

УДК 32.001(73):332.27(477)«2004»

Y. R. Shveda

THE ORANGE REVOLUTION IN THE CONTEXT OF S. HUNTINGTON'S THEORY OF «WAVES OF DEMOCRATIZATION»

The events, which took place in Ukraine in 2004 and have already been romantically named «the orange revolution», have undoubtedly become a subject of a careful analysis by both Ukrainian and foreign analysts. However, among various comments there are too few of those that try to analyze them from the point of view of general transformation processes of the transition societies' political systems. To our mind, the understanding of the fact that everything that is happening in Ukraine nowadays is a component of a complex process of transformation changes is the key to their accurate perception and objective analysis. In this connection we think that the generalizations made by a famous American scholar S. Huntington in «The Third Wave of Democratization» [5] will be of great value. This article is a detailed abstract of the speech on the «round table» at the Annual Congress of American Political Science Association.

Elections as a verdict against dictatorship

The first long wave of democratization began at the beginning of the 19th century and finished in 1920 with the victory of democratic regimes in 30 countries. New authoritarianism and the rise of fascism

in the 20-30s of the 20th century led to a decrease in the number of democratic states to 10.

The second short wave of democratization rose after the World War II and again increased the number of democracies up to over 30.

The third wave of democratization, which started in Portugal, turned out more powerful and swifter and surpassed the two previous ones. While two decades ago less than 30 % of the world countries had governments, which had come to power by means of this or that form of open, fair and competitive elections, 60 % do now.

In fact, the third wave of democratization marked the beginning of the epoch of democracy. For the first time in the whole history of mankind more than half of the world countries have this or that form of democratic government. At present hundreds of millions of people, who were under the yoke of tyranny, live in freedom. This rapid growth of the world's democratic sector over such a short period of time is undoubtedly the most tremendous and important political turnaround in the history of mankind.

Since the World War II it has been common to define democracy exclusively in terms of elections. In this case democracy is viewed as a means of forming bodies of power and authorizing them with responsibility. Elections are a way democracy functions. During the third wave of democratization they were also a way to weaken and bring down authoritarian regimes. They were the beginning of democratization and its goal. The political system of modern national states is democratic to a degree, to which their key leaders are elected by means of fair and honest elections, which take place on a regular basis, and in the process of which all the candidates freely compete for voters' ballots, and almost all the state's adult population have the right to participate in them. Free, fair and competitive elections can take place only under the conditions of freedom of speech, printing and meetings, providing that opposition candidates and parties can criticize the power without fear of repression.

Democratization took place either thanks to autocratic leaders, who due to these or those reasons took a risk of turning to elections, or under the pressure of opposition political powers, that demanded their conduction. We can make the following conclusion from the third wave of democratization: elections are not only democracy's life, but also dictatorship's death.

Under the conditions of a decrease in the degree of legitimacy autocratic leaders face the growing pressure from fighters for the revival of the legitimacy of power with the help of elections. The dictators' political counselors would agree to hold elections hoping that they would be able to prolong the legitimate life of the existing regime. But they would always experience deep disappointment. With a few exceptions parties or candidates related to autocratic regimes would either lose or receive very little support in the elections, arranged by the autocratic

power. The elections' results were very often «unexpected» for both the power and opposition leaders.

During first fifteen years of the third wave this «unexpected result of elections» was common [1].

Electoral and liberal democracy: the unity and clash of differences

However, are elections the only content of democracy? Larry Diamond revealed the main difference between electoral and liberal democracy [4]. Liberal democracies are not limited to the presence of the system of democratic elections. They are also characterized by such features as control over the executive power, independent judicial power that guarantees compliance with the authority of law; the protection of the rights of freedom of personality, speech, meetings, conscience, the right to elect and be elected; the protection of the rights of minorities; the restriction of the sitting parties' possibilities to influence the process of elections; effective guarantees against the abuse of power by the police and judicial bodies; the absence of censure; the minimal governmental control over the mass media. In the case of an electoral democracy there is a system of power and government, formed as a result of relatively free and fair elections, there are no many other guarantees of the rights and freedoms, present in liberal democracies. As L. Diamond emphasizes, the number of electoral democracies has rapidly increased over the recent years, while the number of liberal democracies remains the same [3].

According to the results of the research done by the House of Freedom 118 states are considered electoral democracies. However, the House of Freedom defines only 79 of these states as «free», i. e. liberal democracies. 39 states with elective bodies of power and government are called «partially free», among them such countries as Russia, India, Turkey, Brazil, Pakistan, Columbia and Ukraine [6].

In the West electoral democracy is based on the fundamental legacy of political liberalism that encompasses the rights of people and principles of a law-abiding country. World civilizations differ from each other by the degree of similarity to the western culture and also by the degree of the West's influence on them. In general, the degree of the perception of electoral democracy by non-western societies turned out to depend on the degree of the West's influence on these countries.

The fourth wave of democratization

The parliamentary elections of 2002 in Ukraine were taking place in an extremely tense political situation, caused by the so called «cassette scandal».

The opposition between the proponents of the existing political regime and its opponents was the main line of demarcation between the main subjects of the electoral process. However, despite the fact that the pro-power block «For the unified Ukraine» did not receive the support of the majority of voters, the power managed to form the parliamentarian majority and continue to rule the country. The 2002 elections in Ukraine were not «unexpected». The ruling elite managed to fight back the most furious attacks with minimum losses and transfer the social opposition into the parliamentarian stream where it feels more confident. The majority of Ukraine's population that had given their ballots to the opposition political forces was observing with disappointment how the power was taken by those political forces that had not received the mandate on it from the people. «The third wave of democratization» did not sweep through Ukraine; elections here did not become an instrument of the final resolution of social differences. The key problems, which caused the political crisis, remained unsolved, and thus, after the regrouping of political forces the struggle started again.

The 2004 presidential elections became the next stage in this struggle. Having obtained a considerable administrative resource, the power was trying to take control over the highest state post in Ukraine. They went for everything to achieve the desired result, starting from not letting the opposition candidate into the mass media, finishing by his poisoning and fixing the final results of the elections. However, when the Central Electoral Committee announced the final election results, they appeared «unexpected», which made the opposition refute them in the Supreme Court and the people take to the streets. The population of Ukraine that over a short period of its existence in the independent state seemed to have completely put up with the role of observer, the opinion of which is asked only to do things all the way round, rose from its knees and expressed a strong protest against the authorities' intention to deceive them again. The events, which swept over 17 days through not only Ukraine, but also all the world, and which will enter the modern history as «orange revolution», will be still a subject of substantial scholarly research, but one thing is clear at

present - the third wave of democratization has finally reached Ukraine!

This gives grounds to refer Ukraine to the countries with electoral democracy. However, the next strategic task it faces is the transition to liberal democracy, the spread here of the political institutions and culture of the western type, the development of the essentials of the public society, based on the respect to the rights of a personality, the introduction of the competitive basics of politics and management, war on corruption, bureaucracy and other remnants of «quasi-democracy». One should remember that «electoral democracy» is only a prerequisite, historic chance of the transition to a circle of real democratic countries. It's clear that this transition cannot be minute and painless and that conservative political forces will not reject fighting back, however, the fact that people acted as a driving force of political changes in Ukraine gives grounds for optimism. In the course of the orange revolution there showed itself and consolidated the culture of political participation as an important component of a liberal public society.

The transition of Ukraine and Georgia to the rank of countries with electoral democracy speaks for considerable changes in this social and political milieu. The success of this «democratic breakthrough» will be a good example for the rest of the countries with similar socio-cultural characteristics (Belarus, Russia, Kazakhstan), and also a serious victory of democracy on the global scale. Thus, while the main issue on Ukraine's and Georgia's agenda is the introduction of the standards of liberal democracy, for the rest of post soviet countries it is still electoral democracy [2].

Using S. Huntington's terminology, one can assume that here we deal not with single social and political transformations (Georgia, Ukraine), but with the beginning of the large-scale fourth wave of democratization that will sweep through the whole orthodox world and make it closer to the West. And that's why the remarks of the latter about the international solidarity of democratic countries (the so called Demintern) are of extreme importance. I hope that they realize it even in the countries with developed liberal democracy.

1. Шведа Ю. Демократія і вибори за С. Хантінгтоном // Вибори та Демократія. - 2005. - № 1 (3). - С. 38-40.
2. Шведа Ю. Здобутки та загрози демократичної трансформації України в контексті теорії «хвиль демократизації» С. Хантінгтона // Науковий вісник Ужгородського ун-ту. Серія: Політологія. Соціологія. Філософія. Матеріали Міжнародної науково-практичної конференції «Ціна свободи й незалежності: трансформація політичних систем у країнах Центральної та Південно-Східної Європи до та після 1989-1991 рр.». - 2007. - Вип. 5-6. - С. 299-302.
3. Шведа Ю. Парадокси демократії Ларрі Даймонда // Українські варіанти. - 1999. - № 3-4. - С. 70.
4. Diamond L. Is the Third Wave Over? // Journal of Democracy. - July 1996. - No. 7. - P. 20-37.
5. Huntington S. The Third Wave. Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century. - Norman, Oklahoma: The University of Oklahoma Press, 1991.
6. Karatnycky A. Freedom on the March // Freedom Review. - 1997. - No. 28.

Шведа Ю. Р.

ПОМАРАНЧЕВА РЕВОЛЮЦІЯ В КОНТЕКСТІ ТЕОРІЇ «ХВИЛЬ ДЕМОКРАТИЗАЦІЇ» С. ГАНТИНГТОНА

Події, які відбулися в Україні у 2004 р. і отримали романтичну назву «помаранчева революція», стали предметом зацікавленого аналізу численних вітчизняних і зарубіжних дослідників. Тим часом серед різного роду узагальнень знаходимо надто мало таких, які намагаються пов'язати їх із загальними процесами трансформації політичних систем перехідних суспільств. Саме в розумінні того, що все, що відбувається сьогодні в Україні, є складовою частиною процесу трансформаційних змін посткомуністичних суспільств, і лежить ключ до їх адекватного сприйняття та розуміння. У статті зроблено спробу проаналізувати події, пов'язані з «помаранчевою революцією» в Україні, на основі теорії «хвиль демократизації» відомого американського ученого С. Гантінгтона. Ця стаття є розгорнутим викладом виступу, виголошеного на засіданні «круглого столу» щорічних зборів Американської асоції політичних наук.