

Olexiy Haran

## POLITICS AND SOCIETY IN INDEPENDENT UKRAINE

### UNDERSTANDING UKRAINE

Until recently Ukraine was to a great extent *terra incognita* for the West. The history of Ukraine was distorted by Soviet propaganda, many documents were concealed from the public, as well as from most scholars. Although in comparison with studies of other Soviet nationalities Ukrainian studies were better developed, they «were frequently considered irrelevant to ‘real’ politics in the USSR, politically motivated by *émigré* agendas, and emotionally charged by nationalist perspectives. In a word, it was supposed to be ‘unscholarly’.»<sup>1</sup> Events in Ukraine were traditionally viewed by Sovietologists through Moscow’s perspective. Therefore, after Ukraine gained independence, it was rather difficult for Western policy-makers to understand the role of the Ukrainian national movement and its dynamics.<sup>2</sup> Some Western analysts started to talk about possible interethnic conflicts, „split” of the country, turning „back to Eurasia”. It never happened.

### ETHNOPOLITICAL CONTEXT

At the beginning of the 1990s, ethnic Russians made up 21 per cent of Ukraine’s population, while other national minorities comprised 6 per cent.<sup>3</sup> Ukrainian-speaking Ukrainians comprised approximately 40 per cent of Ukraine’s population, and Russian-speaking Ukrainians 33–34 per cent.<sup>4</sup> During his presidential campaign in 1994 Leonid Kuchma referred several times to the ‘Eurasian space’. In turn, the Ukrainian left appealed to Soviet-era elements of public opinion and continued to use symbolic, pan-Slavic rhetoric.

The fact that this rhetoric has not been translated into Kyiv’s policy is explained by the following factors. First, the Ukrainian population is afraid of the possibility of becoming involved in military conflicts within the CIS. Second, Kyiv’s policy toward its ethnic minorities allows them to feel quite secure without appealing to Russia for protection. The Soviet-era designation of ethnicity in passports was eliminated when new Ukrainian passports were introduced in mid-1990s. The 1992 Law on National Minorities was considered by Council of Europe experts as one of the best in Central-Eastern Europe. The 1996 Constitution defined ‘the Ukrainian people’ in its preamble as ‘citizens of Ukraine of all nationalities’. Since independence, the number of pupils and students studying in the Russian language has been falling, but is still considerable - about one-quarter of school pupils and

university students and it is possible that the figure is in reality higher than in official statistics. The Russian language predominates in schools and universities in the east and south of the country. Only about a quarter of circulation of national and local newspapers and journals is published in Ukrainian.<sup>5</sup>

A number of factors have hindered the formation of powerful lobby organisations of Russian-speakers. Socio-economic and political opportunities are not limited by ethno-linguistic criteria. The boundaries between the main ethno-linguistic entities (i.e. Ukrainian-, Russian-speaking Ukrainians and ethnic Russians) are blurred, as the languages are very close; most of the population is bilingual. Russian-speakers do not have their own clear-cut identity: they are split between ‘Ukrainians’, ‘citizens of Ukraine’, ‘Russians’, ‘Russians in Ukraine’, ‘Russo-Ukrainians’ and so on. Russian-speaking leaders do not feel excluded from the political struggle in Kyiv and they feel that it is more realistic to compete for seats and resources in Kyiv than in Moscow. As Taras Kuzio and David Meyer stress, ‘Donbas Russians need not mobilise ethnically when they can mobilise more easily, efficiently, and effectively as a purely political and regional force, operating in co-operation with Russified Ukrainians and other regions’.<sup>6</sup>

Independence transformed the status of what had previously been a provincial elite. The independence of Ukraine became one of the dominant values of the elite, even though Russian political and cultural influence was essential. Both Presidents Kravchuk and Kuchma followed a certain logic of state-building. Societal preferences in Ukraine were changing as well. The number of those who favoured any form of unification with Russia (federation or confederation) drastically reduced: from 41% in 1993 to 26-27% in 2001-2002.<sup>7</sup> As Paul d’Anieri wrote, “the most important change in society is the increasing acceptance by all citizens of Ukraine that Ukraine will indeed remain separate from Russia and that it is their country...”<sup>8</sup>

## „NEW” PRESIDENT: AUTHORITARIANISM VS. REFORMS

Since *perestroika* political development in Ukraine has shown that most decisions in the country are made by compromise. In contrast to many other countries of the CIS, Ukraine gained independence and is developing without bloody interethnic conflicts, without violent conflicts between branches of power. Ukraine became the first country of the CIS where both the parliament (Verkhovna Rada) and President were changed democratically in the 1994

elections. The new 1996 Constitution of Ukraine was the result of a compromise between the President and the parliament. Kyiv solved this problem in an ‘evolutionary’ way, as opposed to the ‘revolutionary’ Yeltsin way, which involved an armed assault on the Russian parliament. The fact that Ukrainian rightists and national-democrats were joined by centrists and part of the left deputies was crucial for the adoption of the Constitution.

However, the flip side of the transition period in Ukraine was the strong influence of the Communist past. This influence was not radically restricted as in Poland, the Czech Republic, and the Baltic countries. As a result, political and economic situation has not been stabilised yet.

Despite irregularities (including restrictions on independent media, illegal campaigning by state officials, etc.), elections throughout the 1990s were considered by international observers to reflect the general will of the electorate.<sup>9</sup> For example, in the second round of the 1999 presidential election, the incumbent Kuchma defeated the Communist hard-liner, Symonenko, in a landslide victory (56.25 and 37.8 percent respectively). This result coincided both with sociological forecasts and exit polls.

In his inaugural address, Kuchma promised to become „a new President”. In December 1999, pro-market (reform) head of the National Bank of Ukraine, Viktor Yushchenko, was approved as premier. In January 2000, the leftist leadership of the parliament was replaced and for the first time since independence a distinctly anti-Communist, pro-Presidential, majority was created.

Despite this progress, the authoritarian trend in Kuchma’s policy was growing. On April 16, 2000, President Kuchma won a referendum which was held on a so-called „people’s initiative” (in fact, organised by oligarchic clans). The final text of the ballot included four questions: 1) Should the President be able to dissolve the parliament for failure to form a majority within a month or to adopt a state budget within three months? 2) Should the immunity of the parliamentary deputies be cancelled? 3) Should the number of parliamentary deputies be reduced from 450 to 300? 4) Should the parliament have two chambers?

European institutions strongly criticised this referendum, which was held on a very loose legal basis to give the President broader authority. Although official voter participation was over 80 percent, this figure was unreliable because of obvious violations during the referendum process. The law on referendums was adopted in July 1991, when Ukraine was still a part of the Soviet Union. The authorities directly interfered in the campaign, and 54 percent of the

voting was conducted over week-long period prior to April 16.

At the same time, two other questions submitted by President Kuchma for the 2000 referendum (on the right of the President to dissolve then existed parliament, and to adopt the new Constitution on referendum) were deemed unconstitutional by the Constitutional Court. Therefore, these two questions were omitted from the ballot. Moreover, the Constitutional Court stipulated that the results of the referendum should be implemented through proper constitutional procedure, that is, approval of two-thirds of MPs. Because of the opposition in the parliament, both from leftist and rightist deputies, the President's draft law on constitutional changes failed.

### THE „TAPEGATE” SCANDAL AND GEOPOLITICAL CONTEXT

In November 2000, Oleksandr Moroz, former speaker of the parliament and leader of the opposition Socialist party, made public tapes allegedly recorded in Kuchma's cabinet by the President's former security officer. The recordings could be interpreted as the President and his entourage discussing the journalist Gongadze's kidnapping (Gongadze was found murdered) as well as the unlawful treatment of the opposition and the press. As a result, the opposition demanded Kuchma to resign. Most TV channels and some newspapers seized the opportunity created by internal government struggles over the „Tapegate” scandal and provided a relatively balanced coverage of the events.

There were many speculations in the mass media about who provoked the crisis. Russian and Ukrainian media controlled by „oligarchs” wrote about the so called „Brzezinski plan” to undermine Russian-Ukrainian relations, to make Yushchenko President, and then, perhaps, even „to send Kuchma to the Hague” (as happened with former Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic).

These interpretations were not been substantiated by subsequent developments. Ukraine's relations with the West deteriorated. In April 2001, the parliament dismissed Yushchenko (with the de-facto consent of Kuchma). At the same time, in contrast to the West, Russian President Putin did not criticise Kuchma, but de-facto provided support to him and intensified contacts with Kyiv.

However, as Russian influence in Ukraine could limit the power of the Ukrainian elite, it was clear that even in the midst of the crisis Kyiv would resist to any scenarios which could lead to the strengthening of supranational institutions in the post-Soviet space. It is significant that in Ukrainian diplomacy under foreign minister Anatoly Zlenko (who was favoured by Moscow

for his compromising approach) the very term „multi-vector policy” disappeared by the summer of 2001. It was stated that Ukraine’s first priority was European integration. After the terrorist attack on the US on September 11, 2001, the West has concentrated on dealing with Putin and Kyiv faces the danger of falling behind Russia’s shadow. In the Western press, Ukraine is often negatively depicted, with primacy given to criticisms of Kuchma and the corrupt state bureaucracy. However, in this approach one important factor is missed: in Russia there is no real opposition to President Putin while in Ukraine, democratic forces still fight for power.

In the new geopolitical situation it was extremely important for Kyiv to remind the West about its European aspirations. In February 2002, Kuchma presented the schedule for Ukraine’s integration into the EU, which envisaged that by 2011 Ukraine should meet the EU criteria for a membership. The Ukrainian leadership also tried to use further NATO-Russian rapprochement (which resulted in the creation of NATO-Russia Council on May 28, 2002) to declare on May 23, 2002 „about the beginning of practical realisation of the course to join NATO”. In the context of Russia–NATO rapprochement, the arguments of the Ukrainian adversaries of NATO about the ‘anti-Russian’ character of NATO lost its importance. After the optimistic results of the March 2002 parliamentary election, some Ukrainian and Western analysts called for forward movement in launching a Membership Action Plan for Ukraine, and even to raise the question of future membership for Ukraine at the NATO summit in Prague in November 2002. However, the latest „tapegate” revelations have also had an effect on Ukraine’s NATO aspirations.

The tapes contained a portion in which Kuchma discussed, on July 10, 2000, the possibility of illegal sales to Iraq of the Ukraine-produced *Kolchuga* anti-aircraft radar system. At the end of September 2002, American experts identified this part of the tapes as authentic. Washington demanded participation of Western experts in the investigation of this matter in Ukraine, and Kuchma had to agree. US and British experts received unprecedented access to Ukrainian military facilities. Both sides did not have enough arguments to prove or disprove if this selling had ever taken place. However, it seemed that the West withdrew at least part of its objections on Kuchma’s presence in Prague; the Ukrainian President finally appeared in Prague to participate in one of the two planned events. Ukrainian Foreign Minister Zlenko signed the Action Plan between Ukraine and NATO, which, according to Ukrainian diplomats, resembles to a certain extent the Membership Action Plan, but without formally proclaiming the final aim of joining NATO. The US-Ukrainian relations were improved in

spring 2003 when, in the course of American military action against the Iraqi regime, Kyiv agreed to send a Ukrainian anti-chemical batallion to Kuwait, and decided to participate in stabilization forces in Iraq after the conflict.

## ECONOMIC POLICY

Since 2000, Ukraine has demonstrated impressive positive economic growth after a decade of economic decline. In 2000, the GDP increased by 6%, in 2001 - by 9%. This success is usually attributed to favourable external market conditions and the policy of Yushchenko's government in reducing administrative interference in the economy, providing for stable payment schemes in the energy sector, and cutting inflation. In 2001, the Verkhovna Rada passed new Land, Budgetary, Criminal, Family, Civil, Commercial and Customs codes which provide a long-awaited legal basis for modernizing Ukraine's economy and legal system. In July 2001, President Kuchma signed a package of five laws that implemented the so-called small judicial reform. On February 7, 2002, the Law On the Court System was adopted. It provides for the implementation of the constitutional requirement that separate courts exist for criminal, civil, administrative, and other types of cases.

Though recent reforms pave the way for systemic changes in the judiciary, there are continuing problems in Ukraine with the executive artificially influencing and misinterpreting legislation, administrative over-regulation in the economic sphere, corruption and the persistence shadow economy. The government of Anatoliy Kinakh (Yushchenko's successor) lacked political will and its economic policy remained inconsistent. Signs of economic slow down appeared, though growth remains quite high. In 2002, the GDP increased by 4.8%, and deflation was negative 0.6%.

More than two-thirds of Ukraine's GDP is generated by non state-owned enterprises. There is an improvement in the development of small businesses. In June 1999, the Ukrainian President issued a decree allowing small businesses to pay a fixed tax of \$4 to \$40 per month, depending on the type of business, exempting them from all other taxes. Unsurprisingly, many businesses signed up for this tax scheme. Since the new tax was earmarked for local bodies, local government revenues have increased as a result. The June 2001 Budget Code created a coherent scheme for distributing tax and duty revenues among the state, oblast, and rayon levels.

There has been a certain improvement in Ukraine's rating in the index of corruption compiled annually by Transparency International, from 1.5 in 2000 to 2.4 in 2002. In November 2002,

the Ukrainian Parliament adopted the law „On Avoiding Legalization of Funds Obtained by the Illegal Ways”. It was the main demand of Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering (FATF) to Ukraine. However, on December 20, 2002, the FATF recommended its member-states to introduce sanctions against Ukraine, which should be regarded as a state which does not sufficiently fight to combat money-laundering. The FATF deemed that Ukraine had not implemented its recommendations proposed half a year earlier. At the same time, 40 recommendations of the FATF did not take into consideration Ukrainian realities, proposing to strengthen the role of law-enforcement agencies, which could lead to economic control over opposition. After the Ukrainian parliament approved several additional changes to the laws regulating banking activity, the FATF recommended, on February 12, 2003, to lift sanctions, but decided to closely monitor the situation in the Ukrainian financial sector until June 2003.

#### CIVIL SOCIETY AND MASS MEDIA<sup>10</sup>

The process of development of civil society is lagging behind analogous processes in the post-communist countries of Central Europe or the Baltic. However, it is important to take into account that in Soviet Ukraine sprouts of civil society were destroyed systematically and more vigorously than in Russia proper.

Nevertheless, the number of NGOs has grown significantly. By the end of 2002, there were approximately 35,000 NGOs in Ukraine, up from 30,000 in 2000 and only 4,000 in 1995. This can be explained by the increasing possibilities for active persons to find self-fulfilment in NGOs, as they begin to influence local life and decision-making. Local authorities have also started to show an interest in NGO activities aimed at helping the poor, children, or the disabled. According to the Innovation and Development Centre, in 22 oblasts (out of 24 oblasts plus the Autonomous Republic of Crimea) the quantity of NGOs per 10,000 persons is the same as in 35 US states.<sup>11</sup> However, in small towns and villages, NGOs that operate well are rather an exception. Philanthropy and volunteerism are insufficiently developed because of over-regulation and they are usually connected to election campaigns.

One of the main problems of Ukrainian third sector is its overdependence on Western support. At the same time, since the beginning of the „tapegate” scandal, the suspicious attitudes of Ukrainian authorities towards the West have increased. In January 2002, Volodymyr Lytvyn, then head of the Presidential Administration (chief of staff) and leader of the „For a United Ukraine” block, published in the daily *Fakty*, an article „Civic Society: Myths and Reality”.

This article was based on the work of Thomas Carothers, Vice-President of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. However, it took into account only those arguments that pointed out to problems in NGO activities. According to Lytvyn, Ukrainian NGOs represent mostly Western interests. In February 2002, in another article, one of the oligarchs, Viktor Medvedchuk (present head of Presidential Administration), supported the view on Ukrainian NGOs' overdependence on the USA<sup>12</sup>.

This approach evoked a strong reaction from democratic forces. In 2002, there were two national forums of Ukrainian NGOs (supported by the International Renaissance Foundation, a branch of the Soros Foundation). The first one, held in February 2002, was devoted to monitoring the electoral campaign. It was attended by Madelene Albright, head of National Democratic Institute and former Secretary of State, who was visiting Ukraine. The second forum, in June 2002, discussed the idea of creation of a „civil parliament” of Ukrainian NGOs. Major NGOs are increasingly influencing the policy debate. Ukrainian Foreign Minister regularly meets with the consultative board of NGOs created at the end of 2001 on the initiative of this Ministry. However, on many occasions, authorities try to use pro-governmental NGOs to legitimize their decisions.

Since 1999, the authorities have increased their control over the mass media. Most of Ukraine's media is privatised.<sup>13</sup> Opposition newspapers have a combined circulation of about 1.5 million. However, the opposition's access to radio and TV outlets is very restricted. The murders of Heorgiy Gongadze, editor of opposition Internet newspaper *Ukrainska pravda*, in September 2000, and of Ihor Aleksandrov, director of an independent TV station in the Donetsk region, in July 2001, remain unresolved.

Ukrainian media is very dependent financially on its owners, most of whom belong to oligarchic clans. The printed media's low profitability can be explained by insufficient development of the advertising market in Ukraine. In 2002, it comprised about \$95 mln (\$70 mln in 2001). The TV advertisement market is larger (about \$ 650 mln. in 2002) because of the higher price of advertising, though this too is insufficient.<sup>14</sup>

The number of Internet media is growing rapidly. Political Internet-editions have become an important source of independent information. About 2 million people use Internet. Although this represents only 4 percent of the population, the figure is increasing and these users represent the most dynamic part of society. In small towns and villages Internet access is limited because of technical problems and financial difficulty. The overall quantity of Internet providers in Ukraine is about 400. The income of Internet-providers has grown by 46% in

2001, but remains low compared to Western European countries and the United States. Western support to Ukraine's civil society and independent mass media remain crucial. Western decision-makers seem to understand the necessity to differentiate between Kuchma's regime and Ukrainian society. At the end of September 2002, in the course of „Iraqgate” scandal, the United States suspended \$54 million (one-third of its aid to Ukraine) which was earmarked for central government agencies while continuing support to the „third sector”, local government, and military institutions.

## STRUCTURING THE PARTY SYSTEM

The political structuring of Ukrainian society sped up after the introduction of a mixed electoral system for the 1998 election.

There are four major political camps in Ukrainian politics: the traditional Left (Communists), the Centre-Left (Socialists), Centre, and Centre-Right.

„THE CENTRE” remains amorphous and is controlled by oligarchic groups/clans who find it convenient to depict themselves as centrist. These clans, or groups, have a strong industrial base (plants, factories), financial capital (banks), strong political representation (political party, faction in the parliament), representatives holding executive power, mass media, and sometimes NGOs.

Three main oligarchic groups include:

The “Donetsk group”, which controls primary Donbas metallurgy plants, coal mines, the newspaper „Segodnya”, and the soccer club „Shakhtar” (Donetsk). It created the Party of Regions of Ukraine. The head of the Donetsk regional administration, Viktor Yanukovitch, became Prime Minister in November 2002.

The Medvedchuk and Surkis group controls the metallurgical consortium „Metallurgiya”, the „Slavutych” corporation, one-fourth of the Ukrainian *oblenergos* (energy distribution companies), numerous off-shore companies, TV-channels „1+1” and „Inter”, the newspapers „Kievskie vedomosti”, „Komanda”, and the soccer club „Dynamo” (Kyiv). Its political wing is the SDPU(u) - Social Democratic Party of Ukraine (United). Victor Medvedchuk is currently the head of the Presidential Administration.

The Viktor Pinchuk group (Investment and Industrial Group „Interpipe”) includes five huge pipe plants, the political party „Labour Ukraine” (which has about 40 members in parliament), the newspaper „Fakty”, and TV channels ICTV, the New Channel, and STB. Viktor Pinchuk himself is a member of parliament and married to the President's daughter,

Olena Kuchma.

In the 2002 election, both the Pinchuk and Donetsk groups supported the pro-Presidential amorphous electoral block „For a United Ukraine”. The activity of oligarchic clans and permanent infighting hamper the formation of strong, ideologically-oriented centrist parties.

CENTRE-RIGHT. In its analysis of the situation in Ukraine the Western press continues to make the same mistakes as earlier. It characterises the supporters of Ukrainian independence, of Ukrainian language and culture as «nationalists» with a certain negative connotation; this differs from the neutral-academic approach in the West which views «nationalism» as a movement for «nation-state», autonomy or defence of common rights for ethnic community - synonymous with „patriotism” - rather than as extreme radicalism. First of all, extreme nationalist forces won only three seats in the 1994 parliamentary elections; during the 1998 and 2002 elections they entered the Rada with only 2 representatives elected in single-mandate districts. In party lists, parties with radical nationalist orientation failed to overcome the 4% threshold both in the 1998 and 2002 elections. Therefore under the circumstances, it is better to distinguish between «national-democrats» and «national-radicals».

The main centre-right force which won the 2002 election on party lists is the „Our Ukraine” bloc led by Viktor Yushchenko. It include two wings of the Rukh, and Reforms and Order Parties among others. Those who were unsatisfied with Yushchenko’s diplomatic manoeuvring toward Kuchma joined Yulia Tymoshenko’s block, which used the slogan “Kuchma, go away”. Yulia Tymoshenko was Pavlo Lazarenko’s business partner. Former premier Pavlo Lazarenko became Kuchma’s rival and was subsequently accused of large-scale corruption, currently he is under arrest in the United States. Nevertheless, in December 1999, Yushchenko invited Tymoshenko to join the government, where she designed a workable scheme to collect revenues from energy companies (her actions were appreciated by Western experts). This provoked attacks from oligarchs who are close to the President, and she was dismissed. Having become an „opposition oligarch,” she faced increased pressure from the establishment. Tymoshenko was arrested on corruption charges in 2001, but two courts ordered her release. Several „patriarchs” of the Ukrainian national movement from the legendary Ukrainian Republican Party joined her bloc, Levko Lukianenko for example, who was sentenced to death in 1961 and spent 26 years in prison.

COMMUNISTS. Although in the first round of the 1999 presidential election the three Leftist candidates outstripped Kuchma by 2.1 million votes, in the second round, Communist leader, Petro Symonenko, lost by 5.1 million votes, one million fewer votes than the combined Left vote in the first round. This proves that for the majority of the population, and for supporters or the non-Communist Left, returning the Communists to power was seen as a greater evil than economic difficulties and Kuchma's regime. The presidential elections marked the first time that the Left's opponents won; in the 1991 and 1994 elections the Left ultimately supported the future president.

The Communist Party of Ukraine (CPU) has already transformed into a „system” party (like the Russian Communists led by Zyuganov). At the end of 2000, radical supporters of the restoration of the USSR were expelled from the CPU. The rhetoric of Communists leaders has also softened a little. During the 1999 elections, Symonenko even promised to preserve Ukraine's 'non-aligned' status. During the campaign, the Russian television channel ORT campaigned for Kuchma, emphasising the impracticality of the CPU's rhetoric regarding a union with Russia. Instead of mentioning Marxism–Leninism they spoke about the 'ideas' of Marx, Engels, and Lenin. Development of relations with the EU is seen to be compatible with relations with Russia. However, in general, Communist rhetoric remains quite orthodox.

SOCIALISTS (CENTRE-LEFT). Comparing the situation on the left flank in Ukraine with that in other CIS countries, analysts stress that Ukrainian Communists have a strong centre-left rival in the Socialist Party of Ukraine (SPU). «In Russia nothing came out of this idea» to create a non-communist party, and initiators of these attempts remained «politically eccentric and marginal» (e.g., Roy Medvedev) or «turned into functionaries of the new regime» (e.g., Ivan Rybkin, Alexander Rutzkoi).<sup>15</sup>

By its self-definition, the SPU is located in an intermediary position between Communists and traditional western Social Democrats. In this sense, the SPU reminds one of the «new» French Communist Party or of the German Party of Democratic Socialism (PDS). This being the case, the SPU preserves enough potential for evolving toward a left social democracy. It is symbolic that the Ninth Congress of the SPU (November 2001) received greetings from French Socialists, as well as German, Swedish, and Polish Social Democrats.

In the struggle for the social democratic niche, a key issue is who will fill it quicker: the SPU or the oligarchic Social Democratic Party of Ukraine (SDPU(u)). The «united social democrats» do not defend the political and social rights of the workers at all. When the SPU

was founded in the fall of 1991, it had strong ties with the nomenklatura, these were subsequently noticeably weakened and the SPU started to establish contacts with emerging medium-size business. For the most part, social democratic parties throughout East Central Europe also came out of the Communist nomenklatura. The SPU's place in the opposition makes the party much more effective than the SDPU(u) in defending the rights of hired workers and the middle class.

The West should try to support the evolution of the Left towards the centre. The long-term approach should include educating the younger generation of Socialists. Western foundations could fund the publication of a Ukrainian non-party journal with a social democratic orientation. Finally, the more active involvement of the Socialist International, its ties with SPU and other social democratic groups, will be very important. Such development within the Left will benefit, not threaten, Ukrainian statehood and democracy.

Ukrainian democratic forces have a good chance of being structured around the centre-right (Yushchenko and the more radical Tymoshenko) and the centre-left Socialists (Moroz). The paradox lies in the fact that although Moroz and his supporters are drifting to the right, it is possible that it will be necessary for them to use leftist rhetoric to take votes away from the Communists and those oligarchic factions that declare themselves to be centre-left.

#### THE 2002 PARLIAMENTARY ELECTION: A VICTORY FOR DEMOCRACY

The present Ukrainian electoral system is based on a mixed majority /proportional system (50:50). This system was introduced on the eve of the 1998 election and it was a clear step forward compared to the purely majority system, used in the 1990 and 1994 elections. To some extent it helped to strengthen Ukrainian parties.

In the parliament elected in 1998 the number of non-party deputies reduced to 22% (from 50% in 1994), and to 15% after the 2002 election. Political parties have less influence at the local level. After the 1998 elections, party members accounted for only 8 percent of local, rayon, and oblast deputies (among the heads of rayon and oblast radas this figure increased to 20 percent). Nevertheless, after the 2002 local elections party members accounted already for 22 percent of local, rayon, and oblast deputies.<sup>16</sup> In December 2001, the Verkhovna Rada passed a bill on local elections that provides for a majority electoral system for local and mayoral elections and an equal mix of majority and proportional voting for rayon and oblast elections. However, President Kuchma vetoed it.

The result of the March 2002 parliamentary election, by party lists, was a victory for democracy. PR-techniques used by Ukrainian oligarchs with the help of Russian consultants failed. Several parties supported by authorities (like „The Winter Crop Generation”, „Women for Future”, The Green party, The Democratic Union) did not pass the 4% threshold. Despite large amounts of money spent, oligarchic SDPU/u/ was in last place on the party lists of those who passed the threshold (see the table 1).

For the first time since independence, the winner of the party list, despite administrative pressure, was the centre-right bloc „Our Ukraine” led by Yushchenko. In the course of the campaign, Yushchenko distanced himself from the authorities but tried to avoid personal criticism of Kuchma. This was justified for tactical reasons. Otherwise, his campaign would be crushed through administrative means and propaganda , which happened with Socialist leader Oleksandr Moroz’s campaign during the 1999 presidential election.

Despite administrative pressure and isolation from the electronic mass media, the radical opposition represented by the centre-left Socialists, led by Moroz, and the centre-right Tymoshenko’s Bloc confidently passed the threshold. Thus, it also constituted a victory for democracy.

However, in single-mandate districts „administrative resources” were used to their full capacity. Moreover, after the election, the „non-party” MPs were pressed to join the main pro-Presidential force – the amorphous electoral bloc „For a United Ukraine”. Thus, its failure on party lists (in third place with only 35 mandates) was temporarily compensated.

TABLE 1. RESULTS OF THE MARCH 2002 ELECTION.

№		Party lists	Seats	Single-mandate districts	Total seats
1	The block „Our Ukraine”	23.57%	70	42	112
2	The Communist Party of Ukraine	19.98%	59	6	65
3	The block „For a United Ukraine”	11.77%	35	86	121
4	Yulia Tymoshenko’s Block	7.26%	22	0	22
5	The Socialist Party of Ukraine	6.87%	20	2	22

6	The Social-Democratic Party of Ukraine (United)	6.27%	19	8	27
	<b>Deputies from other parties</b>			12	12
	Non-party members			68	68
	Total		225	224	<b>449</b>

Compared to the 1994 and 1998 elections, the 2002 election resulted in a more even regional distribution of votes. „Our Ukraine” won not only in the West or Kyiv, but also in many central regions, including those which earlier supported the Communists (i.e. northern Chernihiv or eastern Sumy regions). In the Donetsk region, a traditional Communist stronghold, the winner was „For a United Ukraine”.

In the Crimean Verkhovna Rada, the pro-Presidential „Kunitsyn Team” won 39 of 100 seats; the Communists gained only 15, and pro-Russian parties 3. As a result, the Communist speaker was replaced by Borys Deutch, a member of the pro-Presidential “Party of the Regions” and the new Crimean government is led by Serhiy Kunitsyn from the People’s Democratic Party.

In the 2002 national election, most Crimean Tartars supported „Our Ukraine” and two of their leaders were elected to the Ukrainian parliament on its party list. In the 100-seat Crimean parliament they made a comeback with 8 single member seats.<sup>17</sup> In general, in Crimean local Radas, Crimean Tatars make up 14% of the deputies, which is definitely a stabilising factor for Crimea.

## PARTIES AND FOREIGN POLICY ISSUES

During the parliamentary elections of March 2002, foreign policy issues were muted, perhaps deliberately, as the main forces did not want to concentrate on divisive issues of Ukraine’s geopolitical choices (NATO and the Eurasian Economic Community). Compared to the elections in 1994, the topic of relations with Russia in the 1998 parliamentary and the 1999 presidential elections lost its importance, and in the 2002 election this trend was reinforced. The position of the supporters of Slavic unity weakened further. The radical populist Progressive Socialist Party of Ukraine (PSPU), led by the charismatic Natalia Vitrenko, did not clear the 4 per cent barrier. The same happened to those parties whose campaign were based on pan-Slavic ideas— the Rus’kyi bloc (the term ‘Rus’—not Russia—makes a reference to the medieval Kiev Rus state) received 0.7 per cent, and the „For Ukraine, Belarus

and Russia” bloc (ZUBR: the Ukrainian abbreviation is the name of a type of bison which now survives only in the Belavezh region) only 0.4 per cent. This resembled the pattern of the 1998 campaign when the Social Liberal Organization (SLOn—the abbreviation spells out the Ukrainian word for ‘elephant’), which campaigned on the platform of relations with Russia and the official status of Russian language, received only 0.9 per cent and the Union Party 0.7 per cent. Thus, Zubr appeared no stronger than Elephant.

This leads to the conclusion that the Communists are more attractive to the pro-Russian element of the electorate than parties that stood for a pan-Slavic idea. Thus, ethno-political slogans are only effective if combined with slogans about social security. Even so, support for the CPU dropped from 26.7 per cent in 1998 to 20 per cent in 2002. Because of the failure in single-mandate districts, the total numbers of deputies from the CPU reduced almost by one-half.

In the present parliament there is no faction that objects to Ukraine’s goal to join the EU, not even the Communists - at least, in their public statements. A new parliamentary Committee on European Integration has been formed, led by the pro-Western former Foreign Minister, Borys Tarasyuk, of Yushchenko’s bloc. However, the Committee on Foreign Relations was chaired by Dmytro Tabachnyk (of the Labour Ukraine Party), a former head of the Presidential Administration. He was appointed vice premier on humanitarian issues at the end of 2002.

It is evident that Ukrainian oligarchic groups do not desire to come under Moscow’s control again as they would face competition from more powerful Russian business groups. At the same time, their economic interests are mainly concentrated in the post-Soviet space. In some situations they could use the slogans of pan-Slavism for specific political and economic reasons, especially in order to lobby their interests in the economic sphere.

The ‘Russian factor’ continues to play an important role in the domestic struggle. However, its importance has decreased compared to 1994.<sup>18</sup> It includes (a) attempts to mobilise the Russian-speaking electorate and (b) attempts to use support from Moscow, above all for media projects. It cannot be ruled out that, in their struggle against the opposition, oligarchic groups could try to accuse the centre-right forces of nationalism and to play the ‘Russian card’ against them. This has been attempted to a certain extent by the United Social Democrats, whose 2002 parliamentary election campaign used the Kremlin’s image-maker, Gleb Pavlovskiy, and his media projects group as consultants. However, these attempts had limited success. Interestingly, contrary to this rhetoric, several representatives of Russian business in Ukraine were elected to the parliament in 2002 on the list of Yushchenko’s bloc.

It seems that no prospective candidate from the ‘party of power’, who competes with Yushchenko or other centre–right leaders, will be able to use the slogans of the ‘Eurasian space,’ or the deepening of economic and historical ties with Russia, as openly as Kuchma did it in 1994, in order to attract the votes of electors in the east and south of the country.

## ENERGY ISSUES AND DOMESTIC POLITICS

The issue of gas supply to a great extent shapes Russian–Ukrainian bilateral relations and influences Ukraine’s domestic policy. Ninety per cent of the gas exported from Russia to Central and Eastern Europe goes through Ukraine. Ukraine receives about one-third of its entire gas consumption as payment for transit rights.

The essence of the problem lays in: (a) permanent debts of Ukrainian companies for gas; (b) the ‘siphoning off’ of gas as it transited Ukraine (which was used for shadow deals between Ukrainian and Russian oligarchs; this practice was stopped by Yushchenko’s government); and (c) Ukraine’s inability to provide for reconstruction of the network (though according to some Ukrainian politicians this thesis was artificially created by the Russian side in order to press Kyiv).<sup>19</sup> Ukraine has—with good reason—also accused Gazprom of putting open pressure on it by blocking the transit of gas for Ukraine from Central Asia. Gazprom has decided to start construction of a gas pipeline through Belarus and Poland to Slovakia, bypassing Ukraine. However, the new project demanded much larger investments than the reconstruction of the already existing route.

Trying to increase his international credibility, Kuchma unexpectedly signed a declaration with Putin and German chancellor Gerhard Schroeder on June 10, 2002, in St Petersburg, to establish an international consortium to use Ukrainian transit gas pipelines. The new international agreement on gas transit could, on the one hand, help Ukraine to find a stable position in the context of Russian–Western rapprochement and strengthen its partnership with both Russia and the West. On the other hand, this trilateral declaration only provided for a general framework and needed concrete definition. This raised suspicions in Ukraine that the country would become a playground between Russia and the West, eventually be forgotten by the West, only to finally be dominated once again by Russia.

The opposition blamed Kuchma for trying to trade Ukrainian state property for international support for his regime. According to Tymoshenko, the Ukrainian gas network, which costs \$30 billion and annually contributes \$2 billion to the Ukrainian budget (which is about

\$10 billion), will come under joint Ukrainian-Russian-German management in which the Ukrainian share would comprise only 30 percent. On October 7, 2002, at the CIS summit in Chisinau, Moldova agreements were signed between the Ukrainian and Russian governments, and Russian Gazprom and Ukrainian Naftogaz companies on the transit of gas. However, texts of the agreements remain vague. The prospect of German participation in the project similarly remains unclear. This case confirmed the lack of transparency at the highest level of Ukraine's decision-making process.

#### CHANGING RELATIONS BETWEEN BRANCHES OF POWER?

The President is the key figure in decision and policymaking process in Ukraine. According to the 1996 Constitution, the President appoints the Prime Minister with the consent of the parliament but has the power to fire him unilaterally. The appointment of ministers does not formally demand the consent of parliament and consequently does not reflect the composition of the parliament. The President's informal powers include the ability to prevent any group from acquiring too much influence by dismissing its representatives from positions that allow access to him. It makes the governmental system unstable. Eleven Prime Ministers have been changed over twelve years of independence.

In turn, parliament can influence the government by rejecting a candidate for the post of Prime Minister, rejecting the government's general strategy, or voting down the government in a vote of no-confidence. Until recently, parties had no significant say in the government's formation, and parliamentary elections did not result in any major cabinet changes. Therefore, almost all parties were eager to change the Kinakh government, which finally resulted in Kuchma's decision on November 16, 2002 to appoint Viktor Yanukovich Prime Minister. Right after the March 2002 election, „Our Ukraine” proposed a treaty between the parliament, the President, and the government. According to the draft, the Ukrainian political system should be reformed: the role of the government should be increased, the coalition government would be responsible before the parliament, the next election would be held purely on party lists (these ideas, in fact, were supported by all factions - from the Communist to the oligarchic SDPU(u), with the exception of „For a United Ukraine” which relied on administrative leverages). As the winner on party lists, „Our Ukraine” hoped to form the coalition government.

Nevertheless, Our Ukraine's proposal was ignored by the President. „The Opposition of Four” was formed („Our Ukraine”, Tymoshenko's Bloc, the Socialists, and the Communists).

However, they lacked both votes and genuine unity needed to elect a speaker and two deputies. On the contrary, because of administrative pressure, „For a United Ukraine” increased up to 177 deputies. Several businessmen changed the factions. As a result of it, Volodymyr Lytvyn, former head of the President’s Administration, and number 1 on the „For a United Ukraine” list was elected speaker. He received the minimum possible votes for election – 226 out of 450. His first deputy, Henadiy Vasyliiev, represents the Donetsk wing of „For a United Ukraine”, and his deputy, Oleksandr Zinchenko – the United Social Democrats. More constructive was the distribution of parliamentary committees. The opposition headed 19 out of 24 committees, including those on legal policy; budgetary questions; state-building and local government; economic policy; freedom of speech etc. Having elected the parliamentary leadership, „For a United Ukraine” block split into 8 factions (see table 2).

TABLE 2. COMPOSITION OF THE PARLIAMENT (as of June 9, 2003)

	<b>Factions</b>	Seats
1	„Our Ukraine”	100
2	The Communist Party of Ukraine	60
3	Yulia Tymoshenko’s Block	18
4	The Socialist Party of Ukraine	20
	<b>Total</b>	<b>198</b>
	Pro-Presidential Factions:	
5	The Social Democratic Party of Ukraine (United)	37
	<i>Factions on the basis of „For a United Ukraine”</i>	
6	The Party of Industrialists and Entrepreneurs – Party „Labour Ukraine”	43
7	"Regions of Ukraine "	46
8	The People’s Democratic Party	15
9	Agrarian Party	16
10	"European Choice"	20
11	"Democratic Initiatives"	22
12	"Sovereignty of the People"	19
13	"People’s Choice"	15

	<b>Total</b>	<b>233</b>
14	Non-affiliated	18
	Total in the parliament	<b>449</b>

The greatest challenge for the democratic forces was the appointment of the new head of the Presidential Administration in June 2002. Kuchma's choice was Viktor Medvedchuk, the leader of the SDPU(u). He is a tough person who uses any means to gain power (that is why, there are even signs of the rapprochement between the opposition and Lytvyn on an „anti-Medvedchuk” basis). His presidential ambitions are well known. Medvedchuk evokes such resistance that most analysts agree that he was chosen not as a successor to Kuchma but as a manager to secure transition from Kuchma to somebody else.

Opposition forces launched protests against Kuchma and his “regime” on September 16, the second anniversary of the disappearance of journalist Heorhij Gongadze. On October 15, 2002, a judge of the Kyiv Appellate Court, Yuriy Vasylenko, filed a legal case against Kuchma, based on accusations of abuse of power. Though the judge may have overstepped his authority, his decision was very symbolic.

However, Kuchma, or more precisely Medvedchuk, took several preventive steps. These included traditional pressure on businessmen supporting the opposition and a demand for parliament to lift Tymoshenko's deputy immunity, which the parliamentary committee rejected. Four former high-ranking managers of the „United Energy System of Ukraine” (former gas monopolist affiliated with Tymoshenko), including Tymoshenko's father-in-law, were imprisoned in Turkey, on 1 July 2002, on the demand of the Ukrainian Prosecutor General and extradited to Ukraine in late October. On October 12, 2002, Andriy Fedur, a defender of Gongadze's mother and of judge Zamkovenko who found Tymoshenko not-guilty of corruption charges, was arrested. After many protests by the general public and opposition he was freed on October 15.

Medvedchuk also increased control over mass media. In early September 2002, Mykola Tomenko, the head of the parliamentary committee for freedom of speech and information, disclosed so called *temniks*, unofficial papers sent to mass media by the Presidential Administration, instructing how to cover or ignore the current events.

At the end of September 2002, UNIAN, the leading independent news agency functioning since 1993, and was put under de-facto control of Presidential Administration. UNIAN journalists organised a striking committee. About 400 journalists from different media signed

a manifesto, decrying the existence of political censorship in Ukraine. As a result, parliamentary hearings on freedom of press were held on December 4, 2002, which were broadcast live on TV. The existence of the *temniks* attracted special attention from the Council of Europe's Parliamentary Assembly (PACE). In 2003, Human Rights Watch demanded that international financial organizations should make respect for media freedom an element of their assistance strategies.

On April 3, 2003, reacting to the results of the December 4 hearing, the parliament made some important changes to media legislation, subsequently signed by President Kuchma. Moreover, as a result of competition between oligarchic groups, UNIAN returned to a more independent position.

By applying administrative pressure on deputies, Medvedchuk managed by the beginning of October 2002 to create a pro-Presidential majority in parliament. As of 8 October, it included deputies from pro-Presidential factions, some non-affiliated (independent) deputies, and several defectors from the opposition – in total, 231 deputies. This majority seemed to be quite unstable, and did not have the 300 votes necessary to approve constitutional changes. At the same time, needing to balance Medvedchuk's increased influence, Kuchma decided on November 16 to appoint Viktor Yanukovich, former head of Donetsk oblast administration, as the new Prime Minister. This proposal was supported by 234 deputies. Yanukovich formed a pseudo-coalition government, based on back-room deals rather than electoral results.

However, Medvedchuk's influence was reduced.

In early Fall 2002, the situation was complicated by a new episode of the „tapegate” scandal, which concerned with possible sale of a Kolchuga radar system to Iraq. On one hand, these accusations were used by the opposition as an additional argument to pressure Kuchma's to resign and for early presidential elections to be called. On the other hand, they had the same effect as the start of the „tapegate” scandal in the Fall of 2000; pressure from the US made Kuchma look to Russia for support and represent the opposition's demands as a part of an American campaign against him. Thus, this scandal again produced a mixed result on the domestic situation in Ukraine.

By the end of 2002, it seemed that the radical opposition had lost momentum. The compromise scenario was to persuade Kuchma to secure a smooth transition to a democrat controlled government. This scenario could have included a tacit agreement between democrats and Kuchma: „we will not disturb you after the presidential elections, but now do

not work against us”. As Adrian Karatnycky, former President of Freedom House, pointed out, „American and European diplomatic isolation of Mr. Kuchma must be airtight and confined to the President and his corrupt cronies, not the entire Ukrainian government or nation”. At the same time, the author stressed: „One possible compromise would be to give Mr. Kuchma blanket amnesty for past transgressions”.<sup>20</sup> However, democrats lacked forces to implement this scenario in the Fall of 2002.

At the same time, Medvedchuk’s plans to isolate the opposition, to deprive it of parliamentary committees and to simultaneously lessen the influence of Yanukovich failed. On December 16, 2002, the opposition reached a compromise with Lytvyn and Yanukovich: it supported the government’s budget and kept committees. Thus, Medvedchuk was outmanoeuvred.

To seize the initiative in the struggle with opposition, Kuchma started to talk about “comprehensive political reform”. He made the most sensational move in his TV statement on August 24, Ukraine’s Independence Day. The President seemed to agree with proposals to form a coalition government, to introduce a proportional electoral system and, moreover, to transform Ukraine into a “parliamentary-presidential republic”. (Previously Kuchma had five times vetoed the law on proportional electoral system). His initiative was aimed at splitting the opposition; to separate „Our Ukraine” from the radical opposition – the Socialists and Tymoshenko’s block. The Communists have already been cooped by Kuchma but they cannot ignore mass protests against Kuchma in order not to be wholly discredited.

As Yushchenko is confidently leading in the polls, analysts saw Kuchma’s proposal as a desire to reduce the power of a future President. Some analysts even speculated that Kuchma would like the future President to be elected by parliament. Democratisation of the present system does not require such steps to be taken. The Ukrainian system can be more easily adjusted to resemble the French or Polish model through the formation of a coalition government based on parliamentary majority and by increasing parliament’s responsibilities and real powers. On 16 October 2002, the Constitutional Court decided that the opposition’s draft law on constitutional reform corresponded to the Ukrainian Constitution.

Nevertheless, in early March 2003, Kuchma submitted his own plan to the “nation-wide discussion”. His controversial plan included the introduction of a second chamber, which oligarchs may easily control, and he also started to talk again about direct referendums for adopting laws and the Constitution. These two proposals were firmly rejected by the opposition, and the President decided to sacrifice them, trying simultaneously to keep another

changes which would help him to control the legislative and judiciary branches.

Nevertheless, there is a possibility of a compromise between the major parliamentary forces on two main questions: 1) a purely proportional system; 2) the formation of a coalition government based on parliamentary majority which is approved and ousted only by the parliament. On July 11, after stormy discussions in the parliament, the opposition persuaded the majority to vote for the submitting to the Constitutional Court two variants of the constitutional changes: the presidential one, and the variant prepared by the parliamentary commission.

## CONCLUSION

Despite administrative pressure from the authorities, the Ukrainian democratic opposition performed well in the March 2002 parliamentary election. In contrast to Russia, Ukrainian democrats still possess the potential to manoeuvre and struggle for power. In several important cases, the Constitutional Court, the Supreme Court and even local courts have demonstrated its independence, contradicting demands by authorities.

Yanukovich's appointment as a Prime Minister may mark a turning point in Ukrainian politics. On one hand, the country can finally be divided between three main clans and the ruling elite could consolidate. On the other hand, inflexible actions of the authorities may lead „Our Ukraine” to radicalise - a process which already started during the electoral campaign. In this case, „Our Ukraine” could organise an anti-regime coalition with the Socialists and Tymoshenko's bloc and try to split the oligarchs.

The West can have a significant influence on the course of events in Ukraine by making it clear that Ukraine's drift toward authoritarianism and corruption will lead to Ukraine's international isolation. Official Kyiv should demonstrate its 'European choice' in deeds, not simply declarations. Simultaneously, the policy of 'good-neighbourliness' which was being formulated by the EU over the course of 2002 does not seem to be sufficient from Ukraine's point of view as it does not provide a clear prospect of EU membership (or even associate membership) for Ukrainian politicians and society. The same is true for Ukraine's prospect to join the Membership Action Plan. However, it is fully understood within Ukraine that potential EU and NATO membership is conditional on positive changes to present political situation.

The 2004 presidential election will determine Ukraine's development for the next decade. The preparation for this campaign has already started; it will be a long and exhausting fight. The

West should differentiate between Kuchma's regime and Ukrainian society, as the Ukrainian electorate voted for changes in the 2002 parliamentary election. The West should invest in democracy-building in Ukraine, first of all, through support to Ukrainian civil society, higher education, and independent mass media. As anti-American feelings are becoming stronger within Kuchma's entourage, Western Europe is more suitable in some cases to assume an active role in Ukraine.

The future policy of Ukraine will be determined first of all by Ukraine's ability to move down the road toward European integration in time to meet the EU's membership criteria. This implies undertaking significant reforms in both the economic and political spheres. In turn, it is in the long term interests of the West not only to demonstrate its desire but also effectively engage Ukraine in the processes of European integration and support building Ukrainian democracy.

---

<sup>1</sup> Alexander Motyl, *Dilemmas of Independence: Ukraine after Totalitarianism* (New York, 1993), p. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Even now, the complex questions of Resistance movement in Ukraine against both Hitler and Stalin remain unclear for many Westerners while Moscow still depicts this movement as „a fascist” one.

<sup>3</sup> According to the census of 1989. The first census in independent Ukraine took place in December 2001. The number of ethnic Ukrainians increased to 77.8 percent and number of ethnic Russians decreased to 17.3 percent which harkens back to the 1959 census (76.8 and 16.9 respectively).

<sup>4</sup> According to a study conducted in early 1994 by the Kyiv International Institute of Sociology (KIIS). See ‘People, nations, identities: the Russian–Ukrainian encounter’, *The Harriman Review*, vol. 9, nos 1–2 (1996), pp. 81–91.

According to KIIS studies, there is a slow but steady trend of Ukrainianization: in recent years the number of Ukrainian-speaking Ukrainians increased to 42-44%.

<sup>5</sup> *Abetka ukrains'koi polityky* [ABC of Ukrainian politics], (Kyiv: Smoloskyp, 2002).

<sup>6</sup> Taras Kuzio, Robert Kravchuk and Paul D'Anieri (eds.), *State and Institution Building in Ukraine* (New York, 1999), p. 320.

<sup>7</sup> See the study of KIIS in: *Politychna dumka* (Political Thought), Kyiv, 2001, N 3, pp. 42-44.

<sup>8</sup> Taras Kuzio, Robert Kravchuk, Paul D'Anieri (eds.), P. 336.

<sup>9</sup> See, *Nations in Transit 2002. Civil Society, Democracy and Markets in East Central Europe and the Newly Independent States* /Ed. by Adrian Karatnycky, Alexander Motyl, and Amanda Schnetzer, New Brunswick (N.J.), 2002, p. 401.

<sup>10</sup> This section of the report is partially based on the analyses on Ukraine prepared by Olexiy Haran and Rostyslav Pavlenko, see *Nations in Transit 2002*. For recent development see the forthcoming 2003 issue. For more statistics and sociological data, see also *The Third Sector in Ukraine* (Ukrainian Institute of Social Research), Kyiv, 2001.

<sup>11</sup> *Perekhrestia* [Crossroads], 2000, N 6, p. 29; N 4, p. 4-7.

<sup>12</sup> *Dzerkalo tyzhnya* [Weekly Mirror], N 4, February 2002.

<sup>13</sup> Only about 4 percent of TV and radio broadcasting companies and 30 percent of Ukraine's print media are state-owned.

---

<sup>14</sup> The author is thankful to Serhiy Kyseliov, expert of Kyiv-based International Institute of Comparative Analysis, for providing this data.

<sup>15</sup> Dmitri Furman, ed., *Ukraina i Rossiia: obshchestva i gosudarstva* [Ukraine and Russia: societies and states] (Moscow: Prava cheloveka, 1997), p. 205.

<sup>16</sup> Calculation from official data provided by the parliamentary Committee on Local Self-Government.

<sup>17</sup> On the eve of the 1998 election, then pro-Russian Crimean parliament cancelled a 1994 provision granting Crimean Tartars (about 300,000 or 12 percent of Crimean population) a quota for representation in that body.

<sup>18</sup> See, for example, the point of Russian expert Arkady Moshes, ‘The Russian factor in the 2002 parliamentary election in Ukraine’, *National Security and Defence* (Kyiv), no. 2 (2002), pp. 50–53.

<sup>19</sup> Yulia Tymoshenko, ‘„Truba”—Ukrains’kiy ekonomichniy nezalezhnosti’ [‘The Pipe’—to Ukrainian economic independence], *Dzerkalo tyzhnia*, 28 June 2002.

<sup>20</sup> Adrian Karatnycky ‘An Exit Strategy For Ukraine's Rogue President’, in: *Wall Street Journal Europe*, October 8, 2002.