, none of the project managers interviewed claimed that their work contributed directly to the Orange Revolution. When pressed by the author to speculate about indirect contributions (such as the creation of farmers owning land who in turn might have voted differently, or the stimulation of economic growth, which in turn might have influenced the behavior of citizens during the fall of 2004), no one dared. Untangling the complex relationship between economic transformation on the one hand and the political outcomes related to the Orange Revolution is an important research question, that would require the collection of data --survey data in particular – which is (so far) beyond the scope of this study.

Generally, in the literature on democratization, there is disagreement about this relationship. One school of thoughts contends that economic growth facilitates

democratization, while another school argues that economic crises sparks democratic change.⁵⁶ In the post-communist world, there is no single pattern. Economic crisis helped to undermined Milosevic in Serbia in 2000 and Shevardnadze in Georgia in 2003, but the absence of economic crisis in Ukraine in 2004 did not prevent the fall of the Kuchma regime. Kyrgyzstan also was experiencing economic growth when Akaev was ousted in the spring of 2005.

Demonstration Effects

In interviews, actors in the Orange Revolution reported favorably on the demonstration effects that Serbia 2000 and Georgia 2003 had on their own mobilization efforts. Contacts between youth activists from Serbia, Slovakia, and Georgia provided inspiration to their counterparts in Ukraine, even if the transfer of technical knowledge about civic resistance is more difficult to measure. Elite contacts between Ukrainian opposition leaders and their counterparts in Georgia, Poland, and the United States had a similar inspirational effect. Groups, which facilitated such contacts, such as Freedom House, the German Marshall Fund, NDI, and IRI, therefore contributed in another way to the Orange Revolution.

The Pull of Western Institutions and Western Norms

Among those that supported Yushchenko in the election and then demonstrated to their votes for him after the second round, there is clear evidence that they supported the idea of Ukraine joining Europe. Among elites involved in the organizing the Orange

⁵⁶ Lipset versus Haggard and Kaufman.

Revolution interviewed by the author, this desire to make Ukraine look more European (and less like the autocracies in Central Asia and Russia) was a sentiment frequently expressed. Western aid programs that helped to advance this idea of Ukraine as a country in Europe therefore contributed indirectly to the Orange Revolution.

IV. Conclusion: The Limits of External Actors

In seeking to learn lessons from the Ukrainian democratic breakthrough, it is important to realize that the list of necessary conditions specified above is long. The presence of only a few of these factors is unlikely to generate the same outcome. A more popular or more ruthless autocrat might have been able to outmaneuver the democratic opposition. A less organized electoral monitoring effort might not have been able to convince people to take to the streets. Thousands on the streets, instead of tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands, might have produced a very different outcome. The stars must really be aligned to produce such dramatic events as the Orange Revolution.

Of this long list of factors, external actors can only play a positive role in influencing a few of them. The Ukrainian experience suggests that it is hard for outsiders to foster splits within the *ancien regime* and difficult to influence directly the popularity of the regime. Influencing the effectiveness of opposition candidates is also difficult, though not impossible. In the margins, external actors can encourage unity among the democratic opposition, but the real drivers of unity or disunity will always be local actors, not their foreign partners.

The greatest space for meaningful activity was regarding electoral observation, creating the perception of a falsified vote, and the development of societal organizations that then played a critical role in protecting the vote after Election Day. The Ukrainian experience underscored the importance of having a multi-pronged strategy, that is supporting exit polls, a parallel vote tabulation, domestic monitors, and international monitors. Reliance on just one of these mechanisms would have been insufficient. The novel idea of bringing international monitors from the region (rather than from the United States) who are more familiar with the problems of elections in semi-autocratic regimes, was a brilliant one. Developing the European Network of Election Monitoring Organizations (ENEMO) should be a top priority for USAID and other democracy assistance organizations. In addition to expanding its work in the post-communist region, ENEMO could help develop new electoral monitoring organizations in the greater Middle East.

External actors also played a significant role in underwriting the activities of civic organizations that helped to get out the vote and then protect it. In reference to the big debate over whether to support state institutions or civil society, the Orange Revolution is a clear example of the payoffs to maintaining sustained support to civil society.

External actors also contributed to the development of independent media in Ukraine. One of the most effective media outlets, *Ukrainskaya Pravda*, relied almost exclusively on external financial support. The Ukrainian experience affirms the wisdom of a strategy focused primarily on supporting societal actors, rather than state institutions, in a country ruled by a semi-authoritarian regime. Democratic change did not occur as a result of incremental changes within the old regime, but due to societal mobilization

against the old regime. To be sure, the Orange Revolution did not eliminate all anti-democratic elements of the Ukrainian regime. But the rupture in the fall of 2004 has helped to accelerate the pace of democratic deepening.

The Ukrainian experience suggests that programs designed to foster the development of professional media, civil society, and political parties must be funded for long periods of time, as it is difficult to predict when the payoffs for democratization will come.

Appendix One: Interviews

David A. Atwood
Director, Office of Democracy, Governance and Social Transition
Bureau for Europe and Eurasia

Yarema Bachynsky
Chief of Party
Strengthening Electoral Administration in Ukraine Project
Development Associates, Inc.

Roman Mikhailovich Barabash
Center Coordinator, Attorney
Ukraine Land Titling Initiative Project
Chernigiv Center for Legal Aid to New Land Owners

Oleksandr Barabash
Expert
Strengthening Electoral Administration in Ukraine Project
Development Associates, Inc.

Iryna Bekeshina
Research Director
Democratic Initiatives Foundation

Markian Bilynskij
Vice President
US-Ukraine Foundation

David Black
Office of Democracy and Governance
USAID

Tetyana Boiko
Member of Governing Board
Pora! (United)

Jeanne M. Bourgault
COO and Vice President for Programs
Internews Network

Eric David Boyle
Regional Director, Kiev Regional Office
The Eurasia Foundation

Aleksandra E. Braginski
Team Leader, Ukraine/Moldova/Belarus Team
USAID

Svitlana Buko
IREX/Media Administrative Manager
IREX Kiev

Yevhen Bystrytsky, Ph.D.
Executive Director
International Renaissance Foundation

Irina Cherenko
Board Member
“Orange” Center for Progressive Youth

Jeff Clark
Executive Associate
Development Associates, Inc.

Lorne Craner
President
International Republican Institute

Serhiy Dyoma
Grants Manager, Open Media Fund
International Renaissance Foundation

David Dettman
Resident Director (Kyiv, Ukraine)
National Democratic Institute

Nadia Diuk
National Endowment for Democracy

Natalia Drozd
Director, NGO "Dobrochyn" (Good Deed) Center for Social Welfare
(Chernihiv, Ukraine)

Alisa Farah
Ukrainian Association of Publishers

Barbara Felitti
Country Director
Ukraine Citizen Action Network Project

Volodymyr Fesenko, Ph.D.
Chairman of the Board
Center for Political Studies “Penta”

Susan W. Folger
Chief of Party
Internews Network

Svitlana Franchuk
Deputy Chief of Party
Civic Oversight of Election Program
Freedom House

Vadim Galaychuk
General Director, Moor & Krosndovich
Coordinator for Our Ukraine Election Monitoring Program

David Goldberg
Special Advisor, Democracy Programs
Office of the Coordinator for U.S. Assistance to Europe and Eurasia
U.S. Department of State

Juhani Grossman
Senior Program Officer
Civic Participation in Elections in Ukraine
Freedom House

Ihor Gryniv
Former Director
National Institute for Strategic Studies
Our Ukraine MP
(key campaign advisor to Yushchenko)

Kostyantyn Gryshchenko
Vice-Chairman of the Party, Republican Party of Ukraine
Minister for Foreign Affairs of Ukraine (2003-2005)

Sheila Gwaltney
Deputy Chief of Mission, Ukraine
Embassy of the United States of America

John Herbst
American Ambassador to Ukraine
Embassy of the United States of America

Karen R. Hilliard
Deputy Director
USAID Mission for Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova
U.S. Embassy

Chris Holzen
Resident Program Director, Ukraine
International Republican Institute

Andriy Ihnatov
Board Member
Maidan Inform

Oleh Ilkiv
Head of the Board
“Your Right”

Assia Ivantcheva
Deputy Director
Office of Democracy and Governance
USAID Ukraine

Sarah Jedrzejczak
Senior Program Manager
Freedom House

Laura Jewitt
Deputy Director of FSU Programs

National Democratic Institute

Serhii Kalchenko
Activity Manager
Strengthening Electoral Administration in Ukraine Project
Development Associates, Inc.

Andrij Kartashov
Head of Parliamentary Center
Nash Dim

Vladislav Kaskiv
Yellow Pora/Freedom of Choice Coalition

Mikhola Katarynychuk
Chairman of Our Ukraine

Daria Khabarova
PR Specialist, Translator
BBC World Service

Tanya Khmyz
Senior Project Officer
Civic Participation in Elections in Ukraine
Freedom House

Yuri Kliuchkovsky
Deputy Head of the Committee
Committee on State Development & Local Self-Government
Parliament of Ukraine

Roman Knyazevich
Member
Central Election Commission

Andriy Kohut
Member of Board
Pora! (Black)

Sergey Kokizyuk
Center for Ukrainian Reform Education

Marta Kolomayets
Project Director
Community Partnerships Project
US-Ukraine Foundation

Petro Koshukov
LED Advisor, ERUM Project (Chemonics)
(former co-director of Znayu project)

Sergiy Kostyuk
Reporter
Ukrainskaya Pravda

Dr. Volodymyr Kovtunets

Deputy Chief of Party
Strengthening Electoral Administration in Ukraine Project
Development Associates, Inc.

John M. Kubiniec
Regional Director (Poland)
Freedom House

Ilko Kucheriv
Director
Democratic Initiatives Fund

Sally Kux
Director of Democracy Programs
Office of the Coordinator for U.S. Assistance to Europe and Eurasia
U.S. Department of State

Taras Kuzio
Visiting Professor
George Washington University

Konstyantyn Kvurt
Executive Director
Internews Ukraine

Iryna Kyselova
Monitoring and Evaluation Manager
USAID Implementing partner (ERUM Project)

Tetyana Lebedeva
Head of the Board
Independent Association of Broadcasters

Ambassador Nelson Ledsky
Director of FSU
National Democratic Institute

Oleh Levchenko
Member of the Board
Black Pora!

Natalya Ligachova,
Project Director and Chairman of the Board
Telekritika

Yurii Lutsenko
Minister of Interior
Ukraine
(former MP from Socialist Party and one of key organizers of Maidan events)

Iryna Manokha
Center for Political Education
(Znayu organizer)

Sergei Markov
Russian advisor to Yanukovich campaign

Oksana Maydan
Grant Manager
Center for Ukrainian Reform Education

Leslie McCuaig
Vice President for Program Development
Institute for Sustainable Communities

H. Brian Mefford
Resident Program Officer, Ukraine
International Republican Institute

Vitaly Moroz
Program Officer
Civic Participation in Elections in Ukraine
Freedom House

Kateryna Myasnykova
Executive Director
Independent Association of Broadcasters

Mary Mycio
Media Law Adviser
U-Media Legal Defense and Education Program
IREX

Hryhoriy Nemyria
Director
Center for European and International Studies
(advisor to Yulia Tymoshenko)

Steve Nix
Director of FSU Programs
International Republican Institute

Valeriy Oliynyk
Grant Programs Director
Ukraine Citizen Action Network Project (UCAN)

Dr. Irina Paliashvili
President
Russian-Ukrainian Legal Group, P.A.

Yurii Papernyi
Political Observer

Volodymyr Parkhomenko
LED Advisor
USAID Implementing partner (ERUM Project)

Dr. Roman A. Petrov
Board Member, Ukrainian Bar Association
Associate Dean for International Programs, Economics and Law Faculty
Donetsk National University

Inna Pidluska
President
Europa XXI Foundation

Konstantyn Polsky
Center for Political Education

Yevgen Poberezhny
Deputy Chairman of the Board
Committee of Voters of Ukraine

Alexandr Podgorniy
Chairman of the Board
Center for Social Welfare “Dobrochin” (Chernihiv)

Mikhailo Borisovich Pogrebinskiy
Director, Kiev Center for Political Studies and Conflictology
(campaign advisor for Yanukovich)

Ihor Popov
President
Committee of Voters of Ukraine (CVU)

Dmytro Potekhin
Co-director Znayu campaign
U.S.-Ukraine Foundation

Antonina Prudko
Clinical Legal Education Program Coordinator
ABA/CEELI

Olena Prytula
Editor
Ukrainskaya Pravda

Anatoliy V. Rachok
Director General
Ukrainian Center for Economic & Political Studies Named After Razumkov

Edward Rakhimkulov
Associate Field Director
Indiana University Parliamentary Development Project
USAID Democratic Parliamentary Strengthening Program

Olga Romanyuk,
Project Coordinator
PADCO

Kateryna Ryabiko
Program Management Specialist
Office of Democracy and Governance
U.S. Embassy to Ukraine/USAID Mission for Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova

Aly Farkhatovich Safarov
Attorney, Expert on Media Rights

Lyudmyla Safarova
Grant Manager
Freedom House - Ukraine

Bill Schlansker
Municipal Development Advisor, Office of Economic Growth
U.S. Embassy to Ukraine
USAID Mission for Ukraine, Belarus, and Moldova

Paula Schriefer
Director of Programs
Freedom House

James Schumaker
Ambassador/Project Coordinator in Ukraine
OSCE

Valeriy Semenets
Chief Director
Ukrainian Social-Democratic Youth

Natalia Semiryazhko
Director
Center of the Women's Initiative "Belie Zolnt"

Illia Shevliak
First Deputy Minister
Ministry of Ukraine for Family, Youth & Sports
(former senior advisor to the OSCE)

Yuriy Stepanets
"Nash Podilya"

Nick Stevens
Director
Ukraine Citizen Action Network Project (UCAN)

Tetiana Soboleva
Political Party Program Officer (Kyiv, Ukraine)
National Democratic Institute

Alexander Sokolowski, Ph.D.
Senior Political Process Advisor
USAID

Anatoly Solovyov
LED Advisor
ERUM Project (Chemonics)

Oleksandr Sputay
NGO Program Coordinator
International Republican Institute

Taras Stepanovich Stetskiv
Member of Parliament, Ukraine
(One of key organizers of Maidan events)

Kathryn Stevens
Director, Office of Democracy & Governance
USAID Ukraine

Nick Stevens
Program Director
Ukraine Citizen Action Network Project

Volodimir Cheslavovich Sventitsky
Director
Public Education and Legal Assistance

Sergiy Taran
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Political Science
Duke University
Yellow Pora leader

Viatcheslav Tcherniavski
Financial Manager
Center for Social Innovations

Yulia Timoshenko
former prime minister

Michael Uyehara
First Secretary
Embassy of the United States of America (Ukraine)

Judy Van Rest
Executive Vice President
International Republican Institute

Olena Vasilchenko, Ph.D.
Project Director, Senior Legal Advisor
Planning and Development Collaborative International
USAID Ukraine Pension Reform Implementation Program

Oleksandr Vorobyov
Activity Manager
Strengthening Electoral Administration in Ukraine Project
Development Associates, Inc.

Gavin Weise
ABA/CEELI

Charles R. Wise
Director
Parliamentary Development Project
USAID

Andriy Yaramenko
Board Member
City Charitable Organization “All Together”

Yarna Yasynevyh

Member of the Board
Pora! (Black)

Yevgen Zolotarov
Yellow Pora leader