

THE EVOLUTION OF THE U.S. POSITION TOWARD DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT OF UKRAINE (2000-2008)

Natalya KORNIYENKO

“Institute of the World History
of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine”, Kyiv, Ukraine
nekoN@i.ua

Rezumat: Evoluția poziției SUA față de dezvoltarea democratică a Ucrainei (2000-2008).

Autorul descrie și analizează evoluția poziției SUA privind dezvoltarea democratică în Ucraina, în timpul mandatului Președintelui George W. Bush (2000-2008). În acest sens, au fost analizate patru campanii electorale din Ucraina, din care trei dintre ele parlamentare (2002, 2006, 2007) și una prezidențială (2004). Se încearcă identificarea principalelor particularități ale poziției SUA față de fiecare dintre aceste campanii electorale ucrainene, privite ca indicator al dezvoltării democrației. Conform rezultatelor analizei efectuate, în opinia experților americani, aprecierile SUA asupra procesului democratic în Ucraina s-au modificat pe parcursul perioadei examinate. Alegerile parlamentare din anul 2002 au fost clasificate drept un scrutin în care standardele internaționale au fost respectate doar parțial. Revoluția portocalie din anul 2004 a fost punctul cheie care a generat democratizarea procesului electoral și a stimulat dezvoltarea democrației în Ucraina, în general. Alegerile parlamentare din 2006 și 2007 au fost date ca exemple de afirmare a democrației în Ucraina. În mare parte, responsabilitatea pentru aprofundarea procesului democratic în Ucraina a fost atribuită guvernului de atunci și, în special, președintelui Ucrainei.

Abstract: *In the article the author describes and analyzes the evolution of the US position on democratic development in Ukraine at the time of George W. Bush presidency (2000-2008). Four election campaigns in Ukraine have been examined, three of them for the parliament – Verkhovna Rada (2002, 2006, 2007) and one – for Presidency (2004). There is a try to determine the main features of the US position towards each of these Ukrainian election campaigns as the indicator of the development of democracy. According to the results of research we can say that, in accordance with American side opinion, the US assessment to the democratic process in Ukraine has changed during the 2000-2008. Parliamentary elections in 2002 were classified as ones in which international standards have been partially respected. The Orange revolution of 2004 was the key point, which caused the democratic changes in the electoral processes and the development of the*

democracy in Ukraine, in general. Parliamentary elections in 2006 and 2007 were named as examples of democracy development in Ukraine. Much of the responsibility for the deployment of the democratic process in Ukraine has been given to the current government, especially to the president of Ukraine.

Résumé : Évolution de la position américaine envers le développement démocratique en Ukraine (2000-2008).

L'article analyse l'évolution de la position américaine envers le développement démocratique en Ukraine pendant la présidence de George W. Bush (2000-2008). Nous avons examiné quatre campagnes électorales en Ukraine, trois d'entre elles au parlement - la Verkhovna Rada (2002, 2006, 2007) et une - présidentielle (2004). Nous avons essayé d'identifier les principales caractéristiques de la position américaine envers le chacun des campagnes électorales ukrainiennes comme indicateur du développement de la démocratie. Selon l'étude, on peut dire qu'après l'évaluation du côté américain pendant l'exercice des années 2000-2008 en Ukraine, la position aux États-Unis sur l'évaluation du processus démocratique en Ukraine a changé. Les élections en 2002 ont été classées comme celles dans lesquelles on a été respecté partiellement les normes internationales. Le point tournant a été la Révolution orange de 2004, qui a conduit à des changements positifs dans le processus de l'élection pour le développement de la démocratie en Ukraine. Les élections parlementaires en 2006 et 2007 ont été nommées un exemple de démocratie en Ukraine. Une grande partie de la responsabilité pour le déploiement du processus démocratique en Ukraine a été donnée au gouvernement actuel, et surtout la figure du président de l'Ukraine.

Keywords: *The USA, the foreign policy, the Ukrainian election, Orange revolution, democratic development*

Introduction

One of the important directions of US foreign policy since the second half of the twentieth century was to support the development of democratic processes in the world. After the Second World War, with the rejection of isolationism, US has become one of the leaders of the postwar world. Since 1946, when the US-Soviet Cold War began, an important part of which was the ideological component – it started the fight between Communist (USSR) and Democratic (USA) worlds. At the end of the Cold War and the collapse of the USSR (1991) USA found themselves in a brand new situation – „the enemy” was defeated, and therefore it was necessary to determine the new „priorities” for US foreign policy. The support of democracy and free markets in the world became one of the new main American national

interests. The development of the „democratic component” in US foreign policy should be considered in terms of the security factor and as opportunity for the United State to maintain the global leadership.

Let's assume that that “democratic component” was present in the rhetoric of all American presidents. But it became the main pillar of US foreign policy since Clinton 1994 National Security Strategy, which stated that „promoting of the democracy abroad” is one of the three objectives of the United States, along with increasing of military and diplomatic components. It was considered that in case of enlargement of the community of democratic nations, the prospects for political stability in the world and for the US in particular, will increase. That is why it is important to examine how the United States estimated the development of democracy in Ukraine.

We can name a number of historians and political scientists, such as D. Lakishyk, G. Mernikov, I. Khraban, A. Khudoliy, A. Krapivin and others, who studied some issues of the US position on the development of democratic processes in Ukraine. But still – there is no special generalizations about this. The aim of this publication is to consider the evolution of the US position on democratic development in Ukraine at the time of George W. Bush presidency (2000-2008). This period is interesting because during the presidency of George W. Bush the „basic” strategy, announced as the support of democracy by B. Clinton in 1994, was changed and the fight against the terrorism became the priority number one for the USA. We have to mention that the idea of fight with the terrorism was combined with the idea of spread and support of democracy, because democratic countries were and still are considered as safer and reliable for the United States.

Since George H. W. Bush all American presidents paid attention to the development of democracy in newly independent Post-Soviet states. It was caused by the reason that democratic states are more peaceful and consequently, more friendly to the USA. As it was mentioned in National Security Strategy (1994): “Democratic states are less likely to threaten our interests, and more likely to cooperate with us to meet security threats and promote sustainable development”¹.

This official position we can find in political experts' opinion. Thus, in one of his works Z. Brzezinski wrote that US will be committed to Kyiv until Ukraine will follow the fundamental principles of Western-style democracy and market

¹ *A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement. The White House July 1994*, in <http://nssarchive.us/national-security-strategy-1994/> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

reforms². In turn, H. Kissinger wrote, concerning Ukraine among others: «America will always judge other societies, to some extent, by their respect for human rights»³.

The abidance of the electoral process in Ukraine with Western standards is considered as one of the most important components of building a democratic society in post-communist countries. Thus, the study of the American position toward the development of democracy in Ukraine is relevant, because the US is positioning itself as a country-leader of democracy in the world.

Among the main criteria of democracy development in Ukraine, as well as in other countries, there are usually named: the compliance of the electoral procedure, the access of the opposition candidates to mass-media and transparent voting procedure. Holding the elections in accordance with democratic standards is interpreted as extremely important for Ukraine because the implementation of transparent and fair electoral process is considered as a mean of substantial democratization of the Ukrainian political system and as an opportunity to integrate efficiently into the international states⁴.

During the presidency of George W. Bush there were hold four election campaigns in Ukraine, three of them to the parliament – Verkhovna Rada (Supreme Council) (2002, 2006, 2007) and one – for Presidency (2004). Let's try to determine the main features of the US position towards each of these Ukrainian election campaigns as the indicator of the development of democracy.

The US position toward democratic development of Ukraine in 2000-2004

For better understanding of the basis of the American attitude towards Ukrainian election in 2002, we have to consider US-Ukrainian relations,

² Бжезинский Зб. *Великая шахматная доска (Господство Америки и его геостратегические императивы)* [The Grand Chessboard (American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives)], Москва, Международные отношения, 2010, 256 с., in <http://www.lib.ru/POLITOLOG/AMERICA/bzhezinskij.txt>.

³ Kissinger H. *The Icon and The Eagle*, in “International Herald Tribune”, March 20, 2007; <http://www.henrykissinger.com/articles/iht032007.html> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

⁴ *Senate Concurrent Resolution 5 - Congratulating the people of Ukraine for conducting a democratic, transparent, and fair runoff presidential election on December 26, 2004, and congratulating Viktor Yushchenko on his election as president of Ukraine and his commitment to democracy and reform*, in <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CREC-2005-01-25/html/CREC-2005-01-25-pt1-PgS502.htm> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

which were strained and ambiguous. On the one hand, Ukraine had supported the US in their War on Terror (2001). On the other, the disappearance of the journalist Georgiy Gongadze (2000), „Kolchuga scandal” (2001) and strengthening of the authoritarian tendencies in Ukraine during Kuchma presidency led to sharp criticism of the Ukrainian government by the United States. That’s why the considerable attention was paid in the USA to the Ukrainian parliamentary elections in 2002. Another reason of such an attention was the fact that the parliamentary elections of 2002 were perceived by the American side as a rehearsal of the upcoming presidential elections in Ukraine, scheduled for 2004⁵.

The representatives of the American political establishment compared Ukraine with other countries from the former Soviet Union. General perspective on Ukrainian election was given in Z. Brzezinski interview the day before 2002 parliamentary vote, when he said that the Ukrainian elections, despite some drawbacks, were likely to be the most free and democratic in the Post-Soviet space⁶.

However, the distinguishing feature of these elections was a certain distrust of the United States concerning Ukraine, as being disable to conduct an independent and fair election according to international standards. This fact explains a number of US politicians visits to Kyiv in February 2002. In particular, Ukraine was visited by Deputy Secretary of US on Global Affairs P. Dobriansky, former US State Secretary M. Albright, Deputy Secretary of US on Europe and Eurasia S. Pifer⁷. During these visits, a series of meetings between US officials and representatives of Ukrainian official authorities and the opposition were held. American politicians shared their experiences which they believe would be useful for their Ukrainian counterparts during the parliamentary elections in Ukraine.

The United States concern about the Ukrainian parliament elections was embodied in 205 Congress Resolution (March 21, 2002), where Ukrainians were appealed to hold free, fair and democratic elections⁸. It was emphasized that

⁵ Бжезинский: Белый дом примет любые результаты выборов в Украине [Brzezinski: The White House will take any election results in Ukraine], in “Корреспондент.нет”, 2002, 1 апреля; <http://korrespondent.net/ukraine/politics/43641-bzhezinskij-belyj-dom-primet-lyubye-rezultaty-vyborov-v-ukraine> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ США і парламентські вибори в Україні [The USA and parliamentary elections in Ukraine], in <http://polityka.in.ua/tomenko/content.php?id=pc02-2002-10> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

⁸ *Senate Ukraine elections resolution March 21, 2002 S.Res.205 on parliamentary elections in*

before the Ukrainian elections in the US there were concerns about a number of key components of Ukrainian electoral process: the level of press freedom in Ukraine, the imperfection of the legislative framework and the rights of the Ukrainian opposition. Subsequently, in the case of ignoring the above named obstacles, the resolution named the possibility of the introduction of economic sanctions against Ukraine⁹.

Subsequently, on attainment of Ukrainian election campaign in 2002, the US announced that the elections were a failure compared to international standards. It was concluded that the Government of Ukraine was not able to take appropriate actions to provide the necessary level for democratic vote¹⁰. Among the major violations of the electoral process had been named the following: pro-government candidates used and abused their official position and government „resources”; pro-government parties and candidates were ensured by the benefits given by the government support; the pressure on the part of newly elected opposition deputies to „stimulate” their transition from one political party to another¹¹. As a result, we can quote the words of US State Department spokesman P. Reeker who underlined that the people of Ukraine will feel the consequences of undemocratic elections later¹².

It should be noted that a great resonance in America was caused by Ukrainian presidential elections in 2004 or so called the Orange Revolution. In

Ukraine Hon. Ben Nighthorse Campbell of Colorado, in http://www.csce.gov/index.cfm?FuseAction=ContentRecords.ViewDetail&ContentRecord_id=146&ContentType=S&ContentRecordType=S&UserGroup_id=45®ion_id=45&year=0&month=0&Subaction=ByDate&CFID=27354725&CFTOKEN=52403170 (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

⁹ *Senate Ukraine elections resolution March 21, 2002 S.Res.205 on parliamentary elections in Ukraine Hon. Ben Nighthorse Campbell of Colorado*, in http://www.csce.gov/index.cfm?FuseAction=ContentRecords.ViewDetail&ContentRecord_id=146&ContentType=S&ContentRecordType=S&UserGroup_id=45®ion_id=45&year=0&month=0&Subaction=ByDate&CFID=27354725&CFTOKEN=52403170 (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

¹⁰ *США та вибори в Україні* [The USA and elections in Ukraine], in <http://ukrainian.voanews.com/content/a-49-a-2002-04-09-1-1-86888902/222184.html> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

¹¹ *Існує можливість масштабних фальсифікацій на виборах в Україні – американські спостерігачі* [There is a possibility of large-scale election fraud in Ukraine – US observers], in <http://ukrainian.voanews.com/content/helsinki-comission-elections-in-ukraine-152032395/918879.html>.

¹² *США та вибори в Україні* [The USA and elections in Ukraine], in <http://ukrainian.voanews.com/content/a-49-a-2002-04-09-1-1-86888902/222184.html> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

the US, the Ukrainian elections in 2004 were estimated as the endeavour of Ukrainian government to put into practice Western standards and build a democratic society based on free elections and the rule of law¹³.

Thus, the situation during two rounds of Presidential elections in Ukraine was interpreted as disappointing because of violation of the democratic rights¹⁴. Political atmosphere in Ukraine at the time of the election campaign was qualified as such that it gave little hope of maintaining democratic voting procedures¹⁵.

Among the major violations of election procedures there were considered: falsification, intimidation, misuse of administrative resources, absentee voting, multiple voting, attacks on journalists and observers, use of false papers etc.¹⁶. It was repeatedly emphasized that the second round of Ukrainian presidential elections failed to meet international election standards¹⁷¹⁸¹⁹.

That is why, in the United States dominated the point of view that the cancellation of the second round and the establishment of third one was the best

¹³ *Senate Concurrent Resolution 5-congratulating the people of Ukraine for conducting a democratic, transparent, and fair runoff presidential election on december 26, 2004, and congratulating Viktor Yushchenko on his election as president of Ukraine and his commitment to democracy and reform*, in <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CREC-2005-01-25/html/CREC-2005-01-25-pt1-PgS502.htm> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

¹⁴ *Latvia, Ukraine, Russia, Jordan and Iraq*, in <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CREC-2005-06-13/html/CREC-2005-06-13-pt1-PgS6391-2.htm> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

¹⁵ *Milestone for democracy – Hon. Marilyn N. Musgrave (Extensions of Remarks – February 08, 2005)*, in <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?r109:E08FE5-0028>:. (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

¹⁶ *Senate Concurrent Resolution 5- Congratulating the people of Ukraine for conducting a democratic, transparent, and fair runoff presidential election on december 26, 2004, and congratulating Viktor Yushchenko on his election as president of Ukraine and his commitment to democracy and reform*, in <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CREC-2005-01-25/html/CREC-2005-01-25-pt1-PgS502.htm> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

¹⁷ *Milestone for democracy – Hon. Marilyn N. Musgrave (Extensions of Remarks – February 08, 2005)*, in <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?r109:E08FE5-0028>:. (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

¹⁸ *Congratulating the people of Ukraine on recent presidential elections*, in <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CREC-2005-01-25/html/CREC-2005-01-25-pt1-PgE66-2.htm> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

¹⁹ *Tribute to the ukrainian people and their president, Viktor Yushchenko – (Extensions of Remarks – April 07, 2005)*, in <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?r109:E07AP5-0035>: (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

way out of the situation. In the US Senate Resolution (December 26, 2004), this decision was called as „turning point” for the presidential campaign²⁰. This conclusion was made by the fact that, unlike the first two, the third round of elections was more objective and it reflected the true picture of the vote²¹. On the day of inauguration of the newly elected Ukrainian president, the US Congress passed a resolution, which congratulated Yushchenko with his victory and the people of Ukraine – on holding of free elections²². The resolution, which was initiated by Senator R. Lugar, represented the support for the efforts of the Ukrainian people and the new government of Ukraine on the establishment of full democracy, the rule of law and respect for human rights, also expressed hope for the creation of a prosperous market economy in Ukraine, confirming its independence and territorial sovereignty²³.

During Yushchenko's visit to the US, George W. Bush said: „We salute the people of Ukraine who claimed their right to elect freely their leadership. Their brave stand was a victory for democracy inspiring those throughout the world who yearn for freedom and dignity in the face of tyranny, isolation and oppression”²⁴. The US president also paid attention that the United States were planning their further assistance to Ukraine in the development of democracy and reforming of the Ukrainian economy.

Thus, the Ukrainian presidential elections in 2004 were estimated in the US as starting point in the transformation of the electoral process and

²⁰ *S. Con. Res. 7 Congratulating the people of Ukraine for conducting a democratic, transparent, and fair runoff presidential election on December 26, 2004, and congratulating Viktor Yushchenko on his election as President of Ukraine*, in <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-109sconres7ats/html/BILLS-109sconres7ats.htm> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

²¹ *Senate Concurrent Resolution 5- Congratulating the people of Ukraine for conducting a democratic, transparent, and fair runoff presidential election on december 26, 2004, and congratulating Viktor Yushchenko on his election as president of Ukraine and his commitment to democracy and reform*, in <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CREC-2005-01-25/html/CREC-2005-01-25-pt1-PgS502.htm> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

²² *S. Con. Res. 7 Congratulating the people of Ukraine for conducting a democratic, transparent, and fair runoff presidential election on December 26, 2004, and congratulating Viktor Yushchenko on his election as President of Ukraine*, in <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/BILLS-109sconres7ats/html/BILLS-109sconres7ats.htm> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ *Joint Statement by President George W. Bush and President Viktor Yushchenko of Ukraine*, in <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=73794&st=UKRAINE&st1=> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

democracy in Ukraine²⁵.

New features in American perception towards democratic process in Ukraine after Orange revolution

After the presidential campaign in 2004 and the Yushchenko's coming in to power the US attitude towards the democratic process in Ukraine had changed: the US Senate made a decision to provide Ukraine the status of market economy, and also, US House of Representatives had abolished the Jackson-Vanik amendment concerning Ukraine (9 March 2006). Ukrainian authorities in foreign policy area had become more focused on cooperation with Western countries. That is why the Western analysts predicted the intensive development of democratic processes.

Thus, the next elections in 2006 inspired in advance more confidence in the US, compared to the elections in 2002²⁶. George W. Bush noted that in the last 2 years, Ukraine held free election; and also, the people of Ukraine and its president, V. Yushchenko were deeply committed to democratic reforms²⁷.

According to the point of view of the American establishment, the parliamentary elections in 2006 were provided with better legal framework, compared to the campaign of 2002. Before the elections in 2006 the following positive developments were observed: the election of candidates from the party lists; reducing of the entry level for political parties to 3%; improvement of the national register of electors. Besides, American politicians stressed the idea that the level of civic consciousness of Ukrainian society has increased qualitatively, fact that increased the monitoring of the election procedure by the representatives of the civil society. A significant increase of freedom in mass media, and reducing restrictions on the coverage of the electoral process were also noticed.

²⁵ *Congratulating the people of Ukraine on recent presidential elections*, in <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/CREC-2005-01-25/html/CREC-2005-01-25-pt1-PgE66-2.htm> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

²⁶ *Підтримка прав людини і демократії: Що зроблено Сполученими Штатами у 2005-2006 роках* [Supporting Human Rights and Democracy: What made the United States in 2005-2006], in http://photos.state.gov/libraries/ukraine/164171/pdf/dhr05_ukr.pdf (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

²⁷ *Remarks on Signing a Bill To Authorize the Extension of Nondiscriminatory Treatment to the Products of Ukraine*, in <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=65420&st=UKRAINE&st1=> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

The fact that the Party of Regions, at that time the opposition political force, gained the majority of votes, was perceived by American circles with cautious approval. In the United States it was explained that it could balance the presidency and give it the objective possibility for better governing of the country. Thus, an expert at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, M. McFaul said that the progress and results of the election campaign in 2006 are very positive²⁸. The report, prepared by Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor inside the US Department of State, based on the results of elections in Ukraine, declared that: „The March parliamentary elections became the freest in 15 years of an independent country”²⁹. However, some disadvantages were mentioned: mechanical errors, some deficiencies on a complete set of election commissions and availability of electoral lists. However, it was stressed that these violations did not cause significant obstacles to the results of voting.

The negative result of the 2006 parliamentary election was the polarization of the Verkhovna Rada, which gave the arguments to American experts and politicians to predict the political instability in Ukraine³⁰. And it really happened, because next year the president dissolved parliament. Thus, in 2007 there were announced extraordinary parliamentary elections leading to the situation of political confrontation of presidential and parliamentary branches of power.

In 2007 the US attitude concerning democratic development in Ukraine had an ambiguous character: on the one hand, the United States continued to hold the focus on the events in Ukraine; on the other hand, they concentrated their main attention on the problems of other regions, such as Iraq and the Middle East.

But, overall, the United States called the Ukrainian elections in 2007 as ones which were held on a high level of political culture. It was interpreted as an

²⁸ *Експерти у США аналізують українські вибори* [Experts in the US analyzed Ukrainian elections], in <http://ukrainian.voanews.com/content/a-49-2006-03-30-voa4-86941617/224265.html> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

²⁹ *Підтримка прав людини і демократії: Що зроблено Сполученими Штатами у 2005-2006 роках* [Supporting Human Rights and Democracy: What made the United States in 2005-2006], in http://photos.state.gov/libraries/ukraine/164171/pdf/dhr05_ukr.pdf (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

³⁰ *Експерти у США аналізують українські вибори* [Experts in the US analyzed Ukrainian elections], in <http://ukrainian.voanews.com/content/a-49-2006-03-30-voa4-86941617/224265.html> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

opportunity to solve legally the problem of misunderstanding in the Ukraine Parliament. Thus, the US perceived the extraordinary elections in Ukraine as the most civilized way out of the political crisis. This argument was reinforced by the adoption of 320 Congress Resolution (21 September, 2007). It was appealed to all Ukrainian parties (government and opposition) to resolve the contradiction by re-election of deputies to the Verkhovna Rada in compliance with all international standards³¹.

Among the positive characteristics that Americans remarked about the extraordinary elections in 2007 in Ukraine, it was the possibility of everyone to be able to present his candidature to the Parliament and took advantage of this opportunity without interference.

On the other side, there were mentioned few negative features, which described some kind of worsening of the procedure of Ukrainian elections: the conflict between Ukraine political forces and the next correction of the electoral legislature. So, it was noted that Ukrainian leaders were losing time for solving the energy and economic issues because of the absence of consensus among them. The deputy Assistant Secretary of State D. Kramer said that „The issue of energy security is a priority task ... the WTO is also an important question...”³². A Ukrainian political chaos, caused by conflicts, became the basis of the uncertainty for the Western countries in terms of their co-operation with Ukraine. The Ambassador in Ukraine at that time C. Pascual noted, „Today it is very difficult to understand Ukrainian politics. Ukrainians themselves don't understand their policies. Therefore, in my opinion, it seems to the political leaders of the United States that Ukraine as a country that is very difficult to understand”³³.

However, after the official announcement of the election results, the American side noted that the elections in Ukraine were fair in contrast to other former Soviet republics, and furthermore such elections had become the norm for Ukraine. As a result, the report of the International Republican Institute

³¹ *Bill Summary & Status 110th Congress (2007-2008) S.RES.320*, in <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d110:S.Res.320>: (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

³² *США очікують плідної співпраці з урядом Тимошенко* [The USA expect fruitful cooperation with the Government of Tymoshenko], in <http://ukrainian.voanews.com/content/a-49-2007-12-19-voa3-86825227/219208.html> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

³³ *Карлос Паскуаль: Україна багато досягла за 16 років* [Carlos Pascual: Ukraine has achieved a lot in 16 years], in <http://ukrainian.voanews.com/content/a-49-2007-08-23-voa4-86822827/218733.html> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).

indicated that the elections which were held in 2007, were not worse than the elections in 2004 and 2006³⁴.

Conclusions

So, we can say that within the period of 2000-2008 the American position toward the development of democracy in Ukraine significantly changed. The turning point was the Orange revolution of 2004, which led to the positive changes in the electoral processes and also to the development of the democracy in Ukraine.

³⁴ *The International Republican Institute: Advancing Democracy Worldwide. Ukraine parliamentary elections, September 30, 2007. Election Observation Mission. Final Report*, in <http://www.iri.org/sites/default/files/Ukraine's20200720Parliamentary20Elections.pdf> (Accessed in 12.06.2015).