

Ukraine's "Orange Revolution" and Why It Fizzled

by

Bohdan Harasymiw, Professor Emeritus of Political Science
University of Calgary, 2500 University Drive NW
Calgary, Alberta, CANADA T2N 1N4

bharasym@ucalgary.ca

and

Research Scholar, Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies
University of Alberta, Edmonton

Paper prepared for presentation to the annual meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association, at the 76th Congress of the Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, 1 June 2007

Ukraine's "Orange Revolution" and Why It Fizzled

In November 2004, thousands of demonstrators filled the main square, the Maidan Nezalezhnosti, of Ukraine's capital, Kyiv, and remained there protesting against the preliminary results of the second round of voting in the presidential election. It was announced, as anticipated, that Viktor Yanukovich, the establishment's candidate, had won the runoff vote against his challenger, Viktor Yushchenko. There was a general sentiment that victory had been achieved by fraudulent means. While the protesters remained in the Maidan over the ensuing days, with their numbers ever growing to an estimated half million, the parliament denounced the election result, foreign governments sent representatives to negotiate between the regime and the opposition, and the Supreme Court invalidated the result ordering a rerun of the second round for 26 December. Meanwhile, roundtable discussions involving the two candidates, the outgoing President, and foreign envoys took place eventuating in an agreement on significant constitutional and electoral changes. Ultimately, with his massed supporters still not having dispersed, the champion of the Orange Revolution, Viktor Yushchenko, was elected; the following month he was installed as President.

Two years later, following the 2006 parliamentary elections which gave Yanukovich's Party of Regions a plurality while Yushchenko's Our Ukraine ran a distant third, and after prolonged but futile efforts to cobble together an Orange coalition government, Viktor Yanukovich was named Prime Minister.¹ Thanks to the roundtable constitutional compromise, and taking full advantage of its provisions, Yanukovich was now in a more powerful position than his erstwhile rival, the leader of the Orange forces. He pressed his advantage to the fullest. What went wrong with the Orange Revolution?

This remarkable reversal of fortune prompts several questions. Was the Orange Revolution of November-December 2004 misnamed and not, in fact, a genuine revolution? If truly a revolutionary event, has it already been reversed less than three years later, or could it be expected to unfold further in the near future? What accounts for its failure: structural reasons, inadequate leadership, or absence of ideology? Or, to put it in terms familiar to comparative politics, was it structure, culture, or human agency that was responsible? Similarly, how, if at all, might it be re-ignited? These questions will guide the present inquiry.

Theory

To move beyond the level of everyday political and journalistic discourse whence the very label Orange Revolution originated, and onto the conceptual plane, it is necessary to dwell at least briefly on some definitions of key terms as well as to consider a few potentially suitable models. However chaotic revolutions themselves may be, so too are the academic study, explanation, justification, and repudiation of them. Nevertheless, some useful pointers can be salvaged from the scholarly battlefields, even if the resulting collection of ideas is more eclectic than rigorously systematic. At least we should know if the term "revolution" is warranted for the events under consideration.

Of the various definitions of "revolution," we begin with the one offered by John Dunn. In the Introduction to the second edition of his book, *Modern Revolutions*, he writes that "revolutions . . . are . . . political struggles of great intensity, initiated by

¹ For a concise chronology, see Steven Pifer, "Twists and Turns After the Orange Revolution," *NewsNet: News of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies* 46, no. 5 (October 2006): 1-6.

political crises within particular historical societies and resolved . . . by the creation of a political capacity to confront the historical problems of these societies in ways that their pre-revolutionary regimes had proved wholly incapable of doing.”² Chalmers Johnson reaches all the way back to 1908 for the definition by the French scholar, Arthur Bauer: “Les révolutions sont les changements tentés ou réalisés par la force dans la constitution des sociétés.” Johnson elaborates:

Revolutions are social changes. Sometimes they succeed; often they fail. Revolutionary change . . . involves the intrusion of violence into civil social relations. And revolution . . . concerns the basic level of man’s communal existence—its constitution, . . . the principles of political authority and distributive justice prevailing in a particular society.³

Jack Goldstone has defined revolution, calling it “a complex process,” as being “the forcible overthrow of a government followed by the reconsolidation of authority by new groups, ruling through new political (and sometimes social) institutions.”⁴ As is implied by such definitions, more explicitly articulated in the social scientific literature, a crucial distinction has to be made between social revolution (a more comprehensive, historical phenomenon) and the relatively restricted notion of political revolution, the sense in which the concept may be appropriately applied to the Ukrainian case. In that same vein, the succinct formulation by Mehran Kamrava is particularly helpful: “A revolution may be defined as an event that qualitatively changes the nature and composition of the state, the way it relates to and interfaces with society, and the political culture within which various types and levels of interaction between state and society take place.”⁵ For our purposes, therefore, a revolution can be considered as a fundamental change in the state, state-society relations, and political culture.

Does a revolution always entail violence? Not necessarily. Most, if not all, political revolutions in our lifetime—including specifically those in communist Eastern Europe in 1989—did not involve widespread resort to violence (in contradistinction to Chalmers Johnson’s definition, which looked back to an earlier era), yet they clearly resulted in a basic change of regime in all three dimensions cited above. I should therefore side with those scholars who recognize as revolutionary the changes that have been witnessed in living memory despite their relative lack of bloodshed, and should not disqualify the Orange Revolution on that count alone or *a priori*.⁶ Absence of violence, however, does not preclude forceful change and the element of compulsion, essential for revolutionary, as opposed to evolutionary, transformation.⁷

² John Dunn, *Modern Revolutions: An Introduction to the Analysis of a Political Phenomenon*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), xvi. It should be noted that the body of this work appears not to have been actually updated from its first edition, and so the book deals only with revolutions prior to 1972.

³ Chalmers Johnson, *Revolutionary Change*, 2nd ed. (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1982), 1.

⁴ Jack A. Goldstone, “An Analytical Framework,” in *Revolutions of the Late Twentieth Century*, ed. by Goldstone, Ted Robert Gurr, and Farrokh Moshiri (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1991), 37.

⁵ Mehran Kamrava, “Revolution Revisited: The Structuralist-Voluntarist Debate,” *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 32, no. 2 (June 1999): 318.

⁶ Goldstone, Gurr, and Moshiri, eds., *Revolutions of the Late Twentieth Century*, *passim*.

⁷ George Lawson, *Negotiated Revolution: The Czech Republic, South Africa and Chile* (Aldershot, England, and Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate, 2005), 51-2.

A revolution is clearly not a single event, nor should it be so conceptualized, but as already implied needs to be thought of instead as a multistage process. As the *Blackwell Encyclopaedia* entry rightly says, “The term revolution is variously applied to the *process* of disenchantment with an incumbent regime, the *event* of its overthrow, the *programme* of the new regime, or the *myth* with which they legitimize their seizure of power.”⁸ Likewise, in his model of revolutionary change, Chalmers Johnson distinguishes the causes (change in values or division of labour, whether endogenous or exogenous), the resulting disequilibrium of the social system, power deflation, and the loss of authority and its accelerators, all antecedent to the ultimate revolutionary insurrection.⁹ While the concept of equilibrium may be problematic, the overall idea of revolution as something that unfolds progressively, even unpredictably, over time is a useful antidote to the notion that, like everything else in our day, it can be compressed to a 30-second clip on the television infotainment news. Goldstone for his part distinguishes four phases of revolution: pre-revolution; struggle and reconstruction; and, finally, stabilization.¹⁰

A further refinement in thinking about revolution is the concept of contingency. This has been emphasized by several scholars, even from opposite perspectives. For example, John Dunn has written that “the practical relations between destruction and the reconstruction of a superior social order prove over time to be . . . contingent and elusive.” And again: “revolutionary endeavour becomes a grimly contingent political endeavour.”¹¹ Johnson’s model, too, as he himself emphasizes, is itself not a theory, but “is sensitive to the contingencies that may arise when all the different variables are combined.”¹² This means, to put it briefly, that revolutionary outcomes are dependent on conditions and actions that may or may not be present in the preceding stages of the process, that nothing is inevitable in the development or succession of revolutionary events, and that revolutionary situations are equally liable to be defused as to explode. “Revolutions,” Dunn has written, “may become possible in conditions in which they would previously have been inconceivable.”¹³ Revolution in post-communist Ukraine, therefore, might be surprising, but thinking in terms of contingency it should not be considered improbable, impossible, or inevitable.¹⁴

⁸ *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Institutions*, ed. by Vernon Bogdanor (Oxford: Blackwell Reference, 1987), s.v., “revolution and counter-revolution,” 542. Emphasis in the original.

⁹ Johnson, *Revolutionary Change*, chap. 5.

¹⁰ Jack A. Goldstone, “Ideology, Cultural Frameworks, and the Process of Revolution,” *Theory and Society* 20 (1991): 407.

¹¹ Dunn, *Modern Revolutions*, xvi and xviii.

¹² Johnson, *Revolutionary Change*, 187.

¹³ Dunn, *Modern Revolutions*, 232. “Revolutions, he continues, “have to be considered as very complex series of actions initiated in highly particular circumstances and at particular points in time. The temptation to conceive of them as simply the collapse of long decrepit social orders, societies irretrievably out of functional equilibrium, is a temptation to ignore their character as performances of great complexity, in favour of a vision drawn from metaphors of natural processes. Functional analyses, . . . like those of Chalmers Johnson, plainly favour this perspective.” *Ibid.*, 232-3. Dunn is referring to the first edition (1966) of Johnson’s *Revolutionary Change*.

¹⁴ As to whether we can anticipate revolutions or must resign ourselves to being surprised by them, that is a debate I prefer to sidestep for the moment. For a sample of such debate, see Timur Kuran, “The Inevitability of Future Revolutionary Surprises,” *American Journal of Sociology* 100, no. 6 (May 1995): 1528-51, who argues that preference falsification operates to stymie the researcher, and the rebuttal of

Models of revolution nowadays also incorporate the concept of conjuncture.¹⁵ Thus Goldstone maintains that the conjunction (his term) of state breakdown due to fiscal failure, elite disunity, and the availability of masses of people for mobilization is capable of causing the destruction of the state and making a revolution.¹⁶ This means that monocausal explanations have to be abandoned in favour of theories that treat revolutions as originating in the confluence of and interaction between several factors.

A leading theorist of Third World revolutions whose work may have relevance for the project at hand has argued “that five interrelated causal factors must combine in a given conjuncture to produce a successful social revolution: (1) dependent development; (2) a repressive, exclusionary, personalist state; (3) the elaboration of effective and powerful political cultures of resistance; and a political crisis consisting of (4) an economic downturn; and (5) a world-systemic opening (a let-up of external controls).”¹⁷ Using Boolean analysis, following Charles Ragin,¹⁸ where the expression “ABCDE” indicates the presence and “abcde” absence of all of the above factors, as applied to 31 relevant cases, John Foran uncovered six distinct patterns of outcomes and causes.¹⁹ Thus, successful Third World social revolutions, as well as anti-colonial (social) revolutions, were accounted for by the presence of all five of the above factors, ABCDE. Attempted social revolutions, on the other hand, were associated either with (1) presence of dependent development, a culture of resistance, and an economic downturn, *plus* absence of an opening provided by the world-system (ABCDe), or (2) absence of the second to fifth factors combined (Abcde).

Three of Foran’s other patterns are suggestive for Ukraine’s situation and possible further development, provided that we are allowed to stretch the Third World to include postcommunist states, and assuming that the Orange Revolution does not qualify as an actual or attempted social revolution. But I stress that these patterns of outcomes and their causes are merely suggestive, not prescriptive or predictive. “The pattern of falling from power,” or reversal of revolution, he reports, “appears to be AbcDe,” which translates as being states characterized by

dependent development, more democratic politically than previously, increasingly polarized in terms of political cultures, . . . experiencing an economic downturn, and witnessing the closing of a favorable world-systemic opening. These last three factors—cDe—suggest a possible theory for reversals of revolution: revolutionaries fall from power when political fragmentation and polarization, economic difficulties, and outside intervention occur together.²⁰

Alejandro Portes, “On Grand Surprises and Modest Certainties: Comment on Kuran, Collins, and Tilly,” *ibid.*, 1620-6.

¹⁵ John Foran, “Theories of Revolution Revisited: Toward a Fourth Generation?” *Sociological Theory* 11, no. 1 (March 1993): 16-17; and Lawson, *Negotiated Revolution*, 6 and 54.

¹⁶ Goldstone, “An Analytical Framework,” 38-40 and 49.

¹⁷ John Foran, “The Comparative-Historical Sociology of Third World Social Revolutions: Why a Few Succeed, Why Most Fail,” in *Theorizing Revolutions*, ed. by Foran (London and New York: Routledge, 1997), 228.

¹⁸ Charles C. Ragin, *The Comparative Method: Moving Beyond Qualitative and Quantitative Strategies* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987).

¹⁹ Foran, “The Comparative-Historical Sociology of Third World Social Revolutions,” 231-59.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 246-7.

While it is doubtful that Ukraine qualifies as a case of “dependent development,”²¹ it is altogether possible that a combination of fragmentation of political culture, severe economic downturn, and Russian intervention could well reverse the Orange Revolution, judging by experience elsewhere in the world. A second type of outcome with possible application to Ukraine could be a political revolution. These are defined by Foran as “revolutions made by mass mobilizing movements and resulting in significant political change, but where the social and economic transformations . . . associate[d] with social revolutions do not accompany these changes.”²² The pattern observed, admittedly for only four cases, is that “all four cases lack *both* a full-blown dependent development or a permissive world context, suggesting that these two factors . . . are powerful deflectors of revolutionary movements and brakes on social transformation after they take power.”²³ Again the caveat about dependent development must be registered, and once again the international context—one thinks immediately of Russia, if not of the European Union and United States—acts as a crucial determinant. The third pattern, in which no attempt at revolution takes place, using a strict interpretation of cases, boils down to two key factors, namely that “the key obstacles to revolution appear to be problematical political cultures of opposition and the world-systemic setting.”²⁴ Clearly, if these findings are valid beyond the Third World, Ukraine appears vulnerable to a reversal of social revolution if it were ever to achieve one, to a limitation of its revolution to the political realm, or to no further attempts at revolution beyond the brief flare-up of 2004.

Models and theories such as those advanced by Goldstone and Foran, despite their nod to political culture, are obviously structural ones and hence limited in terms of their approach. The two of them, incidentally, disagree fundamentally on the part played by ideology and culture in the revolutionary process. Foran posits that ideologies and “political cultures of opposition” shape “the organizations and networks of social actors who make revolutions happen.”²⁵ Goldstone, meanwhile, maintains that “ideological factors may promote, but do not produce, the breakdown of old regime. It is chiefly *after* the initial breakdowns of the state, during the ensuing power struggles and state reconstruction, that ideology and culture play a leading role.”²⁶ One distinctly valuable contribution of the structuralist approach to the study of revolutions, however, for understanding the Orange Revolution in Ukraine, is its insistence that neo-patrimonial, sultanistic, and like regimes are more vulnerable.²⁷ Or, as Jeff Goodwin says, “one type of authoritarian regime is especially vulnerable, . . . namely, autonomous, corrupt, and

²¹ This is defined by Foran as “a process . . . of ‘growth within limits’: it refers to certain Third World economies, at certain moments in their history, that undergo both development—as measured by increases in GNP, foreign trade, industrial or agricultural output—combined with the negative consequences of the attendant social transformation in the form of inflation, debt, growing inequality, or overburdened housing and educational infrastructures, among others. This . . . creates social and economic grievances among diverse sectors of the population. . . .” *Ibid.*, 228-9.

²² *Ibid.*, 251.

²³ *Ibid.*, 255. Original emphasis.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 259. On the critical importance of “political cultures of opposition,” see Foran, “Discourses and Social Forces: The Role of Culture and Cultural Studies in Understanding Revolutions,” in *Theorizing Revolutions*, ed. by Foran, 203-26.

²⁵ Foran, “Discourses and Social Forces,” 219.

²⁶ Goldstone, “Ideology, Cultural Frameworks, and the Process of Revolution,” 405. Original emphasis.

²⁷ Foran, “Theories of Revolution Revisited,” 4.

repressive personalist dictatorships.”²⁸ “Neo-patrimonial” and “corrupt” were terms frequently used to characterize the regime of Yushchenko’s immediate predecessor, Leonid Kuchma; Ukraine unquestionably possessed at least that one structural feature as a precursor to revolution in 2004.

What makes structural theories of revolution one-sided (and in this writer’s view unsatisfactory until after the revolution is well and truly over) is that they ignore the element of human agency. To redress this imbalance the literature on negotiated revolutions is instructive. Mehran Kamrava, for example, has posited that “structural determinants and the deliberate actions of individuals can both be important in leading up to and consolidating revolutions. Revolutions,” he states, “can generally be divided into the three ideal types of spontaneous, planned and negotiated, and in each type a different mix of dynamics comes into play.”²⁹ In the simplest terms, spontaneous revolutions are initiated from below by society in response to structural causes; planned revolutions are the creatures of revolutionaries intent on modifying the structural conditions; and in negotiated revolutions elites bargain to resolve the state-society stalemate because “neither side is strong enough to overwhelm the other, not weak enough to be overwhelmed.”³⁰ Distinct outcomes—in ideology, political culture, policy, and institutions—follow from these three types of revolution.³¹ A similarly balanced approach—between structuralism and voluntarism—is emphasized by George Lawson. “Revolutions tend to take place,” he writes, when “the international order is relatively open to revolutionary challenges. . . . States most susceptible to these openings are those on the semi-periphery of the world system.” At the same time, however, “an opposition group exists with . . . a viable plan for radical change, holding sufficient resources to provide a credible challenge, and carrying out the support of significant social groups and members of the public.”³² He shows in his case study of Czechoslovakia’s negotiated revolution how the opposition lacked the resources—coercive, organizational, and legitimate—and had therefore to negotiate rather than being able to topple the regime.³³ Reviewing the subsequent changes, Lawson concludes that Czechoslovakia indeed experienced a true revolution, although not everything was changed.³⁴ While negotiated revolutions introduce a further degree of uncertainty beyond that of the spontaneous combustion of structural components of revolutions, and produce varying results (as Lawson demonstrates with respect to the Czech Republic, South Africa, and Chile), they bring actors and strategies into the picture as a necessary supplement to blind social forces which are never alone sufficient to account for revolutions.³⁵ In the case of the Orange Revolution we need to seek out and identify the revolutionaries, pay attention to their strategies, resources, ideologies, as well as support bases, and follow carefully their negotiations with the authorities as well as any subsequent unravelling of the resulting agreements.

²⁸ Jeff Goodwin, “Toward a New Sociology of Revolutions,” *Theory and Society* 23 (1994): 758.

²⁹ Kamrava, “Revolution Revisited,” 317.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 325.

³¹ *Ibid.*, summarized in Table 2, p. 339.

³² Lawson, *Negotiated Revolution*, 71.

³³ *Ibid.*, 87.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 120.

³⁵ Eric Selbin, “Revolution in the Real World: Bringing Agency Back In,” in *Theorizing Revolutions*, 123-36.

Rather than selecting a single model, theory or approach out of all those just reviewed, I am encouraged by the wise words of Charles Tilly. “The construction of invariant models of revolution,” he says flatly, “is a waste of time.”³⁶ The reason for this is simply that “the conditions for revolution are not uniform, but vary from region to region and period to period. The conditions vary as politics in general varies.”³⁷ It is neither necessary nor even possible to avoid eclecticism to achieve a satisfactory explanation.

Just as scholars have disagreed about the causes and outcomes of revolutions, so, incidentally, have they about the future of these basic transformations. While John Foran is one of those who “finds it far from the case that revolutions are headed for extinction as a species of social change in the near future,”³⁸ Robert Snyder contends that revolution has, in fact, passed into history.³⁹ Accepting Francis Fukuyama’s thesis of the universal triumph of liberalism, Snyder claims that revolutions are a thing of the past due to fundamentally changed circumstances. In terms of structural factors, phenomena such as state-led modernization, colonialism, neopatrimonialism, peasantry, and great power conflicts are all now gone, making revolutions unnecessary. Correspondingly, and in place of these, “four particular factors—democracy, markets, middle classes, and transnationalism—make revolution less likely.”⁴⁰ As to revolutionary agents, these, primarily radical intellectuals, “the group that became revolutionary elites in the past,” Snyder assures us, “will not have the kind of influence in the future that they had in the past.”⁴¹ He does concede, however, that some regions of the globe, like the Middle East, may still be susceptible or prone to revolution, and that new democracies, such as Russia, could fail, but otherwise revolution is obsolete as of the end of the twentieth century.⁴² Even if one does not believe in the “end of history,” such debate can stimulate some critical lines of thinking about the subject. It is probably premature to write the obituary for revolutions, not least because of their habit of surprising us.⁴³

What about democratic revolutions, of which the Orange Revolution has been said to have been an exemplar? As Mark Thompson points out, scholars are sceptical of these as revolutions because they bring “too little” or “too much” change, or because they are “too late”; and because they are urban, strictly political, and non-violent, they do not fit grand historical theories of revolution.⁴⁴ They are also liable to be suppressed by authoritarian regimes. Nevertheless, as explained previously, they do bring fundamental change and should be applicable to post-communist countries.

Of the various possible structural determinants of successful democratic revolution one stands out in particular. Based on a small-scale comparison of three

³⁶ Charles Tilly, “To Explain Political Processes,” *American Journal of Sociology* 100, no. 6 (May 1995): 1605.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 1600.

³⁸ John Foran, “The Future of Revolutions at the *fin de siècle*,” *Third World Quarterly* 18, no. 5 (1997): 815; and *idem*, “Introduction,” in *Theorizing Revolutions*, 1.

³⁹ Robert S. Snyder, “The End of Revolution?” *Review of Politics* 61, no. 1 (Winter 1999): 5-28.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 6 and 24.

⁴³ See again Kuran, “The Inevitability of Future Revolutionary Surprises,” 1528-51; and Portes, “On Grand Surprises and Modest Certainties,” 1620-6.

⁴⁴ Mark R. Thompson, “Whatever Happened to Democratic Revolutions?” *Demokratizatsiya* 7, no. 4 (Winter 2000): 1-20.

successful and three unsuccessful democratic revolutions, Mark Katz argues that “the role played by the military is . . . a key factor in determining the outcome of democratic revolution.” In fact, “it is only the refusal of the armed forces to use force that allows democratic revolutionaries to succeed,” and this evidently “results . . . from an overwhelming desire to prevent conflict within the military.”⁴⁵ As we know, it was the reticence of the military, police, and security forces in Ukraine to interfere with the crowds on the Maidan⁴⁶ that allowed the Orange Revolution to succeed (to the extent that it did).

Which brings us to the cultural determinants of democracy, on which topic Ronald Inglehart has put forward a theory that economic development underlies the secular and post-materialist value changes which support democracy, but that cultural influences moderate those democratic values in particular regions of the globe.⁴⁷ In today’s world, according to Inglehart, where cultures can be mapped principally on the two dimensions of (1) traditional versus secular-rational, and (2) survival versus self-expression, there is a universal shift towards self-expression values which in turn are strongly correlated with democracy. Post-communist countries, however, are collectively rather slow in terms of their development of self-expression values by comparison with their societies’ level of modernization. Ukraine’s acquisition of democratic values, therefore, as preparation for a democratic revolution will be relatively slow because of its experience with communist rule, but the actual rate of change is a topic for another paper (perhaps it should have preceded this one).

Borrowing freely from the theorists reviewed above it is possible to fashion an eclectic, but serviceable, model of revolution applicable to the Ukrainian case. In the spirit of do-it-yourself, such a model begins with the minimal definition of revolution as a forceful and fundamental change in society and the state, and distinguishes between social and political revolution. Revolution is a process, rather than a single event, broken down into at least three stages: preparation, execution, and outcome. The entire process is marked by contingency and conjuncture. A culture of opposition, articulated and led by revolutionaries, supported by a favourable international climate as well as a mass base domestically, overturns a corrupt, neopatrimonial regime. If the military stands down, a democratic revolution is assured. In terms of outcome, a revolution entails change in the institutions of the state, the state’s relationship with society, and the political culture sustaining the whole system. A negotiated revolution occurs when the opposition and regime are evenly matched in power and resources, in strength and weakness.

On the basis of such a model, then, in respect of the case at hand, the following hypotheses can be formulated. (1) If there was a culture of opposition previous to the events of November-December 2004, then the Orange Revolution could rightly be considered a revolutionary event or part of a revolution proper. If not, not. (2) If this

⁴⁵ Mark N. Katz, “Democratic Revolutions: Why Some Succeed, Why Others Fail,” *World Affairs* 166, no. 3 (Winter 2004): 163.

⁴⁶ Andrew Wilson, *Ukraine’s Orange Revolution* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005), 135-7; Taras Kuzio, “Ukraine’s Orange Revolution: The Opposition’s Road to Success,” *Journal of Democracy* 16, no. 2 (April 2005): 128; Adrian Karatnycky, “On Independence Square: Letter from Kiev,” *The American Scholar* 74, no. 2 (Spring 2005): 9; and Action Ukraine Report (henceforth AUR), no. 606, 23 November 2005.

⁴⁷ Ronald Inglehart, “Mapping Global Values,” *Comparative Sociology* 5, nos. 2-3 (2006): 115-36.

was a revolution, who were the revolutionaries, and what was their ideology? What were their resources and social bases? (3) If corruption of the Kuchma regime motivated the revolutionaries, what did they do about it following the Orange Revolution? How did they deal with it? (4) If change in state institutions was brought about by the Orange Revolution, what was the nature of the changes (structures, personnel), and were they significant enough to be characterized as revolutionary in the sense of being qualitative or fundamental? (5) If the Orange Revolution was a genuine one, then there should have been a change in (a) the relationship of the state to its society, and (b) in the political culture. Have these things happened? (6) If the Orange Revolution was a negotiated, as opposed to mass-led or elite-led, revolution, what, specifically, was negotiated, and has the agreement lasted? These hypotheses are in the following section tested in sequence against the historical evidence to provide answers to the questions posed at the outset of this paper.

Revolution in Orange

Scholars generally agree on the essentially non-revolutionary pattern of change that characterised Ukraine's politics from 1991 to 2004, preceding the Orange Revolution.⁴⁸ This pattern was abruptly and unexpectedly broken by the 2004 presidential election, which, as Vicki Hesli has put it, "represented a turning point in mass political involvement in Ukraine."⁴⁹ In the standard version, the Orange Revolution was a spontaneous expression of outrage and democratic sentiment.⁵⁰ In fact, however, a more plausible account emphasizes the preparation of the revolution over a number of years in advance in a series of dress rehearsals. This included the "Ukraine Without Kuchma" protests generated by the revelations surrounding the murder of journalist Hryhoriy Gongadze.⁵¹ Despite the outward political passivity of the Ukrainian public, a significant *culture of opposition* was actually developing in 2000-4 which contributed that element of authenticity to the Orange Revolution without which clearly the presence of the crowds of protesters could not have been sustained.

When we attempt to identify and describe *the would-be revolutionaries*, on the other hand, this aspect of the Orange Revolution becomes distinctly more ambiguous. The principals, of course, are: Viktor Yushchenko; Yuliya Tymoshenko; and Yushchenko's various backers, including Petro Poroshenko, Roman Bezsmertnyi, Davyd Zhvaniya, and others. Yushchenko and Tymoshenko have rather meagre revolutionary

⁴⁸ Wilson, *Ukraine's Orange Revolution*, 36-7; Paul D'Anieri, *Understanding Ukrainian Politics: Power, Politics, and Institutional Design* (Armonk, N. Y., and London, England: M. E. Sharpe, 2007), 69-72 and chap. 4; and Nathaniel Copsey, "Election Report: Popular Politics and the Ukrainian Presidential Election of 2004," *Politics* 25, no. 2 (2005): 100.

⁴⁹ Vicki L. Hesli, "The Orange Revolution: 2004 Presidential Election(s) in Ukraine," *Electoral Studies* 25 (2006): 175.

⁵⁰ Karatnycky, "On Independence Square," 6-9; Kuzio, "Ukraine's Orange Revolution," 117 and 126; and Kuzio, "From Kuchma to Yushchenko: Ukraine's 2004 Presidential Elections and the Orange Revolution," *Problems of Post-Communism* 52, no. 2 (March/April 2005): 40.

⁵¹ *The Guardian* (U.K.), 13 May 2005, in AUR, no. 485, 16 May 2005; Wilson, *Ukraine's Orange Revolution*, chap. 4; Serhiy Kudelia, "Revolutionary Bargain: The Unmaking of Ukraine's Autocracy through Pacting," *Journal of Communist Studies and Transition Politics* 23, no. 1 (March 2007): 80-3; and Tammy Lynch, "In Their Own Words: On the Way to Orange Ukraine's Revolutionary Social Movement Year 2002," Paper presented at the Danyliw Research Seminar in Contemporary Ukrainian Studies, University of Ottawa, 12-14 October 2006, cited with permission.

credentials; their backers are successful businessmen, not flaming radicals let alone populists.

Known because of his dominance of the confectionery business as “the chocolate king,” Poroshenko is one of Ukraine’s most important business magnates and an influential backroom politician with serious ambitions.⁵² He owns the Channel Five (5 kanal) television station, which led the way in publicising Yushchenko’s candidacy and the Orange demonstrations in the 2004 presidential election.⁵³ The godfather of one of Poroshenko’s daughters is none other than Yushchenko.⁵⁴ Poroshenko’s political history has been quite varied, if not to say inconsistent, moving easily from alignment with President Kuchma to opposition. Elected to parliament in 1998 as a member of the “oligarchic” Social-Democratic Party of Ukraine (United), he created his own caucus and party, Solidarity. It joined the Party of Regions (now under the leadership of Yanukovych) in 2000, but a year later pulled out to join Yushchenko’s Our Ukraine electoral alliance. In the 2002 general elections, Poroshenko was Our Ukraine’s campaign manager, and was himself re-elected to parliament. He then co-managed Yushchenko’s presidential campaign in 2004. His strong ties to business were variously seen as advantageous or disadvantageous to his prime ministerial ambitions. In January 2005, having named Tymoshenko as Prime Minister, Yushchenko appointed Poroshenko as head of the Council of National Security and Defence by way of a consolation prize.⁵⁵

Roman Bezsmertnyi also has a varied background, one in which consistently radical opposition to the Kuchma regime was not in evidence.⁵⁶ A history teacher by profession, he wrote a postgraduate dissertation (for a candidate’s degree) on the apostle of integral Ukrainian nationalism, Dmytro Dontsov. First elected to parliament in 1994 as a member of the distinctly conservative Ukrainian Republican Party, he returned in 1998 as a member of the pro-presidential “party of power,” the Popular Democratic Party (NDP) (where he was already part of the national leadership since June 1997). From December 1999 he served as President Kuchma’s permanent representative in the parliament. In 2002, however, having been elected to parliament on the Our Ukraine list (Yushchenko’s bloc), he was replaced. By then he was already a political coordinator of the Our Ukraine bloc; in 2004, he was director of the party’s staff during the presidential election, sharing responsibility for financing campaign activities with Davyd Zhvaniya. In February 2005, he was unexpectedly appointed by President Yushchenko as one of three deputy prime ministers in the cabinet of a rather startled Yuliya Tymoshenko, perhaps as a check on her volatility. Having been elected leader of the (rebranded) Our Ukraine People’s Union in March, Bezsmertnyi resigned his cabinet post in November in order to concentrate on the 2006 parliamentary elections on its behalf. He was reaffirmed as leader of the Our Ukraine People’s Union in November 2006, but having failed to consolidate an Orange coalition government his length of tenure was uncertain.

⁵² This paragraph is based, unless otherwise noted, on RFE/RL Belarus and Ukraine Report, 12 January 2005.

⁵³ Marta Dyczok, “Breaking Through the Information Blockade: Election and Revolution in Ukraine 2004,” *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 47, nos. 3-4 (September-December 2005): 241-64.

⁵⁴ RFE/RL Newswire, 28 December 2001.

⁵⁵ RFE/RL Newswire, 7 January and 25 January 2005.

⁵⁶ This is drawn from Kyivs’ke naukove tovarystvo im. Petra Mohyly, *Khto ie khto v Ukraini* (Kyiv: Vydavnytstvo “K.I.S.,” 2001), 26; and RFE/RL Newswire, 15 May 2001, 22 April 2002, 12 August 2004, 7 and 9 February 2005, 7 March 2005, 22 November 2005, and 13 November 2006.

Davyd Zhvaniya, the “cashier” of the Our Ukraine bloc, managed the logistics of the Orange Revolution demonstrations (at a cost, according to him, of \$150 million US).⁵⁷ Prior to being elected to parliament in 2002 on the Our Ukraine list, he was unaffiliated with any political party as president of the closed stock company, Brinkford, which is at the centre of his business activities and of a network of enterprises which he co-owns. This business empire, as it has been called, specializes in construction and shipbuilding. He was appointed Minister of Emergencies in February 2005. A relative of the late Georgian Prime Minister Zurab Zhvaniya, he has close ties to Michael Saakashvili, the President of Georgia. He also took part in the fateful supper with Viktor Yushchenko at the home of then deputy head of the SBU, Volodymyr Satsiuk. In the leadership of the Our Ukraine People’s Union, of which Yushchenko is honorary chairman, Zhvaniya sits on the ruling council together with Poroshenko and Bezsmertnyi.⁵⁸

As a former banker (and protégé of another banker, the late Vadym Het’man) as well as Prime Minister under President Kuchma, Yushchenko’s background is if anything that of oppositionist by default, not by design. Both he and Tymoshenko joined the opposition when they had antagonized and incurred the wrath of the so-called oligarchs.⁵⁹ At the height of the “Ukraine Without Kuchma” campaign, in fact, as *Dzerkalo tyzhnya* reminds us, a dress rehearsal for the Orange Revolution as it turned out, Yushchenko was rather easily manipulated into signing a statement jointly with Kuchma and parliamentary speaker Ivan Pliushch denouncing it as “fascist.”⁶⁰ Andrew Wilson calls this a big mistake on Yushchenko’s part.⁶¹ Characterizations of him in Western sources are less than flattering. “Personally,” says Wilson, writing of the start of the campaign in 2004, “Yushchenko was often disorganized and lazy; politically he was cautious.”⁶² This does not sound like the description of a radical. Gerhard Simon adds that “Yushchenko is not by nature a revolutionary or overthrower [*sic*] He is a moderate politician oriented toward consensus.”⁶³ Right after the Orange Revolution, Agence France Presse called him “Ukraine’s accidental revolutionary.”⁶⁴ Neither has he fared better since becoming President. “During the course of his presidency,” writes Taras Kuzio, “Yushchenko was increasingly viewed as a weak leader who lacked political will and strategy.”⁶⁵

For her part, Tymoshenko, an ex-client of the notorious ex-prime minister exiled to California, Pavlo Lazarenko, and herself a former gas trader, has little to her credit as revolutionary except her populism. There have, as is well known, been numerous allegations of corruption against her, but no trials or convictions.⁶⁶ It was passing strange

⁵⁷ *Dzerkalo tyzhnya*, 5-11 February 2005, on the internet at <http://www.dt.ua/1000/1030/49128/>, consulted on 4 May 2007; and AFP, Kiev, 17 February 2005, in AUR, no. 431, 17 February 2005.

⁵⁸ RFE/RL Newline, 13 November 2006.

⁵⁹ Wilson, *Ukraine’s Orange Revolution*, 45-9.

⁶⁰ AUR, no. 562, 17 September 2005.

⁶¹ Wilson, *Ukraine’s Orange Revolution*, 59.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 70.

⁶³ Gerhard Simon, “An Orange-Tinged Revolution: The Ukrainian Path to Democracy,” *Russian Politics and Law* 44, no. 2 (March-April 2006): 11.

⁶⁴ Agence France Presse (AFP), Kiev, 23 January 2005, in AUR, no. 416, 26 January 2005.

⁶⁵ Kuzio, “The Orange Revolution at the Crossroads,” *Demokratyzatsiya* 14, no. 4 (Fall 2006): 484.

⁶⁶ Wilson, *Ukraine’s Orange Revolution*, 22-4.

for her to be fighting corruption and to be the conscience of the Orange Revolution,⁶⁷ although conversion of sinners into saints has been known to happen in human history.

The only genuinely revolutionary component of the Orange forces was the youth activist organization, Pora (It's Time!). A radical, non-violent protest movement, it was modelled on its analogues in the previously successful Serbian, Georgian, and to a lesser extent Slovak revolutions.⁶⁸ This gave the Orange Revolution its youthful colouring, but Pora later fell out with its fellow Orange revolutionaries (presumably because of their failure to carry out its plans for an immediate purge of the old regime),⁶⁹ ran separately from Our Ukraine in the 2006 parliamentary elections, failed to cross the three per cent threshold, and practically vanished from the political scene thereafter.⁷⁰ Nevertheless, the Orange Revolution bore the hallmarks of its contemporary counterparts—a youthful, non-confrontational, and festive event making use of cellphone technology, the internet, and rock music—very unlike the violent, bloody, and confrontational revolutions of an earlier generation in 1968.

In the 2004 presidential election, the *corruption* typical of the Kuchma regime was a major issue.⁷¹ Opposition slogans included “Bandits to Jail!” and “Kuchmizm is Corruption!” Thereafter, however, some corrupt politicians of the Kuchma era became Party of Regions deputies following the 2006 parliamentary elections, thus securing immunity from prosecution; some “bandits” were rewarded with state medals in 2006; and a few fled abroad to places like Moscow.⁷² When the President's son, Andriy, became the focus of mass media attention for his lavish lifestyle, and it was revealed that he had registered as potentially profitable trademarks the symbols of the Orange Revolution, the elder Yushchenko became very annoyed, as though intimations of nepotism and corruption were alien phenomena.⁷³ Freedom House reported in June 2005 that while the level of general democracy had improved in Ukraine (from a score of 4.88 to 4.50), corruption had stayed the same in terms of its system of rating.⁷⁴

It was over the issue of corruption that the dispute erupted between Oleksandr Zinchenko, Poroshenko, and Tymoshenko in the fall of 2005, which resulted in the

⁶⁷ Ibid., 159.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 73-6. The similarities of these revolutions, the diffusion of tactics, the opportunities, and the repertoires of action are all analyzed by Olena Nikolayenko, “The Revolt of the Post-Soviet Generation: Youth Movements in Serbia, Georgia, and Ukraine,” *Comparative Politics* 39, no. 2 (January 2007): 169-88. It was revealed in 2007, incidentally, that there had been a Canadian connection as well. According to Mark MacKinnon, Canada's then ambassador, Andrew Robinson, gave Vladislav Kaskiv, head of PORA, \$30,000US, helping to get the movement started. *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 14 April 2007, in AUR, no. 830, 19 April 2007.

⁶⁹ AUR, no. 417, 27 January 2005. Or perhaps fell into step with them by quickly changing its pose to that of “the party of young entrepreneurs, and of ‘small and medium’ business,” according to Wilson, *Ukraine's Orange Revolution*, 162.

⁷⁰ “First,” writes one observer, “there was PORA, the youth-oriented group that played such a major role in 2004. But now, rather than having some clear central direction, PORA is split into Pink Pora and Yellow Pora and maybe even more groups and colors before it's over.” AUR, no. 743, 2 August 2006.

⁷¹ Kuzio, “Ukraine's Orange Revolution,” 122; and Copsey, “Election Report,” 101.

⁷² Kuzio, “The Orange Revolution at the Crossroads,” 478 and 486; and Testimony of Steven B. Nix, Committee on International Relations, Subcommittee on Europe and Emerging Threats, United States House of Representatives, 27 July 2005, in AUR, no. 582, 28 July 2005.

⁷³ *Guardian* (London), 3 August 2005, in AUR, no. 536, 4 August 2005; and BBC News, Kiev, 18 October 2005, in AUR, no. 586, 19 October 2005.

⁷⁴ AUR, no. 504, 17 June 2005.

dismissal of Tymoshenko as prime minister.⁷⁵ Accusations were first made by the President's just resigned chief of staff, Zinchenko, against Poroshenko, saying that the Orange Revolution was in danger and that corruption was re-emerging. Poroshenko then fired back with counter-charges, and abruptly also resigned. Knowing the antagonism between Poroshenko and Tymoshenko, and wary of letting go of the former so as to have to deal with the latter single-handedly, the President accepted Poroshenko's resignation and fired Tymoshenko and the entire cabinet. This was all uncalled-for, as no evidence had been presented, no investigation had been conducted, and neither Tymoshenko nor members of her government were at the moment being accused of or implicated in corruption. Yushchenko undertook to oversee the investigation into the corruption charges,⁷⁶ but nothing ever came of this. Observers were left with the impression that in terms of corruption, there was nothing to differentiate the Kuchma and Yushchenko regimes. That corruption persists was the view of 73.1 per cent of respondents in a survey of the residents of the capital, Kyiv, conducted at the time of this affair. What is important to note is the persistence not only of the perception of corruption but also of its use as a political weapon—altogether consistent with the discredited Kuchma regime.

Having fired Tymoshenko, and having then failed to have her replacement, Yurii Yekhanurov, approved by parliament, Yushchenko then inflicted on himself yet another, possibly fatal, blow to his credibility as revolutionary leader. He sought and obtained an agreement with Yanukovych, his supposed arch-enemy, by which the latter's Party of Regions would support the nomination of Yekhanurov as Prime Minister.⁷⁷ In exchange for the Party of Regions' 50 votes, Yushchenko granted amnesty to those who had perpetrated the vote fraud in the 2004 presidential election. Every pledge in the agreement signed by Yushchenko, Yekhanurov, and Yanukovych was, as one observer put it, a step backward for the President. For many, this was truly the end of the Orange Revolution.

The outstanding *institutional change* brought about by the Orange Revolution was to transform a presidential-parliamentary (or super-presidential, in Paul D'Anieri's assessment)⁷⁸ system of executive-legislative relations into a parliamentary-presidential one. This was part of a package presented at the round table negotiations, and agreed to reluctantly by Yushchenko, who was opposed to this (it was Kuchma's idea), but accepted because the trade-off was a fairer electoral system of pure proportional representation.⁷⁹ It should not have been surprising subsequently when Yushchenko attempted to rescind the agreement; the unconstitutionality of its adoption in December 2004 by the legislature of the day made its legal status questionable in any case. This

⁷⁵ AUR, no. 551, 6 September 2005; no. 554, 9 September 2005; no. 558, 14 September 2005; and no. 559, 15 September 2005. For the Ukrainian perspective, see *Zerkalo nedeli*, 10-16 September 2005, in AUR, no. 562, 17 September 2005.

⁷⁶ AUR, no. 559, 14 September 2005.

⁷⁷ AUR, no. 569, 24 September 2005; no. 571, 28 September 2005; and no. 574, 2 October 2005.

⁷⁸ D'Anieri, *Understanding Ukrainian Politics*, chap. 6.

⁷⁹ Kimitaka Matsuzato, "Differing Dynamics of Semipresidentialism across Euro/Eurasian Borders: Ukraine, Lithuania, Poland, Moldova, and Armenia," *Demokratizatsiya* 14, no. 3 (Summer 2006): 337. For a summary and discussion of the constitutional changes, see Robert K. Christensen, Edward R. Rakhimkulov, and Charles R. Wise, "The Ukrainian Orange Revolution Brought More Than a New President: What Kind of Democracy Will the Institutional Changes Bring?" *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 38 (2005): 223-6.

change in the balance of power in favour of the parliament and prime minister at the expense of the president, however, did nothing to alleviate the power politics and power struggles that had been such a prominent feature of Kuchma's decade in office, as was seen in the events of the spring of 2007. It has proved to be unworkable—suitable perhaps as a prelude to revolution, not as a revolutionary outcome.

One of Yushchenko's first actions in 2005 was to rearrange the Presidential Administration into a Presidential Secretariat. This reorganization has not, however, proven to be effective. Having canvassed the opinions of "various pundits and politicians," for example, one Ukrainian reporter described the new structure as of mid-2006 as having a whole series of evident weaknesses: failure to work out a presidential strategy; failure in generating new ideas and bringing in new blood; lack of clarity about the president's constituency ("all Ukrainians," or just the Our Ukraine party); loss of influence over the parliament; and loss of influence among local and regional elites.⁸⁰ The first two heads of the Secretariat, Oleksandr Zinchenko and Oleh Rybachuk, according to Taras Kuzio, who watches events in Ukraine from his vantage-point in Washington, D.C., "have both failed to provide the president with the necessary backup, expertise, and research for him to undertake presidential functions."⁸¹ In the opinion of Sarah Whitmore, writing more recently, the President was getting "limited support from his secretariat, which has been weakened by high staff turnover and capricious dismissals (sometimes entire departments) by the head of state" himself.⁸²

Beyond the Presidential Secretariat, Yushchenko has made some other personnel changes, including replacement of oblast (and raion) chief executives which were described as "bold." He also gave key jobs to his backers and financiers.⁸³ Writing a year after the Orange Revolution, Paul D'Anieri commented that overall institutions had been tweaked, not fundamentally changed; "there has been only modest institutional change, and some of it has arguably been for the worse," he said at the time.⁸⁴ No significant changes were made in the bureaucracy (except for abolition of the highly corrupt highway traffic police) or the judiciary.

In *state-society relations*, it would be comforting to say that a fundamental transformation had come in the course of the Orange Revolution and in its wake with the birth and maturation of civil society. Some observers did speak in such terms at the time, in late 2004 and early 2005.⁸⁵ Paul D'Anieri at first hailed the 2004 presidential election as marking the end of "machine politics" in Ukraine. He has described Kuchma's political machine as one in which "Ukraine's ruling political group constructed an organized system of distributing patronage, collecting votes, and coercing opponents which was both vertically integrated from the central to the local level and horizontally integrated, with different tactics being used in a coordinated fashion to achieve key

⁸⁰ AUR, no. 773, 16 July 2006.

⁸¹ AUR, no. 740, 28 July 2006.

⁸² AUR, no. 816, 16 February 2007.

⁸³ Wilson, *Ukraine's Orange Revolution*, 163-4.

⁸⁴ D'Anieri, "Assessing the Implications of the Orange Revolution," *Problems of Post-Communism* 52, no. 5 (September/October 2005): 82-3.

⁸⁵ See, for example, Copsey, "Election Report," 104; Karatnycky, "On Independence Square," 9; and Kuzio, "From Kuchma to Yushchenko," 39.

goals.”⁸⁶ The machine’s goal was staying in power and avoiding accountability. Unfortunately, following the relatively clean parliamentary elections of 2006, features of machine politics have reappeared with the use of law enforcement by the government of Viktor Yanukovich against its political opponents, the sidelining of the President by the governing coalition in parliament by all means fair and foul, and the enticement of deputies from other parties to join the coalition led by Yanukovich’s Party of Regions in parliament. Even D’Anieri has acknowledged that by the spring of 2007 there had been a reversion to “machine politics” and “power politics.”⁸⁷

Hans van Zon’s view of state-society relations and of the Ukrainian *political culture* before and after the Orange Revolution is even less encouraging, describing Ukraine as “a neo-patrimonial state in which each civil servant has his own fief.”⁸⁸ Furthermore, “there is no clear delineation of powers, competences, and responsibilities among different state agencies and levels.”⁸⁹ After the Orange Revolution, he claims, the population has not become more democratic (in the sense of holding government to account). Instead, we are seeing “the consolidation of a neo-patrimonial state and society” defined as

an intertwining of polity and economy, sharp separation of state and society, a cult of power, and the absence of rule of law. There was also a sharp distinction between formal rules and the de facto functioning of the state apparatus. The reproduction of the neo-patrimonial state was predicated by a neo-patrimonial society that allowed a ruling elite to govern arbitrarily and with impunity.⁹⁰

Van Zon therefore advises “caution against overly optimistic assessments of the democratization process in Ukraine.”⁹¹ Indeed, since the Orange Revolution, Ukraine’s population has become less engaged in politics than more, which is the opposite of a revolutionary outcome, especially a supposedly democratic one.

Yushchenko’s presidential campaign, Andrew Wilson has noted, “was as modern, even more modern or more post-modern, than any in the West,”⁹² which would suggest a significant change in the country’s political culture, a rapid catching up with the developed world. But it must be remembered that only 52 per cent of Ukrainians ended up voting for Yushchenko, responding to his campaign, in the final round. “It was unrealistic,” Wilson wisely concludes, “to expect political culture to be transformed overnight.”⁹³

A public opinion survey conducted in Ukraine in February-March 2005 on the subject of the Orange Revolution produced interesting results bearing on political participation, political culture, and regionalism.⁹⁴ They were anything but uniform,

⁸⁶ D’Anieri, “The Last Hurrah: The 2004 Ukrainian Presidential Elections and the Limits of Machine Politics,” *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 38 (2005): 234. On the application of the concept of “machine politics” to Ukraine, see the same author’s *Understanding Ukrainian Politics*, chap. 9.

⁸⁷ AUR, no. 828, 13 April 2007.

⁸⁸ Hans van Zon, “Political Culture and Neo-Patrimonialism Under Leonid Kuchma,” *Problems of Post-Communism* 52, no. 5 (September/October 2005): 15.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 16.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 19.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*

⁹² Wilson, *Ukraine’s Orange Revolution*, 132.

⁹³ *Ibid.*, 205.

⁹⁴ Viktor Stepanenko, “How Ukrainians View Their Orange Revolution: Public Opinion and the National Peculiarities of Citizenry Political Activities,” *Demokratizatsiya* 13, no. 4 (Fall 2005): 595-616.

suggesting support for the Orange Revolution was significantly fragmented—if not polarized—and liable to remain that way for some time to come. Respondents were first asked, “What was the Orange Revolution?” to which a plurality, 36.3 per cent, answered that it was a coup d’état, while 33.3 per cent said it was a “conscious struggle of the people, united to protect their own rights,” and 11.8 per cent thought it to be a “spontaneous people’s protest.” When asked whether the Orange Revolution was spontaneous or organized, 33.5 per cent said it was absolutely organized; 25.2 per cent, that it was partly both; and 23.9 per cent replied more organized than spontaneous. These assessments were closely associated with respondents’ actual participation in the events, their ethnicity, and region of residence, such that 64.3 per cent of participants saw the Orange Revolution as a conscious people’s struggle, while only 25.3 per cent of non-participants thought so. Correspondingly, 41.9 per cent of non-participants said it was a coup d’état; only 15.7 per cent of participants had this opinion. Fully 63.4 per cent who identified themselves as Russians termed the Orange Revolution a coup d’état, whereas 38.4 per cent of Ukrainians saw it as a people’s struggle. There was also a distinct West-to-East gradient in these attitudes: in the West and Centre, 58.2 and 41.9 per cent, respectively, called it a popular struggle; in the South and East, 46.5 and 51.5 per cent believed it was a coup d’état instead.⁹⁵ An amazing 20.0 per cent of respondents overall reported participating in the Orange Revolution. This was remarkable, but again not uniformly distributed across the country geographically. Altogether 79.0 per cent did not participate, but this varied to an astonishing degree: in the West and Centre, 51.1 and 76.7 per cent, respectively, did not participate; in the South and East, 95.6 and 90.6 per cent, respectively, stayed home. As the researcher duly noted, Ukraine appears to have “politically active citizens in the west and center and a more politically inert population in the east and south.”⁹⁶

The latter impression is reinforced by a study of the Donbas region, which traditionally has not seen itself as a part of Ukraine and where the newspapers in 2004 failed to report on the Orange Revolution giving the impression that no revolution at all had taken place in Kyiv.⁹⁷ The study concludes that “it will require substantial . . . efforts to integrate . . . this Ukrainian Ruhr into national politics and civil society.”⁹⁸ Hans van Zon has termed this region of eastern Ukraine as the heartland of neo-patrimonialism.⁹⁹ Clearly, the country’s regional cleavage has not been transcended by the Orange Revolution.

Public disillusionment with President Yushchenko, once the hero of the Orange Revolution, has been considerable.¹⁰⁰ In March 2005, he enjoyed a trust rating of 60 per cent; by the end of September 2006, this had fallen to 9.5 per cent, matching that of his predecessor. At the beginning of 2007, if presidential elections had been called, Yuliia Tymoshenko would have obtained 21.2 per cent of the vote, Viktor Yanukovich, 20.5,

⁹⁵ Stepanenko unfortunately fails to specify exactly which oblasts are included under the respective headings of West, Centre, South, and East.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 608.

⁹⁷ Ararat L. Osipian and Alexander L. Osipian, “Why Donbass Votes for Yanukovich: Confronting the Ukrainian Orange Revolution,” *Demokratizatsiya* 14, no. 4 (Fall 2006): 495-517.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 512.

⁹⁹ van Zon, “Political Culture and Neo-Patrimonialism Under Leonid Kuchma,” 20.

¹⁰⁰ *Den*, 23 January 2007.

and Viktor Yushchenko, a mere 8.3 per cent; the runoff would have been between Tymoshenko and Yanukovich.

To the extent that the Orange Revolution was a negotiated one, by early 2007 the *negotiation agreement* was a dead letter. First, the President himself expressed a desire on more than one occasion for a consultative referendum on the constitution; then, he said he wanted changes to the December 2004 constitutional agreement. In the interim, a power struggle between the President on the one side and the parliament and Prime Minister on the other developed into a full-fledged constitutional crisis. According to the American judge Bohdan Futey, an adviser to the Ukrainian authorities since independence, the constitutional crisis stemmed not only from an inadequately thought-through reform package in 2004, but also its questionable, if not illegal and unconstitutional, method of adoption by the parliament at the time.¹⁰¹

The Orange forces began to fall apart in 2005.¹⁰² There were tensions between President Yushchenko and Prime Minister Tymoshenko, as well as between Tymoshenko and the security council head, Petro Poroshenko. In September, Yushchenko dismissed and replaced both of them, making a fateful deal subsequently with Yanukovich in order to secure the appointment of Yekhanurov as Prime Minister. In the following parliamentary election campaign, Tymoshenko no longer backed Yushchenko's Our Ukraine but ran separately at the head of her own electoral alliance. Her bloc came in second place, ahead of Our Ukraine and after Yanukovich's Party of Regions. After the elections, a prolonged delay ensued as the Orange forces attempted to form a majority; Tymoshenko expected to be named Prime Minister, but Yushchenko was reluctant to have her serve again, unless Poroshenko were to be speaker of parliament. These hopes for an Orange government were dashed when the Socialist Party leader, Oleksandr Moroz, defected to the Blue-and-White (the colours of Yanukovich's Party of Regions) side, accepting the speakership of parliament. Ultimately, Yushchenko was forced, contrary to his own ideological proclivities, to designate Yanukovich as Prime Minister because the latter and his allies now had a parliamentary majority. Yushchenko attempted to bind Yanukovich to a declaration of national unity including provision that the latter would support his reform programme; it was signed by all party leaders except Tymoshenko. The government (cabinet) approved by parliament on that occasion was distinctly reminiscent of the Kuchma regime with a substantial contingent of the old guard present, unlike the Tymoshenko cabinet of the previous year. Soon thereafter, 40 of 54 deputy minister posts were given to people from Yanukovich's Donbas region. There then ensued a power struggle, specifically about the ability to name and dismiss cabinet ministers in which the President's powers over the cabinet were taken over by the parliament. At the end of the year, the pro-Western foreign minister, Borys Tarasiuk, was dismissed by the parliament, contrary to the constitution (since this was a presidential prerogative), and barred from cabinet meetings. Interior Minister Yurii Lutsenko, who had likewise irritated the Party of Regions, was also sacked, allegedly for corruption. Tarasiuk resigned in frustration on 30 January 2007. To affirm its power over the government, parliament passed a law on the cabinet and, despite two presidential

¹⁰¹ AUR, no. 827, 13 April 2007. See also Matsuzato, "Differing Dynamics of Semipresidentialism across Euro/Eurasian Borders," 337.

¹⁰² This paragraph is based on a reading of the RFE/RL Newline from January 2005 through early April 2007, and AUR, 1 January 2005 to 30 April 2007.

vetoed, promulgated it by having it published, bypassing the President altogether. Tymoshenko's bloc supported the law on the cabinet in parliament. In March 2007, Anatolii Kinakh, a prominent supporter of the Orange Revolution, deserted Yushchenko to serve in the Yanukovych government. There were numerous defections of deputies from the Our Ukraine caucus to the government side (boosting it to 260 out of 450), amidst allegations of bribery. On 2 April, President Yushchenko dissolved parliament and set elections for 27 May. His rationale was connected to the defections. Legally, he denounced the migration of deputies as unconstitutional, asserting that the parliamentary majority must be formed by factions (party caucuses) as elected, not by individuals defecting from one faction to another. Politically, he was also acting to forestall the formation of a super-majority of 300 capable, as was made clear, of (a) overriding presidential vetoes, (b) changing the constitution, and (c) reducing the presidency to a symbolic role, if not eliminating it altogether. The parliament refused to disperse and banned government funding of the election. Parliament and President denounced each other's actions as unconstitutional and appealed for a ruling from the Constitutional Court. The Minister of Defence announced that the army was taking President Yushchenko's side in the dispute—not, in light of our earlier theoretical discussion, likely a good omen from the point of view of democratic revolution.

Either the Orange Revolution had run its course, or it was being launched into (or lurching into) a second phase. Several developments reminiscent of a revival were evident in early 2007. One was the reunion and cooperation agreement at the beginning of February between Our Ukraine and Tymoshenko's party, a truly revolutionary event in terms of Ukrainian politics, characterized as they had habitually been by fragmentation and infighting. The second was former interior minister Yuri Lutsenko's organization of the People's Self-Defence and his staging of a massive protest demonstration on the Maidan on 31 March together with Tymoshenko and Our Ukraine. At the time, Lutsenko was being harassed by law enforcement agencies much in the style of Kuchma's time. There were many signs of Yanukovych's desire to take Ukrainian politics back to neo-patrimonial days; and a few signs of resistance. An early election would be a showdown between Yanukovych and Tymoshenko, following which she would either emerge as Prime Minister or decide who it would be.¹⁰³ An opinion poll conducted between 27 February and 16 March 2007, with 11,114 respondents, indicated that the Party of Regions (led by Yanukovych) would receive 33.5 per cent of the vote in parliamentary elections; Tymoshenko's BYuT, 24.9 per cent; Our Ukraine (Yushchenko's party), 9.6 per cent; and the Communist Party, 5.0.¹⁰⁴ This compares with the 2006 elections, when the percentages were 32.1, 22.3, 13.9, and 3.7, respectively. In May 2007, another roundtable—this time just with the two principals, Yushchenko and Yanukovych, without either Kuchma or foreign participants—reached an agreement on early parliamentary elections with the tacit understanding that the outcome could well be a Blue-Orange coalition in exchange for Yushchenko's unobstructed run for a second term.¹⁰⁵ From a longer-term perspective, events of 2007 could be seen as a dragged-out extension of the Orange Revolution or its final stifling.

Further Possibilities

¹⁰³ *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 6 April 2007.

¹⁰⁴ *Ukrainian News/Ukrains'ki visti* (Edmonton), 4-17 April 2007. See also AUR, no. 830, 19 April 2007.

¹⁰⁵ AUR, no. 839, 7 May 2007.

A few future scenarios for Ukraine after the Orange Revolution can be sketched in. As the comparative literature suggests, a major impulse for revival of the revolutionary urge could come from a severe economic downturn. This, however, is unlikely in the short term as Ukraine's gross domestic product has resumed growing at a healthy rate (up 9.3 per cent in the twelve months ending January 2007),¹⁰⁶ much better than in 2005 when it dropped to 2.8 from 12.1 per cent growth a year earlier. Another possibility is stalemate, leading eventually to either (a) no revolutionary outcome, (b) a reversal of the Orange Revolution, or (c) re-ignition of revolution. In these instances, presumably the international context will be the chief determinant. Will Russia permit further revolutionary developments towards a genuinely democratic outcome? We know that Russia has in the past interfered in Ukrainian elections to boost the chances of pro-Russian, and to lessen those of pro-Western, forces.¹⁰⁷ The trouble is that they cannot help themselves because Russian "political technologists" do not regard Ukraine as a foreign country, as Taras Kuzio says, but as Russia's own backyard. In general, to the extent that the Orange Revolution was one against fraud, corruption, and neo-patrimonialism, Russia's orientation towards events in Ukraine is anti-revolutionary. What about the posture of the European Union (EU) and United States? Unfortunately for Ukraine, in spite of its active role in supporting the Orange Revolution at the time, the EU has since then moderated this support in order not to alienate Russia on whom it depends for a steady supply of natural gas.¹⁰⁸ In April 2007, therefore, typically the European Parliament was taking a hands-off approach warning "EU institutions not to get involved in Ukraine's political crisis," while Russian parliamentarians were meeting with their counterparts from the governing coalition of Viktor Yanukovych and *Izvestiia* was warning of an imminent coup including the use of force by Yushchenko and the "Orangeists."¹⁰⁹ The international environment will likely be critical for political change in Ukraine, and it will not favour democratic revolution.

What also makes revolutionary upheaval unlikely in Ukraine is that the country is already more democratic now as a result of the Orange Revolution—elections are cleaner, the media are freer, and people are less docile.¹¹⁰ Which is not to deny that the transformation is still less than complete. To appreciate the significance of these accomplishments, such as they are, one has only to contrast the different ways that Russian and Ukrainian authorities respectively handled mass political demonstrations in the spring of 2007.¹¹¹ A further revolutionary impulse, therefore, against an already

¹⁰⁶ RFE/RL Newswire, 15 February 2007.

¹⁰⁷ Kuzio, "Russian Policy Toward Ukraine During Elections," *Demokratizatsiya* 13, no. 4 (Fall 2005): 491-517.

¹⁰⁸ Paul Kubicek, "Ukraine and the European Neighborhood Policy: Can the EU Help the Orange Revolution Bear Fruit?" *East European Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (March 2007): 1-23. By March 2007, relations between Ukraine and the EU, in the wake of visits to European capitals by Yanukovych and Yushchenko, were said to be "at a complete standstill." AUR, no. 823, 14 March 2007.

¹⁰⁹ AUR, no. 826, 12 April 2007, and no. 828, 13 April 2007.

¹¹⁰ See, for example, AUR, no. 585, 17 October 2005; no. 589, 24 October 2005; no. 604 21 November 2005; no. 605, 22 November 2005; no. 609, 2 December 2005; and no. 740, 28 July 2006, and no. 797, 17 December 2006.

¹¹¹ Anne Applebaum, "Two Protests, One Sign of Hope," *Washington Post*, 17 April 2007, in AUR, no. 830, 19 April 2007; *Globe and Mail* (Toronto), 14 and 16 April 2007; and *Edmonton Journal*, 16 and 17 April 2007.

more democratic regime than it was before 2005 seems improbable, based on comparative theory as well as plain logic.

Conclusion

The Orange Revolution of 2004 was, from a strictly political science perspective, a planned, not spontaneous, revolution assisted by the mobilization of large numbers of the public. It showed a loss of fear of the authorities (itself a revolutionary change in state-society relations) and exposed the fraud perpetuated in the second round of the presidential election. The leading revolutionaries were not radical intellectuals or armed insurgents, but politicians out of favour with the regime backed by bankers and successful businessmen. Their ideology was anti-corruption, anti-Kuchma, and vaguely pro-democracy, pro-rule of law, and pro-market. From the roundtable negotiations they secured a compromise agreement—a rerun of the presidential runoff plus a new election law, in exchange for constitutional changes desired by the outgoing regime. After winning the election, the Orange forces produced very little in the way of revolutionary outcomes. The generational change in the political elite represented by the first cabinet of 2005 was totally undone a year later with the return of the old guard under Prime Minister Yanukovich. Frictions dissolved the Orange coalition. President Yushchenko attempted to forge a grand coalition with his former nemesis, Yanukovich. Power struggles and power politics returned. The President, disempowered by parliamentary manoeuvres of the sort used earlier by President Kuchma against the parliament, renounced the constitutional changes agreed to in 2004. Old-style politics—bribery of deputies to cross the floor, harassment of the government’s political opponents, personal ambition taking the upper hand over principle and commitment—re-emerged. Institutions outside the executive-legislative arena were untouched by change. The public became more disenchanting with politics, despite the “people’s victory” of 2004.

All of this dissipation of the revolutionary spirit of 2004 happened, in my estimation, not because of structural reasons, but largely for those of human agency. The economy fell sharply in 2005, which should have impelled the revolution forward. It did not. The revolution fizzled because the pact negotiated in December 2004 was a poisoned chalice, full of ambiguities and uncertainties; it was illegally adopted to boot. The opposition did not have a strong enough position, or did not press strongly enough, and had to accept what was offered by the outgoing regime. Thereafter, failures of leadership account mainly for the revolution’s going off the rails. Yushchenko’s actions and lack thereof—in rewarding his backers rather than concentrating on placing reformers in key offices; his lack of strategy once he became President; his indecisiveness and lack of vision; his deals with Yanukovich including especially the amnesty granted those involved in the 2004 vote fraud—were critically important in braking the revolutionary process. In the meantime, Yanukovich, who was getting image advice from U.S. advertising experts while at the same time receiving moral and propaganda support from Russia, was able to revive neopatrimonialism and power politics into the resulting vacuum. To this has to be added the disengagement of the West, not insisting on democratic reform, this, too, stalled the process. Matters were unpredictably complicated also by unforeseen actions such as the defection of Moroz to the side of Yanukovich. Now at last Yushchenko is showing uncharacteristic

decisiveness, yet without a favourable international context and a commitment to real democratic ideals the prospects of a genuine revolutionary revival are dim.

The Orange Revolution was indeed a truly revolutionary event, but certainly not the whole of the process nor the consummation of a full-fledged revolution. It was a revolution against Leonid Kuchma's neopatrimonial regime, but without any reshaping vision beyond opposition to the former President. It achieved only a partial political transformation because of flawed leadership, and we may have to wait for the next generation of leaders as well as a maturing of the political culture for the process to unfold further.

2007-05-10