

**THE FUNCTIONING OF ELECTORAL DEMOCRACY IN  
KYRGYZSTAN, 1993-2016**

**Dissertation submitted to Jawaharlal Nehru University**

**In partial fulfilment of the requirements**

**For the award of the degree of**

**MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY**

**AMRUTA PRIYAMBADA**



**CENTRE FOR RUSSIAN AND CENTRAL ASIAN STUDIES**

**SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES**

**JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY**

**NEW DELHI – 110067**

**2017**



# JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY

Centre for Russian and Central Asian Studies

School of International Studies

New Delhi-110067

Tel.: (O) +91-11-2670 4365  
Fax: (+91) - 11-2674 1586, 2586  
Email: crcasjnu@gmail.com

DATE:

## DECLARATION

I declare that the dissertation entitled “**The Functioning of Electoral Democracy in Kyrgyzstan, 1993-2016**” submitted by me in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of **Master of Philosophy** of Jawaharlal Nehru University is my own work. The dissertation has not been submitted for any other degree of this University or any other university.

*Amruta Priyambada*  
AMRUTA PRIYAMBADA

## CERTIFICATE

We recommend that this dissertation be placed before the examiners for evaluation.

*AJ Patnaik*

Prof. Ajay Patnaik

(CHAIRPERSON, CRCAS)

 **Acting Chairperson**  
Centre for Russian & Central Asian Studies  
School of International Studies  
Jawaharlal Nehru University  
New Delhi – 110067, India

*AJ Patnaik*

Prof. Ajay Patnaik

(SUPERVISOR)

 **Professor**  
Centre for Russian & Central Asian Studies  
School of International Studies  
Jawaharlal Nehru University  
New Delhi - 110 057

## **Acknowledgements**

This endeavour is a testimony to the diversity of ideas, values and knowledge acquired during interactions within the JNU community and the constant challenges during research. A person who stood as a pillar of strength during each stage of the work and enhanced the learning process was my supervisor Professor Ajay Patnaik. Without his unconditional support, this dissertation would not have seen the light of the day .

I express my heartfelt gratitude to our Chairperson Prof. Archana Upadhyay and all the other faculty members of the Centre for Russian and Central Asian Studies for their valuable cooperation, guidance and suggestions.

I am also thankful to my friends Annapurna, Bijay, Dipsita, Rupali, Monalisa and Amrit who were always there with me during the entire journey.

And lastly, words fall short to thank my parents without whose support and motivation, this dissertation would not have been possible.

**AMRUTA PRIYAMBADA**



Source: Lonely Planet Publications

# CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	i
<i>Map: Kyrgyzstan</i>	ii
<b>CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1-22</b>
1.1 Conceptualizing Electoral democracy	
1.2 Democratic principles of suffrage	
1.3 Minimum requirements of Electoral democracy	
1.4 Broad features of Non-Western Democracies	
1.5 Political condition of Central Asia	
1.6 Evolution of Electoral democracy in Kyrgyzstan	
a) Political System after the October Revolution	
b) The buiding of the “Island of Democracy	
1.7 Rationale and Scope of the study	
1.8 Objectives of the Study	
1.9 Research Questions	
1.10 Hyotheses	
1.11 Research Methodology	
1.12 Overview of the Study	
<b>CHAPTER 2: SOCIO-POLITICAL FACTORS AIDING DEMOCRATIC TRANSITION IN KYRGYZSTAN</b>	<b>23-41</b>
2.1 Theory of Democratic Transition	
2.2 Peculiarities in the transition in Kyrgyzstan	
2.3 Politico-Legal basis of Elections in a democratic system	
2.4 Influence of tribals and inter-ethnic relations in the development of the electoral system	
2.5 Mass media in the electoral process of Kyrgyzstan	

**CHAPTER 3: NATURE OF PARTY SYSTEM IN KYRGYZSTAN** **42-65**

- 3.1 Stages of evolution of the Party-Structure
- 3.2 The Party system of Kyrgyzstan
- 3.3 Penetration of Parties in Kyrgyzstan
- 3.4 Significant parties in Kyrgyzstan
- 3.5 Bottlenecks in the Party System of Kyrgyzstan

**CHAPTER 4: TRANSITION FROM PRESIDENTIAL SYSTEM  
TO PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY IN KYRGYZSTAN** **66-81**

- 4.1 Constitutional history of Kyrgyzstan
- 4.2 The Arrival of Parliamentary Rule to Kyrgyzstan
- 4.3 Kyrgyzstan's Parliamentary Democracy
- 4.4 The Pillars of Pluralism
- 4.5 Role of external actors in shaping Kyrgyz democracy
- 4.6 Regional Context
- 4.7 Role of Parties in making the transition to parliamentary democracy
- 4.8 Organization and conduct of Parliamentary elections in Kyrgyzstan
- 4.9 Challenges and Opportunities

**CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION** **82-88**

**BIBLIOGRAPHY** **89-96**

**CHAPTER – I**  
**THEORITICAL UNDERSTANDING**  
**OF ELECTORAL DEMOCRACY**

The act of choosing a government is the life blood of any democratic set-up. The authority of the government has been derived from the consent of those who are governed. The pertinent tool for translating this consent into momentous governmental authority is fair and regular elections. Elections hold a lot of weight mainly in a representative democracy where individuals choose their representatives who in turn take decisions on their behalf. It is a form of indirect rule which often involves the contest between parties and the emergence of a single leading party.

All contemporary democracies hold elections but not every election is democratic. Authoritarian regimes as well stage elections to grant their rule an impression of legitimacy. In such elections, there might be just a single candidate or a list of candidates with no substitute. It may also happen through intimidation and rigging to manipulate votes. These are not democratic elections.

Democratic elections are far from symbolic, they can be competitive, regular, inclusive in which the major policy framers of a government are elected by the governed who enjoy the liberty to censure the government and side the alternatives (Kirkpatrick 1984).

Elections can be structured into two fragments: first one relates to the levels of government in a country (union, state or local level). Several representatives are elected at each level. Second major difference is related to the fact that posts in the contest may be single member or multi-member. This distinction is vital for examining the functioning and the performance of the structure of government where the link between the results obtained by the presidential and parliamentary elections is of paramount significance. Ultimately, all this boils down to translating the intangible consent to tangible votes and then to seats.

The democratic plan encompasses a sweeping influence outside the developed world, in Africa, Latin America and Central Asia where the politics of several countries were ruled by the authoritarian and totalitarian regimes. The Central Asian countries that were part of the USSR before 1991 and currently the Commonwealth of Independent States, (C.I.S) are passing through a transition. This transition was from communism to democracy, a change from communist political system to a liberal democratic system. In many cases this transformation has impacted politics, in the sense that genuine public debate about the nature of the state has created significant progress towards the institution of a liberal democratic order. The political development of any post communist country is shaped by the attitudes and strategies of the elite and the character of the parties and the mechanism through which they compete for power. The long-term post communist outcomes are dependent on the bed-



rock on which they are built. Electoral democracy requires a supportive culture and civil society to function effectively.

### **Conceptualizing Electoral Democracy:**

Conceptualized from the two words, “demos” meaning people and “kratia” meaning rule , democracy stands basically for a form of government in which sovereignty remains with the citizens. People have been using the word in this sense from 5<sup>th</sup> century. Democratic institutions began to develop in England in the 11th century when the autocratic rule began to be questioned. Levelers and John Milton were the fore-runners of this idea. The constant inclination towards democracy is found in the writings of John Lock and Rousseau who prepared the ground through the social contract theory. Thomas Paine advanced his democratic ideas through the "Rights of men". The declaration made by the founding fathers of the American War of Independence, and revolutionaries of the French Revolution also bear testimony to love for democracy. In the 18<sup>th</sup> century Spinoza, Hume and Montesquieu also supported the main planks of democracy. The job of placing democracy on very strong footing was completed only in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Also during this period , the Utilitarians championed the cause of democracy and so did J.S.Mill, T.H.Green, Harold Laski. Mac Iver, John Dewey and numerous others. The welfare state model, ushered in post the proletarian revolution, realised the ideal of democracy for the masses (Heywood 2000).

Basically, the concept of democracy as we understand it can be broadly classified into direct democracy and indirect(also called representative democracy). The direct form democracy is the classical democratic model where people have a share in the decision making directly. It uses devices like referendum, initiative, plebiscite and recall. This form of popular democracy is found in Switzerland. Contrarily, indirect democracy refers to a system where the chosen representatives rule on behalf of the people. When this task of governance is bestowed based on elections and electoral vote, it stands for electoral democracy, a variant of representative democracy.

It involves the working of electoral processes to entrust eligible citizens with the prime task of governance. Broadly, it throws light on two aspects,

- On the positive side, citizens are given the power to get involved in taking important political decisions through the representatives elected by means of universal, free, fair and secret ballot. One person is assigned just one vote and each vote has equal value.

- On the negative side, preference is given to decisions made this way over other forms of direct democracy that is not practicable in complex and large nations.

Whether the political model is presidential or parliamentary, the chosen representatives employ their legislative and executive power( judicial power in certain cases ), subject to limitations set by the constitution, enjoying basic rights and freedom within the structure of constitutional government and separation of power

### **Democratic principles of suffrage:**

The process of elections can take place on different political foundations - democratic and anti-democratic. This is reflected primarily in the basic principles of the electoral law that underlie the organization and conduct of elections, election campaigns in a given country. Among the most important and internationally recognized principles of electoral law, the observance of which makes it possible to recognize elections as democratic, and their results to be legitimate, include the following: universality, freedom of participation, equality, direct and indirect nature of elections and secret ballot.

The universality of the suffrage as a prime feature negates any discrimination in the sphere of voting and the voting rights are assigned to all the mentally healthy citizens who have reached a certain age. This principle excludes the possibility of depriving or restricting the citizen's voting rights on grounds of gender, race, nationality, religious affiliation, ideological convictions, and, most often, property and official status. At the same time, this principle does not exclude the practice of preventing minors, persons recognized as mentally ill by court, and convicts sentenced by a court in custody, as their conscious, free or independent expression of will cannot be ensured.

In principle, democratic suffrage allows the introduction of certain qualifications, i.e. special conditions, compliance with which means the acquisition of relevant voting rights. The age qualification means the recognition of electoral rights for a person at a certain age. There are other qualifications: the citizenship qualification, the residence qualification, the qualification of origin, etc. The value of citizenship means that, as a rule, electoral rights are granted only to citizens, although in some cases (Spain, Finland, Hungary, etc.) to elections of local self-government bodies non-citizens residing in the country for a more or less long time and paying taxes are also allowed. In some countries, in determining the electoral rights of

citizens, a distinction is made between those who received citizenship from birth and those who acquired it from naturalization (the qualification of origin). Often introduced, primarily in determining passive electoral law, and the residence requirement, the essence of which is to recognize the need for residence in a given country or locality for at least the prescribed time. For example, in France, to live in any election, one needs to live in the commune for at least six months, and in the United States only those who have lived in the country for at least 14 years have the right to be elected president ( Afanas'evna 2001).

The existence of certain electoral qualifications does not in itself make it possible to recognize such elections and the electoral right underlying them as undemocratic. The whole point is, what are the qualifications. At the same time, on the whole, it can be admitted that an excessive interest in these qualifications undoubtedly narrows the liberal orientation of the country's suffrage and even may call into question its democracy. It is not by chance that, especially in developed democracies, the tendency of the reduction of various qualifications and their framework has been clearly revealed for the past century. The property qualification associated with the requirement to own a certain amount of property, the payment of a corresponding tax, as well as the gender qualification, when women in the past (in democratic Switzerland before the early 1970s) were deprived of their voting rights, came to naught, and educational Censorship, including literacy qualifications, when only those who have a certain level of education have the right to vote (although literacy is sometimes reserved in some countries, for example, in Brazil, Rwanda, Malawi, etc.). A few decades ago, in such democratic countries as the United States, Britain, Canada, etc., even for obtaining active suffrage it was necessary to achieve a citizen of 21 years, and now - 18 years. Today, in about two-thirds of the countries of the world, citizens over the age of 18 have this right, and in some (Brazil, Iran, Cuba, Nicaragua) ,even over 16 years ( Evgen'evich 2000).

The principle of free participation in elections means the voluntariness of voter participation in elections, its independence in resolving the issue of the use of active and passive suffrage, freedom of expression of voters, excluding illegal interference of the state and other political forces in this process. Compliance with this principle is an important condition for recognizing elections as valid, and elected as a result of their bodies - legitimate.

During the elections, absenteeism can also be seen, more or less mass evasion of voters from voting. Thus, voters express their dissatisfaction with the current state of affairs in the country, disappointment with both the political and practical activities of the authorities, as

well as party programs and political platforms of opposition candidates, lack of faith in the possibility of significantly changing anything by election or in the honest nature of their conduct, etc. In order to overcome absenteeism and ensure greater legitimacy of elected bodies, a number of countries (for example, Italy, Argentina, Belgium, Australia, Greece, Turkey) introduce legal mandatory voting (mandatory vote), when non-participation in voting entails moral condemnation, fine and even deprivation of liberty. In order to overcome the negative consequences of absenteeism, the way to lower the threshold is used, after which the elections are recognized as failed (for example, from the level of participation of the majority of voters - 50% plus one vote to more than a quarter of all voters).

The feature of equal voting right means equal rights of each voter in elections, the same by law gives the opportunity for all voters to influence their results and be elected. This is achieved first of all by: empowering each voter with an equal number of votes (usually one voice by the principle "one person - one vote", although in rare cases everyone can have two or more votes); Formation of approximately equal in number of residents or voters of electoral districts, so that the votes cast in the elections have equal weight, exert equal influence on the results of elections; Refusal to divide the electoral corps of the country into unequal parts (electoral curia), with unequal norms of representation, when each deputy has a different number of residents or voters represented by him. The principle of equality of electoral rights is also ensured by the fact that the same electoral law determines the same conditions and requirements for all candidates for their nomination, registration, election campaigning and voting and summing up its results.

Direct and indirect suffrage refers to the fact that like the elections themselves, the suffrage can be respectively direct and indirect. Direct suffrage provides for the right of citizens to directly elect their representatives to government bodies and local self-government bodies and be elected in them. In this way practically all local government bodies, almost all lower houses of parliaments and deputies of unicameral parliaments, often upper chambers of parliaments (USA, Italy, Brazil, Poland, etc.) and presidents (France, Austria, Mexico, Bulgaria, etc.) are elected in democratic countries. .), And in Israel in recent years - even the prime minister. In contrast, indirect suffrage provides that citizens have the right to elect an authority directly, but through the representatives elected by them, who then elect a president or deputies. At the same time, there are two main types of indirect suffrage and the elections themselves: indirect and multi-step (multi-stage). Indirect elections are held through electoral

colleges specially elected by citizens (for example, the election of the President of the United States by the electoral college) or a permanent body (for example, presidential elections by parliaments in Greece, Turkey and other countries). For multi-stage, multi-stage elections, a slightly different way is characteristic, when grass-roots representative bodies are directly elected by citizens, and then these bodies elect deputies of a higher representative body, etc. Such an electoral system was used in the past in the USSR, Cuba and a number of other countries, and is now used in the PRC ( Evgen'evich 2000).

The principle of secret voting stands for voting that is carried out without external supervision and control, which ensures the real freedom of the voter's will, freedom of choice. In democratic countries, violation of the secrecy of voting is recognized as a crime and punishable by law. No outsider has the right to be in the voting booth. This principle excludes the right of anyone to require voters to disclose how they voted or open envelopes with ballots that have been left in the ballot box before the counting of votes. Open voting today is very rarely used ( Evgen'evich 2000).

### **Minimum requirements of electoral democracy:**

For electoral democracy to be considered effective, it needs to fulfil certain basic requirements. A truly democratic electoral process should-

- Take place in a system with inherent and assured suffrage rights. Correct procedures are followed which are equal for all.
- Take place, in an atmosphere where citizens' rights of participation are provided (eg -opinion, protest, assembly, etc.), without which the election results themselves, as an expression of public sentiment, would be liable for falsification. This includes the role of mass media, public expenditure or any other form of aid during the election process.
- Regular and periodic elections held in accordance with the rules established in the constitution.
- Electoral commission that heads the process must function independently of the rest of the state powers, especially the executive. It should act as a neutral agency.

- Standard procedures established to guarantee the casting of votes, assuring freedom and secrecy, fair vote counting and conversion of these votes into seats, in accordance with established principles.
- Finally, an independent adjudicatory body that applies pre-established legal rules to solve disputes of any kind that might occur during or after electoral process (e.g. an independent supreme court).

Electoral democracy is a relative concept, as the focus is on a specific element and may vary according to perspectives. Further, it is also a historic concept, as pillars that made the system at a specific time (e.g., extension of universal franchise or restriction of the right to vote in an election) have ceased to do so because of the progress of democracy, so they become pre-decided facts that no legislator can bypass. As a result, they lose their character as a political decision, emerging out of the system.

Setting out from this twin nature (impact on the conversion of votes into seats and the target of differentiating treatment in accordance with a political decision), the elements which nowadays make up the contents of the electoral system, are:

- a constituency, considered as the geographic unit of conversion of the votes into actual seats.
- the electoral formula, or mathematical mode of turning the votes into seats
- whether or not an electoral limit will be set, i.e., a certain percentage of votes, more than which the candidacies need to secure to participate in the seat count
- the form of expression of the vote, referring to the capacity of the voter and, correspondingly, the capacity of the political groups that organise candidacies to determine which persons in particular will hold the office being disputed

It has been said that electoral system as a concept is historic. Consequently, it is a procedure through which certain solutions are reached and they become the democratic credential leaving no scope for a back-turn. Among these aspects, which at the time formed part of the electoral system, but today dominate as pre-existing facts, can be found:

- the co-existence of the instruments of direct democracy and indirect democracy as means of the expression of popular sentiment
- the tussle between the system of direct legislation with its delegated variant and the efficacy of both
- extent of exercise of the freedom to vote , universal or limited by some criteria
- the choice of a party system , single party or multi-party which indicates the range of choice before the people.

In a nutshell, political liberty, economic equality, social equity, educated and enlightened citizens, strong moral character, dynamic leadership, institution of local self-government, independence of judiciary, rule of law, decentralization of powers, established party system, presence of opposition, informed civil society, protection of minority rights, freedoms of media and civil liberty and supremacy of the constitutions etc are the basic components of democracy. But before accepting any universal stand on democracy, it is desirable to know the differentiation existing between the Western and Non-Western democratic process, within the preview of their own distinct historical legacy, economy, culture and society etc.

### **Broad features of non-western democracies:**

In the aftermath of the Second World War, attempts were made to analyse the dominant and distinctive characteristics of non-Western political set-ups. It can be summed up under seventeen heads ,they are:-

1. In non-Western societies, there is no clear differentiation between the political, social and personal spheres. Power, prestige, and influence and based largely on social status the fundamental framework of non-Western politics is a communal one, and all political behavior is wrongly coloured by considerations of communal identification (Pye 1958)
2. Political parties or interest groups are not confined just to the political arena or listed political principles, but tend to take a global stand and present a certain view of life. Successful parties tend to become social movements in the long run.
3. The political process is characterized by a prevalence of cliques but the social structure is characterized by functionally diffuse relationships, decision-making is largely influenced by judgments about personality and relations of the various actors with each other. The pattern of political relationships largely determined by decisions made at the personal level.

4. Political loyalty is governed more by a sense of identification with the concrete group than by identification with the professed policy goals of the groups, and leadership has a high degree of freedom in determining matters of strategy and tactics.

5. Since the leadership and the ruling party are committed to absolute change in society or fundamental issues about its future course or the priority of the whole nation, the role of opposition parties is dubbed as obstructive to development.

6. Political process is fragmented and highlights lack of cooperation among the participants in case of the absence of a communications system in society. This restricts the kind of political issues that can emerge in such societies. For example, the values and concepts of the rural element are not effectively represented in the national political process.

7. The political process is characterized by a high rate of recruitment of new elements into political roles. There is a constant increase in the number of participants and types of organizations, involved in the political process. Also the existence of multiple channels of contact with the national government tends to increase the number of people anxious to participate in national decision-making.

8. The political process is characterized by sharp differences in the political orientation of the generations. The younger generation, who are the aspiring elite, put pressure on the current leaders who took part in the revolutionary movement, for inclusion in the circle of national politics, but are thwarted by them. This results in a clash of views and consequent tensions.

9. There is little consensus the legitimate ends and means of political action. Since the urban elite and the village peasants live in different worlds and have different outlook towards life, they can rarely exhibit the same approach towards political activity.

10. There is a wide divergence between the level of information and knowledge through discussion of the masses, and their actual participation in political decision making. They keep themselves informed of the political developments without trying to influence such developments.

11. There is a high degree of interchangeability of roles which are not clearly differentiated, but are functionally diffuse. There are no sharply defined divisions of labour in any sphere of life.

12. There are relatively few organized interest groups with functionally specific roles. Trade unions and peasant associations, for instance, are merely agents of the government or of a dominant party or movement. Although the process of social change is creating the basis for new interests, the formation of the explicit interest groups rarely moves at the same space.



Many interests are not explicitly organized and when organized, they act more as protective associations than as pressure groups.

13. The national leadership has to appeal to an undifferentiated public, and have no means for calculating the relative distribution of values and attitudes throughout society. They have few guides to how the public opinion is divided over particular issues.

14. The unstructured character of the non-Western political process encourages leaders to adopt more clearly defined positions in international issues than on domestic issues. They seek a role in the world politics that is out of proportion to their nation's power.

15. The affective or expressive aspect of politics tends to override its problem-solving or public-policy aspect.

16. Charismatic leaders tend to prevail in non-Western politics because societies experiencing cultural change are characterized by confusion over values providing an ideal setting for such leaders. The problems of political communications further reinforce the position of the charismatic leader

17. The non-Western political process operates largely without benefits of political 'broker'.

The articulation function and the bargaining operation in the West as performed by the influential members of the competing political parties or constitutional government have, with a few exceptions found instability to be the dominate feature of politics. A close examination of Lucian .W. Pye' s above mentioned famous "syndrome of seventeen features that jointly characterize the non-Western political process" reveals that as the non-western countries have their own unique socio-economic, political and cultural traditions they also have inherent problems of unique nature i.e., anti-apathy to government, oppositionism, inefficient and corrupt bureaucracy, limited experiment with democracy, habit of violence, a small middle class, poverty, illiteracy, absence of an efficient and popular mass property, social heterogeneity, lack of tolerance and lack of national unity etc.

The issues of the non-Western democratic countries are in many ways different from the western democracies. Hence, democracy in these countries· needs to be consolidated from the point of view of the problems they are facing for the smooth functioning of their democratic system. Faithfulness to the spirit of the democratic process, consolidating economic reforms, increasing literacy rate and living standard of the people, giving meaningful space to the oppositions and granting freedom to media, press and NGOs, protection of the right of individuals, minorities and giving a rightful place to civil society are the appropriate steps towards consolidation of democracy in the non-Western countries.

## **Political condition of Central Asia:**

The present day Central Asian States, namely, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Kazakhstan, came into being after the October revolution in 1917. They came into existence as a result of Soviet nationality policy. Looked at from this perspective, they have, indeed, a short history as independent, separate nations. They share a host of commonalities like Turkic identity, strong clan sentiments, predominance of rural population, low socio-economic mobility and inter-ethnic divide. In fact, they attained independence quite reluctantly without waging any struggle. But the major challenge lied in stabilising as a democratic political system, free economically and excelling on the parameters of free society. Each had the desire to break from the past.

The constitutions of all the Central Asian republics profess sovereignty, democracy and secularism as their underlying principles. All of them have adopted unitary type of government. The Central election commissions of these countries claim of conducting free and fair elections. But in practise, institutional procedures for conducting the same have not been set up. For instance, in the December 1999 elections to the Majlis in Turkmenistan, the Organisation for Security and cooperation in Europe (OSCE) refused to send observers to monitor the election, stating that legislative framework is inadequate for even a minimally democratic election. The ruling elite particularly in Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and Tajikistan have made electoral rules or laws, procedures and practices to suit themselves and perpetuate themselves in power. They have curbed freedom of information, expression and association. Rigid control has been introduced on the mass- media. No debate over government policies is allowed and opposition is suppressed. Contrarily, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan have shown their interest in democratizing the political system.

## **Evolution of electoral democracy in Kyrgyzstan:**

Prior to the subjugation of Kyrgyzstan by the Russian army and its merger into Russian Empire, its culture and politics was not much distinct from the other parts of the nomadic region. The earliest population of the region are said to be a mixed breed of Mongol, Turkic, and Kypchak descent. Being nomadic, the society was based on customs and traditions. Hunting and food gathering were the primary occupations practised by the people. Kyrgyzstan, a land-locked country was secluded from the outside world (Wheeler 1969)

During the 13<sup>th</sup> century the Kyrgyz migrated to the south which was under the dominance of the Mongolian Empire. Various Kyrgyz tribes resided in the area in 15<sup>th</sup>-16<sup>th</sup> centuries which stretched from western Mongolia to the eastern Turkestan. However, Central Tien-Shan, the Chui valley and the south eastern part of Fergana region, i.e. the territory closely coinciding with the present borders of the Kyrgyzstan, formed the heart of Kyrgyz nation's territory. As such, the Turkic people ruled this region till 1685 (Ploshikh 1998).

In the aftermath of the medieval era, this region of Central Asia broke down into three native Khanates i.e., Khanates of Kokand, Khanates of Khiva and Emirate of Bukara. The Khans and Emirs were the ruling elites of the Khanates. Khanates were backward provinces based on Islam, their political and administrative structure revolved around Islamic laws (Shariat and Adat). Most of the rulers being orthodox, followed the age old principles of Islam and forced the people to do the same.

The rulers were merciless towards any native who failed to adhere to Islamic doctrines. Moreover, poor people of the region were forced to do unlimited work. They were disallowed in social gatherings. Women were the worst victims during the Khanate rule. They were not allowed to come out of their homes and were forced to remain Burka clad at all times. The restrictions were also placed on the extent of their social interactions. Education was imparted through institutions known as *Madrassahs* and *Maktabs*, which were directly attached to the mosque. In the same line, the justice delivery system was based on traditional Islamic laws known as *Shariat* and the customary law called *Adat*. The judicial system was ruled by a group of religious elites, known as Kazi. In the beginning, the Kazis were appointed for a life-term but with time the Kaziship became hereditary. They were the arbiters of justice during this phase. They dealt with all disputes-social, economic or religious and enjoyed a high social esteem and economic prestige in the society. Similar to the rulers, the Kazis were exploitive in nature and usually their verdicts favoured the rich and powerful. Another community of religious elite were the Mufti who used to be the exponent of Islamic laws (Shariah). Mufti was the legal and the spiritual head of the Khanates. The political powers were concentrated in the hands of the provincial government known as beks. The government was tyrannical and exploitive. The people had no say in the formulation of policies. The clergy misinterpreted the Islamic laws but still enjoyed high status and respect in a society. The people had wide and varying superstitions due to low level of education. The system of administration, taxation and land tenure was based on the Perso- Arab system of Transoxiana with heavy levies and punishment including the death penalty. In the 19th

century Khanates of the region lost most of their power and, the Russian forces captured this region (Shams-ud-din 1992).

In order to capture the area Russia Government followed a policy of forced resettlement of ethnic Russians and Cossacks to dilute the native population and turned the land over to them for large-scale cotton production. A series of Islamic resistance movements opposing Russian encroachment broke out in the Fergana Valley region. The people had no right to criticize the policies of the Tsarist administrators. However, at the local level the administration was largely in the hands of native administrators with customary courts retaining jurisdiction over criminal and civil cases. The Tsarist rulers treated the Kyrgyz region as their colony. The main purpose of Russians which lead to their conquest of this region was its economic potential to fulfil the primary needs of the industries in the metropolis of Russia. Since the population was nomadic, shifting cultivation was practiced on common land and the most important crop was cotton (Sharma 1979).

The judicial system consisted of two types of courts ( 1) for the settled population, and (2) for the nomadic population. The Kazi was the main source of justice for the settled population. Initially the Kazi was appointed by the Tsarist governor but later the Kazis were elected by the people. The Kazi dealt with both civil and criminal cases<sup>21</sup>. In this period the powers of Kazi in judicial sphere was limited and the more serious cases were decided by the Governor General of the Turkestan. The second types of courts were for nomadic people. The system was based on the customary laws passed on orally from generations to generations. Disputes were settled before a group of respected elders called beiys. There was no criminal act. All the disputes and offences including murder were settled by payment of the Kun (payment for release of criminal). The Tsarist Government established a new type of education system based on Russian model. It was based on three types of school system. Firstly, there were schools for teaching Russian language to the local people. In the second types of schools the Russian administrators taught Russian culture to the local people, so that they could sideline Islam -and tighten their hold on local people and thirdly, there were schools for the native Russians who were serving in the region. During the Tsarist period the native people felt unsafe. In this period the educational institutions were biased in favour of Arabic, Turkish and Persian, theology and the laws of Shariat. The Russian administrators started the modernization of the judicial system also. The Russian administration equalized the burden of taxation. The conditions of women had slightly improved, as the administration

did not force the women to follow the Islamic rules. However, the native people did not appreciate these relaxations (Sharma 1979).

### **Political System after October Revolution :**

After the October Revolution of 1917 the Soviet Union emerged on the map of the world. Its new Constitution described the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics as a socialist state and all powers belonged to the Soviets. Additionally small-scale enterprise was permissible in the initial Soviet Constitution and rights of inheritance was protected by law .Moreover, the Soviet Union was a one party state. The Communist Party was the only political organization that was allowed in the country. Major decisions of the government were taken by the Communist party. In 1924 after the demarcation of the Central Asian republics, Kyrgyzstan became Kara-Kyrgyz Autonomous Oblast, as a part of the Russian Federation. In 1926 it was reorganized as the Kyrgyz Autonomous Republic in the structure of the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republic.

The new Constitution, 1936 made the oblast a Kyrgyz Soviet Socialist Republic with the same status as the other union republics of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Government changed the structure of Kyrgyz life dramatically. During the Soviet period Bolsheviks tried to wipe out Islam from Central Asia but they did not succeed. In 1917 the Soviet Government declared the equality of men and women, and in 1921 declared polygamy and the kalym (bride price) to be illegal. During the Soviet period mosques and prayer houses were destroyed. In the 1920s cultural, educational, and social life developed considerably in Kyrgyzstan. Literacy rate greatly improved, and a standard literary language was introduced in the region. Economic and social development also was notable. Many aspects of the Kyrgyz national culture were retained despite the suppression of nationalist activity under Stalin, therefore, tensions with the all-Union authorities were constant. After discrediting Islam indirectly the government began a direct assault. Authorities forbade zakat (giving of alms) and hajj (pilgrimage to Mecca) and began closing mosques. During the Stalin period the government ordered the execution of Muslims who possessed a copy of the Koran. In order to suppress Islam, the Soviet authorities made major improvements in the educational system in Muslim parts of the country. The Soviet leaders also were convinced that improved education would lead many Muslims to recognize the superiority of Marxism over Islam.

Despite the suppression of Islam by the Soviet Government the native people did not move away from the fundamental observance of the Islam (Sharma 1979).

Though it was not publicly done but they practiced clandestinely. Salat (daily prayers) could only be performed once and not five times. Saw (fasting during the month of Ramadan) was reinterpreted as a means to gain awareness of deprivation and hunger, which could be achieved without actually fasting for an entire month. Similarly, the impossible hajj to Mecca was replaced by pilgrimages to the many local holy places within the Soviet Union. During the Soviet era, the primary change in popular Islam was that leaders of Sufism, an unofficial Muslim mystical movement, came to be regarded, in effect, as unofficial mullahs. In the absence of actual mullahs, especially in rural areas, people naturally turned elsewhere for spiritual counsel and guidance. The Sufis, considered to be the holiest of all people, were the obvious choice to fill the vacuum. In this period citizens were given political rights but these rights were on paper only. The Communist concept of political freedom was totally different from the West. Therefore, in the Soviet Union freedom was allowed under the supervision of Communist Party. In the Constitution the citizens were given the right to speech, and freedom for street processions and demonstrations (Munro 1959).

The Soviet Constitution of 1977 which is almost same as 1936 Soviet Constitution provided for universal suffrage, , right to be elected to the public offices and to join political party but at the same time restricted the citizens from forming or joining a political party other than Communist Party. Moreover, the Soviet Kyrgyz people were given the freedom to associate under the supervision of Communist Party. During the Soviet period there was a provision in the Soviet system that no person can be arbitrarily arrested and put in jail. Thus, no person shall be placed under arrest except by decision of courts or with the sanctions of a procurator. Like the other citizens of the other parts of the Soviet Union the Kyrgyz people were given the right to vote. This right means that in addition to elect Soviets the people were not allowed to take part in nationwide discussion on important issues. Moreover, as citizens of the Soviet Union, the Kyrgyz people could take part in referendum held on important national issues. During the Soviet period the Kyrgyz people were given the rights to criticize the policies of the government and various state organs. To the extent the Communist party approved and permitted it. In the entire Soviet Union there was an improvement in the condition of women. Unlike in the past now the women for the first time in the history of Central Asia were given the opportunity to take active part in the political process of the state (Shams-ud-din 1992).

According to Soviet census the number of women in higher education as a percentage of the total had risen from 28 percent in 1927, to 43 percent in 1960, to 49 percent in 1970. There were improvements in pre-school care for children - in 1960 there were 500,000 places but by 1971 this had risen to over five million. Due to spread of education among the women they became more aware about their political rights. Additionally many women took part in the political discussions. The women were now taking active part in the voting and referendums. In some areas women participation during elections exceeded that of men. In parallel the development of education, modern state institutions and a modern bureaucracy were established. Additionally the traditional art forms in music, literature, dance and painting were revived. In their place modern Soviet art such as theatre, opera and orchestral music were encouraged. Material advances also facilitated the full involvement of women in all spheres of social, economic and political life: the provision of free school meals, milk for all children, special food and clothes allowances for children, pregnancy consultation centres, maternity homes, creches and other facilities (Sajoo 2002)

The Communist party monopolized the political system of the Soviet Union. Being a single party system there was only one political party the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and no other party was allowed to function in the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republic. Thus, the Communist Party had been officially recognized as the main political party. The party was organized and functioned on the basis of democratic centralism. All the major decisions of the government were taken with the guidance and direction from the party. In March 1985 Gorbachev became the General Secretary of the Communist party of the Soviet Union. After coming to power Gorbachev introduced radical economic and political reforms. At the twenty seventh party congress in 1986 Gorbachev announced that economic reform was the key to all problems, immediate and long term, economic and social, political, ideological, domestic and foreign. The adoption of economic and political reforms of *Perestroika* and *Glasnost* influenced the political, cultural, social and economic life of the people of the entire Soviet Union (Ronald J 1999).

In Kyrgyzstan the introduction of reforms led to the emergence of new political parties, groups and the media and the end of the monopoly of the Communist party. Simultaneously, it was viewed that the Communist party had lost its old charm and penetration over areas. The most important single event leading to independence grew from an outburst of ethnic friction. From the Kyrgyz perspective, the most acute nationality problem was posed by the Uzbeks residing near the city of Osh, in the republic's southwest. According to the 1989 census, about twelve percent of the Uzbek ethnic population is living in the Kyrgyzstan are

concentrated in the southern part of the country particularly in Osh region situated in the Fargana Valley. Tensions had existed between the Kyrgyz and the Uzbeks throughout the Soviet period, but Moscow was able to preserve the image of Soviet ethnic harmony until the reforms of Gorbachev in the mid-1980s. The real issue behind Adalat's demand was land, which is in extremely short supply in Osh. To protect their claims, some of the people here had also formed an opposing ethnic association, called Osh-aimagy (Osh-land). In early June 1990, the Kyrgyz-dominated Osh City Council announced plans to build a cotton processing plant on a parcel of land under the control of an Uzbek-dominated collective farm in Osh Province. The confrontation that erupted over control of that land resulted in several days of bloody riots between crowds led by the respective associations, killing at least 320 Kyrgyz and Uzbeks in Osh. The precise cause and sequence of events in early June 1990 is disputed between Uzbek and Kyrgyz. A lots of families were left homeless when their houses were burned out. The government finally stopped the rioting by imposing a military curfew. In 1990 the leadership was transferred to Asker Akaev after the bloody riots of Osh in Southern Kyrgyzstan. Very soon this new government started a policy of economic and political reforms. The disintegration of the Soviet Union further gave a boost to the process of democratization in the Kyrgyz republic (Sajoo 2012).

### **The building of the “Island of democracy”:**

Kyrgyzstan bagged a unique place for itself and was dubbed as the liberal oasis of Central Asia. Surprisingly, periodic elections have been held since independence and the constitutional reforms of 2010 led to the transition to a parliamentary system. Subsequent elections have been termed free and fair by international observers. The election results brought hope of political pluralism and a democratic breakthrough as the votes spread roughly among five political parties.

By conducting fair and transparent elections, the Kyrgyz Republic proved that democracy is possible in developing countries, despite the theory that democracy can only exist in developed Western nations, while authoritarianism is the best system for developing countries. As opposed to many post-Soviet countries, where elections are attended by 99% of population, and the ruling candidates get 99% of votes, in Kyrgyzstan the results were not known in advance.



After much debate, the Kyrgyz Republic adopted parliamentary system of government. Opponents of this new system, both domestic and foreign, saw the change as an inappropriate imitation of western lifestyle. They predicted the new system would not last long, five years at most. The new system should have sunk into oblivion along with the parliament. Yet, the Kyrgyz Parliamentarianism displays its survivability and is in demand. Since the last convocation of the Kyrgyz Parliament started work in 2010, street protests moved inside its walls and transformed into political debates. Apparently the new parliament has satisfied a primary goal: to clear the streets and squares of countless protesters and negativity.

According to expert opinion, the use of new technologies such as biometric data and automatic voting machines helped hold fair elections. The new measures have reduced risks of falsifications of results to a minimum. Six of the fourteen parties won seats in the Kyrgyz Parliament, from left to right leaning; from moderates to radicals; from liberals to conservatives ; from supporters of integration with Eurasian Economic Union to adherents of a new independent Kyrgyz course of development. The journey of electoral democracy in Kyrgyzstan has been directly dependant on the chosen model of the political system, its openness, transparency, pluralism. However the roadblocks before Kyrgyzstan are numerous, rapacious forms of corruption, economic crisis , poor governance, elite-interference and unfree media. Election is not a panacea to all this but surely would be a stepping stone for further reforms (Kurmanov 2003).

### **Rationale and scope of the study:**

The proposed study is relevant for both academic and general understanding. It tries to explore the relations among different processes like election, political participation, parliamentary system. It tries to understand how democracy has prospered in the post-soviet Kyrgyzstan and the road blocks before it.

Although many works have been done on Kyrgyzstan's democratisation, the entire journey of electoral democracy has not been touched upon. This will highlight the issues of competition and participation in politics from a new perspective. The availability of resources may constraint the research work to some extent .But attempt will be made to widen our understanding of the dynamics of electoral politics in the broader framework of post-Soviet transformation.

## **Objectives of the study :**

The main focus of the present study is to analyse the working of the electoral system in Kyrgyzstan as the sole such model in Central Asia. It has been analysed in the following objectives of research:

- To explore the different dimensions of representative democracy.
- To understand the political situation in Kyrgyzstan.
- To explore the role of political parties in Kyrgyzstan.
- To understand the forces involved in transforming Kyrgyzstan to a parliamentary system.
- To understand the challenges to the parliamentary system itself.

## **Research questions:**

- What impact do elections have on strengthening democracy ?
- What are the major factors resisting democracy in Central Asia ?
- How is the political condition of Kyrgyzstan different from its neighbours ?
- Why has there been a transition from presidential system to parliamentary system in Kyrgyzstan ?
- What kind of electoral reforms should be initiated in Kyrgyzstan ?
- What is the contribution of political parties in upkeeping the democratic tradition of Kyrgyzstan ?
- Is the democracy of Kyrgyzstan still personality centric ?

## **Hypotheses:**

These basic objectives were set in light of certain hypotheses which will also be tested in the course of study. They are listed below:

- The strengthening of parliamentary system will help in sustaining a viable democracy in Kyrgyzstan.
- The diversity of political parties in Kyrgyzstan shows the movement away from personality-centric politics.

## **Research Methodology:**

The proposed study will apply both qualitative and quantitative methods. It will be both analytical and exploratory in nature as it testifies the democratic credentials of Kyrgyzstan. Issues like transparency, media and civil society participation, voters turn-out, agenda of political parties and the efforts being made to establish a stable parliamentary system are of prime importance. Mostly it relies on primary and secondary data like books, journals articles, newspapers and internet websites. Historical analysis of political framework of the system is an essential part of study. It will try to unravel different nuances of electoral democracy and its contribution to the development of Kyrgyzstan. Therefore, it will adopt both longitudinal and cross-sectional methods too.

## **Overview of the study:**

The journey of electoral democracy in Kyrgyzstan has been directly dependant on the chosen model of the political system, its openness, transparency, pluralism. Be it any country, its way to democracy evolves through a period of time, social and legal state through its political system consisting of presidents, governments, parliaments, political parties, elections, bureaucracy, media and other institutions. And the presence of parliament, elections and political parties is one of the mandatory characteristics of a modern democratic political system. The political system is an important instrument of transformation. Without planning the political system and its further modelling, it is impossible to achieve the goals stated in the constitution.

In the beginning, the study will deal with the theoretical understanding of the basic concepts like representative democracy, participation, elite-formation and the analysis of the electoral process. Taking consideration of various perspectives is an essential part of this chapter to unravel the nuances of the aforementioned conceptual categories. This chapter will also deal with the evolution of electoral democracy in Kyrgyzstan.

The second chapter will focus on be on social and political conditions of society that give impetus to democracy. It will take into account the various forces which shape the situation of Kyrgyzstan and give directions to it both internally and externally. Having come out of the erstwhile regime of USSR, Kyrgyzstan underwent lot many changes to create its own niche as Central Asia's island of democracy. Many liberal reforms opened up the political system and made it accountable. However, on the flip side, it became vulnerable to scrutiny and

pressure that accentuated the state problems further more. The chapter will deal with all these in essence

The third chapter would trace the development of political parties from the soviet period to present time and their status in Kyrgyzstan's politics. The party system is highly fragmented as both institutional factors such as constitutional and political party laws and structural factors such as social and political cleavages play a role in this fragmentation. The four main parameters of analysis would be : the extent to which parties penetrate society , ideologies of these parties , stance of parties towards legitimacy of the regime and increase in the number of parties in the system.

In the fourth chapter, the study will highlight the constitutional development of Kyrgyzstan and its reform processes. The journey from a presidential system to a parliamentary system has brought tremendous changes in the nature of people's participation and the transparency of elections. The process is ongoing and the leaders have been trying to create a stable parliamentary set-up post 2010. As such, the chapter will cover both the type of government system and the changes in the election trends.

Lastly, in conclusion, the study will sum up the views of the previous chapters. Taking account of the given hypotheses, it will try to analyse the facts. The hypothesis will be tested as per the findings of the previous chapters. Simultaneously, this chapter will attempt to view the overall functioning of the electoral system and the timely changes undertaken through constitutional amendments. As such, Kyrgyzstan continues its journey as the most viable democracy in Central Asia.

**CHAPTER-II**  
**SOCIO-POLITICAL FACTORS**  
**AIDING DEMOCRATIC**  
**TRANSITION IN KYRGYZSTAN**

Following the breakup of the Soviet Union were crucial social, institutional, economic and political changes in the newly independent countries of Central Asia. The main roadblock was the issue of establishing democratic states in multiethnic and illiberal societies. The mismatch of ethnic borders with the political boundaries, which were formed as a consequence of Soviet ethnic restructuring policies and historical reasons acts as a limitation for state building. Moreover, the pre-dominance of authoritarian elite, corruption, human rights violence and absence of functional civil society led to further political instability. Kyrgyzstan at that time emerged as a breath of fresh air. Under the leadership of Askar Akayev, it was called the island of democracy in authoritarian Central Asia, as the president of the country tried to develop it following the example of the Western liberal model.

Proclaimed sovereignty Kyrgyzstan did not have the experience of building a democratic state, however, the orientation toward democracy was emotionally adopted. The fact that at the present stage adherence to democracy is so vividly demonstrated by the ruling circles, there is little to say about the actual arrangement of real government regimes. Indeed, over the past quarter century of Kyrgyzstan's existence as a sovereign state, all the former and current presidents have spoken with enthusiasm and talk not only about the commitment of the republic of democracy, but also about the improvement of the latter.

First President Askar Akaev repeatedly emphasized that Kyrgyzstan led the democratic movement in Central Asia. Next President K. Bakiev initiated the so-called deliberative democracy, where the accent could be made with the inclusion of various social groups in the processes of elaborating state policy and its implementation under the auspices of the People's Kurultai. However, the first president, A. Akaev, and the second K.Bakiyev, over time, increasingly tended to use authoritarian principles of governing the country, which eventually resulted in a flight from the republic, both the first and the second.

### **Theory of democratic transition :**

In different regions of the world, various processes of political transformation take place, connected with the transition from undemocratic forms of government to more democratic ones. Political science highlights several waves of democratization in world history (according to S. Huntington - three, and according to T. Karl and F. Schmitter - four). The beginning of the modern, third wave of democratization dates back to 1974, when the process

of political transformation embraced the states of Southern Europe (Greece, Spain, Portugal), and then spread to Central and Eastern Europe and the USSR.

The third wave differs from the first two in that the process of transition to democracy has acquired an almost global scale. Political changes occur in countries with varying initial data and conditions (Elebaeva and Pukhova 2014)

Researchers note that modern democratic transitions in most cases do not allow talking about the creation of consolidated democracies in their final - they are often hampered or even lead to the revival of authoritarian orders, renewed with pseudo-democratic rhetoric (Melvil 1998).

Transitions from undemocratic forms of government to democratic in post-communist countries are very diverse, they cannot be reduced to any one model. In addition, democratic transit does not mean a guaranteed transition to democracy and its consolidation. It is important to analyze the features of the model of political development in post-communist Kyrgyzstan, consider the main stages in the evolution of the political regime and the form of government in the republic.

For a more precise definition of the model of political development, it is necessary to find out what form the state is, because it is the main link of the political system. What is the state - this is also the model of its political development.

The concept of state-form includes: the form of government and the political regime. The form of government is a way of organizing the supreme state power, reflects the degree of participation of the population in its creation. Distinguish such forms of government as the monarchy (absolute and constitutional) and the republic (presidential and parliamentary). Each of them is characterized by certain signs. The development of criteria for determining the forms of government is important for assessing the functioning of different types of regimes.

The following features are inherent in the presidential form: the maximum degree of separation of branches of power; National election of the supreme executive power; The president heads the executive branch of government, and a separate post of prime minister may be absent; The government is appointed by the president and accountable to him; The

president has no right to dissolve parliament. The American model is recognized as a classic model of the presidential form of government.

The interaction of the divided authorities is regulated by the constitution, but it is difficult to achieve it in reality. The proportion of the relative weight of the three branches of power may be in favour of the presidential, especially in countries experiencing a transition to democracy. Therefore, in presidential systems, there is a possibility of concentration of power in the hands of one person.

Such a system can lead to authoritarianism in the following cases: if the constitution establishes the sovereignty of the president, and the system of checks and balances does not function; if the principle of separation of powers is not implemented in practice.

There are several types of presidential form of government: the Prime-Presidential (for example, in France) and hybrid regimes that combine the features of the presidential and parliamentary systems.

Researchers distinguish such characteristic features of the premier presidential system: the president is elected publicly and is endowed with significant powers; At the same time, the Prime Minister and Cabinet responsible for the Parliament exist and perform the functions of the executive power; The president, unlike the presidential system, is not necessarily endowed with legislative powers, but can submit the bill to a referendum; has the right to dissolve parliament (which is not provided for in the presidential system); is given the right to nominate ministers and appoint to non-governmental posts. It should be noted that such a system does not allow the president to control the government.

### **Peculiarities of the democratic transition in Kyrgyzstan:**

The form of government in Kyrgyzstan can be determined on the basis of the stated criteria and analysis of articles of the Constitution of the Republic. The most important milestones on the path to the disintegration of the USSR and the formation of the political system of sovereign Kyrgyzstan were the Law "On the Establishment of the Post of the President of the Kirghiz SSR and Amendments and Additions to the Constitution (Basic Law) of the Kirghiz SSR", adopted on October 24, 1990, and the Declaration on State Sovereignty of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan dated December 15, 1990.



October 27, 1990 at the meeting of the Supreme Council of the Kirghiz SSR, A. Akayev was elected president. Shortly after the failure of the August 1991 putsch of 1991, on August 31, Kyrgyzstan proclaimed itself a sovereign and independent republic, and on October 12, the president legitimized his positions through non-alternative national elections, receiving 96% of the vote. The first years of presidential activity of A. Akayev (1991-1993) can be described as a period of confrontation and revealing leadership between the executive and representative branches of power, neutralizing the Communist Party of Kyrgyzstan, which, despite the limitations of its activities after the August coup of 1991, was the most serious opposition force. The powers of the president at this stage were limited by the parliament, and therefore one can assume that a model of the state system, close to the parliamentary-presidential one, was elected.

By 1993, the country had the prerequisites for constitutional reform, the reorganization of state institutions, the formation of a democratic system. On May 5, 1993, at the 12th session of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan of the twelfth convocation a new Constitution was adopted. It was based on certain principles: the separation of power into legislative, executive and judicial; National election of the head of state-president; Separation of state power and local self-government. The principle of separation of powers meant that the legislative, executive and judicial authorities "act independently, interact with each other" (Article 7, paragraph 2). The basic law gave the president quite broad powers: he is the head of state, the guarantor of the inviolability of the Constitution and the unity of state power (Zhumaliev and Ozhukeyeva 1998).

The Constitution contained a number of articles similar to the French constitution, that is, characteristic of the semi-presidential (prime-presidential) republic: the prime minister, who headed the government, worked simultaneously with the president; The president was given the right, with the consent of the Jogorku Kenesh (parliament), to appoint the prime minister and members of the government, and also to take, on his own initiative, a decision on the early resignation of the government. He could bring issues of state life to a national referendum and dissolve the parliament on its results (Article 46, 1, 5). In addition, he was granted the right (with the consent of local keneshes) to approve the appointment of the prime minister of the heads of state administrations of districts and cities.

At the same time, a number of articles of the Constitution pointed to the difference in the form of government in Kyrgyzstan from the semi-presidential (prime-presidential) republic:

the president of the Kyrgyz Republic was given the right to dismiss members of the government and heads of administrative departments (Article 46). That is, he could solve the issue of the displacement of ministers singly. Granting such a right means that the regime is not a prime-ministerial one, because the existence of such a right contradicts one of the main criteria of the prime-presidential system - the dependence of the cabinet on parliament. The president was endowed with legislative powers. He was granted the following rights: on his own initiative to submit bills to the Jogorku Kenesh; to sign laws passed by parliament or return them for reconsideration (the right of "veto"); Issue decrees, resolutions and orders that are binding on the entire territory of the country (Constitution of Kyrgyz Republic 1993, <http://www.gov.kg/> accessed 15/5/2017).

These features indicate that the 1993 Constitution created prerequisites for the formation of a presidential republic. To create a parliamentary republic in the country there were no necessary conditions (there are none at the present time). The parliamentary republic is characterized by the fact that the supreme state body is the parliament, which forms the government and is responsible for its composition. The government retains its power as long as it enjoys the confidence of the parliament. Such legal norms were absent in the 1993 Constitution. In addition, the country has not yet formed a multi-party system and a strong opposition.

The Constitution created legal prerequisites for relatively independent functioning of the legislative and executive branches of power and achieving a balance between them. Without the support of the Jogorku Kenesh, the president could not manage the state alone.

In support of this provision, a number of articles of the Constitution can be cited. The competence of the Jogorku Kenesh included the following issues: introduction of amendments and additions to the Constitution; The adoption of laws, the introduction of changes and additions to them, as well as control over their execution; the definition of the main directions of domestic and foreign policy. In addition, the parliament approved the republican budget and a report on its implementation; appointed presidential elections; had the right to take questions of state life to a referendum; to elect, at the President's request, the chairmen of the Constitutional body, Supreme Arbitration Court and their deputies; approve the structure of the government; give consent to the appointment of the Prime Minister and the composition of the government, as well as the early resignation of the government (Article 58). Based on the conclusion of the Constitutional Court, the Jogorku Kenesh (at

least two-thirds of the total number of deputies) could be removed from office as president for high treason and other crimes- Article 52 (Constitution of Kyrgyz Republic 1993, <http://www.gov.kg/>-accessed 15/5/2017).

If the president for some reason cannot fulfill his duties, then his powers pass to the head of parliament. If the toraga (speaker) cannot fulfill presidential powers, then only they passed to the prime minister - before the election of the new president according to Article 53 (Constitution of Kyrgyz Republic 1993, <http://www.gov.kg/>-accessed 15/5/2017)

Thus, according to the Constitution of 1993, the design of presidential power combined the signs of various models of the presidency: first, the signs of a clean presidential republic, and secondly, some features of a prime-presidential (semi-presidential) system. Parliament played an important role in determining the structure of the government, the main directions of domestic and foreign policy. That is, the Constitution laid down legal prerequisites for the formation of a democratic political regime.

Since 1994, there has been a tendency to strengthen the power of the president and weaken the parliament. This course led to their confrontation, which ended with the dissolution of the Jogorku Kenesh (October 1994) and the appointment of early parliamentary elections. In order to weaken the influence of the Communist Party and prevent it from coming to power, a majority electoral system was introduced.

On October 24, 1995, the first alternative elections were held - A. Akayev was again elected to the post of president, receiving 73% of the vote. The referendum held after the elections (February 10, 1996) significantly expanded his powers and limited the power of the parliament. Based on the results of the referendum on February 17, 1996, the law "On Amendments and Additions to the Constitution of the Kyrgyz Republic" was adopted.

The Constitution of 1996 defines the form of the state structure: the Kyrgyz Republic is a sovereign, unitary democratic republic built on the basis of a legal secular state ( Constitution of Kyrgyz Republic 1996, <https://www.uta.edu/cpsees/KYRGCON2.htm> accessed on <http://www.gov.kg/> 7/4/2017).

The Constitution gives both the president and the parliament considerable resources of power: they have the right to speak on behalf of the people; are elected on the basis of

universal, equal, direct suffrage by secret ballot. The basis of the legitimacy of their power is a broad support in society.

The 1996 Constitution is based on democratic principles: the rule of the people, the separation of powers, the delineation of functions of state power and local self-government (Article 7). Unlike the 1993 Constitution, the president's powers were expanded: he is the head of state, the highest official, connected not only with executive power (like the US president) but with all its branches, as it ensures unity and continuity of state power, "Coordinated functioning and interaction of state bodies" (Constitution of Kyrgyz Republic 1996, <https://www.uta.edu/cpsees/KYRGCON2.htm>- accessed 7/4/2017)

The Constitution of 1996 granted the President the right, on his own initiative, to decide on the resignation of the Prime Minister and the Government, and the consent of the Jogorku Kenesh, as envisaged by the 1993 Constitution, was no longer required (Constitution of Kyrgyz Republic 1993, <http://www.gov.kg/>- accessed 15/5/2017)

According to the Constitution of 1993, the prime minister appointed the heads of state administrations of districts and cities, and the president claimed that according to the 1996 Constitution, the heads of state administrations of oblasts, districts, cities are appointed by the president (with the consent of local keneshes) and dismisses them (Article 46 ). He appoints chairmen, their deputies and judges of regional courts, Bishkek, districts, cities, dismisses them. The consent of the Jogorku Kenesh is not required (Constitution of Kyrgyz Republic 1993, <http://www.gov.kg/>-accessed 15/5/2017).

The President determines the main directions of domestic and foreign policy (Article 42) Under the 1993 Constitution, this right was granted to the Jogorku Kenesh. The Constitution of 1996 granted the president the right to initiate a referendum on his own initiative; Decide on the referendum on the initiative of at least three hundred thousand voters, the majority of the total number of deputies of both chambers of the Jogorku Kenesh. According to the 1993 Constitution, the Jogorku Kenesh also had the right to hold a referendum. Granting this right to the president testifies to the strengthening of his power, because in case of divergence from the parliament he can address directly to the people, bypassing the parliament (Constitution of Kyrgyz Republic 1993).

The 1996 Constitution expanded the president's right to early dissolution of parliament (both chambers - the Legislative Assembly and the People's Congress). Now he can dissolve the parliament not only by referendum results (as in the 1993 Constitution), but also in case of a three-time refusal to consent to the appointment of a prime minister whose candidature the president proposes ( <https://www.uta.edu/cpsees/KYRGCON2.htm> accessed 7/4/2017).

In the 1996 Constitution, the president was not explicitly called the head of the executive (as in the American model), but closely related to it. He defines the main directions of foreign and domestic policy, and manages foreign policy. He is given broad powers in the field of personnel policy: he appoints (with the consent of the Assembly of People's Representatives) the prime minister, members of the government, heads of administrative departments, and also releases them from office, that is, in fact, forms executive power. The provisions of the 1996 Constitution that the president cannot be discharged from his duties are entitled to transfer powers to the prime minister (Article 52) about his close relationship with the executive power. And under the 1993 Constitution, the president transferred his powers to the speaker of parliament. The Prime Minister, acting President, has no right to dissolve the Legislative Assembly or the assembly of People's Representatives, to appoint a referendum, to terminate the powers of the government, and to make proposals on changes and additions to the Constitution of the Republic.

The Constitution of 1996 complicated the procedure for removing the president from office: the Assembly of People's Representatives can do so only on the basis of charges of high treason brought by the Legislative Assembly or the commission of another grave crime, confirmed by the conclusion of the Constitutional Court (Constitution of Kyrgyz Republic of 1996 , <https://www.uta.edu/cpsees/KYRGCON2.htm>- accessed 7/4/2017).

The decision to bring an accusation against the president must be taken by a majority (at least two thirds of the total number of votes) of deputies of the Legislative Assembly. However, in case of negative conclusion of the Constitutional Court on the charge, the President dissolves the Legislative Assembly.

In addition, the ruling People's Congress as to the removal from office of the President shall be made not later than two months after bringing charges. If during this time a decision is taken, the charge shall be considered as rejected.

The 1996 Constitution extended the legislative powers of the president: he not only contributes to the Jogorku Kenesh bills, issues decrees, has the power to reject laws passed by Parliament, but the Chamber of the Jogorku Kenesh may delegate their legislative powers to him for a term not exceeding one year. Legislative powers are transferred to the president in the case of dissolution chambers Jogorku Kenesh ( Constitution of Kyrgyz Republic of 1996 , <https://www.uta.edu/cpsees/KYRGCON2.htm>- accessed 7/4/2017).

The 1996 Constitution, the analysis leads to the conclusion that in Kyrgyzstan were created legal prerequisites for establishing a presidential form of government. Mainstream has become a trend for approval of an authoritarian regime with elements of democracy. The nature of the current regime is clearly visible in the analysis of the articles of the Constitution defines the powers of the judiciary, the procedure of its formation.

The principle of separation of powers requires the independence of the judiciary from the executive and legislative, judicial subordination only to the law and at the same time, the interaction between the branches of government. The nature of their interaction depends on the form of government. Constitutional law of democratic countries proclaims the principle of laissez-faire president and executive bodies in the prerogatives of the judiciary .

A democratic regime is characterized by the proclamation of the principle of the independence and integrity of judges. For example, the US president appoints the members of the Supreme Court and other federal judges, but with the approval of Congress, the Senate. Supreme Court justices are appointed for life. In this the constitutional guarantee of their independence from the president and Congress. The President has the right to dismiss a member of the Supreme Court and federal judges. Member of the Supreme Court may leave his post only on their own or as a result of impeachment.

According to the Constitution of the Kyrgyz Republic in 1993 members of the Constitutional Court are elected by the Jogorku Kenesh on the proposal of the president for 15 years. Judges of the Supreme Court and the Supreme Arbitration Court elected by the Jogorku Kenesh on the proposal of the president of 10 years, and the local court - appointed by the president with the consent of the Parliament, - the first time for three years, and later for seven- Art.80 (Constitution of Kyrgyz Republic 1993, <http://www.gov.kg/index>-accessed 15/5/2017).

Such legal provisions are contained in the Constitution of 1996. Judges of the Constitutional Court are elected by the Legislative Assembly and the Assembly of People's Representatives on the president for 15 years, and the judges of the Supreme Court and the Supreme Arbitration Court - People's Congress by the president for 10 years. In contrast to the 1993 Constitution, the new Constitution gave the president the right to appoint judges of local courts: the first time - for three years thereafter - for seven years (. Article 80), but the approval of the Jogorku Kenesh of the judges is not provided. In addition, the judges of the Constitutional, Supreme and Supreme Arbitration Court may be relieved from office by the president by a majority (at least two thirds of the total number) of deputies of the Jogorku Kenesh (Art. 81).

The 1996 Constitution gives the president broad powers in respect to the formation of the judiciary. Decree "On some organizational measures to accelerate the judicial reform in the Kyrgyz Republic" under the President established the Judicial Reform Commission. Its purpose - to ensure the coordination of actions of the legislative, executive and judicial authorities to conduct this reform . However, the reform to ensure the independence of the judiciary is not yet complete.

Democratic regimes are characterized by certain autonomy of local elected bodies of state power and local self-government bodies, the lack of strict control over them by the central government. In the US, for example, each state governor, members of the state legislature, mayors are elected by the local people and are accountable to their constituents. In West European countries, local authorities are elected. However, even in democratic countries, the highest executive, legislative and judicial authorities exercise control over the actions of local authorities.

New local government system in Kyrgyzstan was established in accordance with the law "On local self-government and local state administration in the Kyrgyz Republic", adopted by the Jogorku Kenesh of the March 4, 1992. This system includes: local councils, bodies of territorial public self-government, as well as citizens' assemblies and other forms of direct democracy; executive authorities - local state administrations. Local councils have been exempted from the executive and administrative functions; they are given the right to approve the program of socio-economic development of territories and local budgets, monitor their execution.

Legal, organizational and financial and economic bases of local government organization created in stages, beginning in 1994. Of great importance for the reorganization of the local government system was the presidential decree "On the reform of local self-government in the Kyrgyz Republic" from August 18, 1994, in which two stages of reform identified. At the first stage it should cover ails (villages), towns and cities; on the second - it was supposed to transfer to local government areas .

In accordance with this decree, developed "Regulations on the foundations of the organization of local self-government in the Kyrgyz Republic" (approved by the decree of the President of September 22, 1994). Constitution and the decrees of the President laid the legal basis for the development of local self-government at the level of villages and town.

The 1996 Constitution has assigned to keneshs right to local self-government (Art. 92), established the independence of the councils of local government administration. Moreover, self-made local communities govern local affairs (Art. 91, 92). The heads of local state administration were appointed by the president with the consent of the local councils. President could dismiss them .

Local councils have the right to express (two-thirds majority of the total membership) distrust of the head of the local state administration of the relevant territorial unit (Art. 95). The Constitution also established the principle of local self-government delegation of certain state powers. For their transferred powers , local government bodies are accountable to the public authorities (Art. 94).

Thus, the Constitution of 1996 focuses on the country's democratic development. It stipulates that Kyrgyzstan is a democratic republic, as the basis of state power on the principle of separation of powers. However, analysis of the Constitution enables us to conclude that the balance between the branches of power is broken in favor of the president, and the current political regime can be characterized as authoritarian with elements of democracy.

Unlike prime-presidential (semi) system , Kyrgyzstan does not have dual power centre (as can occur on the French model), when the President conducts its policy, and the parliament - its policy. The dissolution of Parliament in 1994 is explained by the lack of coordination of activities of the president and the legislature.



The President has the right to control the activities of Parliament and, under certain conditions, its dissolution. An important means of influencing the Parliament - not just the president's veto, but also the annual message of the President to the Parliament and the people who serve as a guide in the legislative activity of the Jogorku Kenesh , as they define the main directions of domestic and foreign policy. However, effective control of the President of the Parliament of the activities achieved in the case where the President has the support of its majority. The current composition of the Parliament allows the president to actually exercise the powers conferred on him by the Constitution.

It should also be borne in mind that conservative tendencies intensified in the society, the desire to avoid drastic changes, extreme "left" and "right" wing. The pact of agreement between the different political forces - is possible under certain conditions. This, above all, consistent adherence to the principle of separation of powers, a strict rule of law, democratic procedures, free competition of potential elite, full transparency and freedom of speech.

### **Politico-legal basis of elections in a democratic political system:**

The phenomenon of elections is one of the most important elements of modern political systems. The development of the political system in time is characterized as a process of changing, developing or degrading political institutions. It includes the historical scale of the change in the forms of power, the emergence of a state of a new type, which makes it possible to identify and describe the systemic properties of various political phenomena. On the state of social relations, the level of development of society depends on whether this situation is static or mobile, and, consequently, whether the political system itself is dynamic or not.

The dynamism of the political system is different from instability, it determines the ability of the system to develop, adapt to changes in society and its external environment, and to respond to these changes in mixed organizational systems, and elections in such dynamism play an important role.

In the modern legislation of Kyrgyzstan, the notions of active and passive suffrage are divorced. In the Constitution there is no concept, but there is a clause 23, p. 1, on the right of citizens to elect and be elected to the bodies of state power and local self-government, and also participate in a referendum. The Electoral Code, Article 3 states that active suffrage is a

direct and indirect right of citizens to have, at the achievement of the established age, a decisive vote in the election of bodies of state power and local self-government bodies. This right is realized by the participation of a citizen in voting at the elections. Along with this, for the acquisition of active suffrage there are certain qualifications, such as a certain age, the availability of citizenship. The Electoral Code also defines passive electoral law as the right of a citizen to be elected to government bodies and local self-government bodies. Realization of a passive electoral right by a citizen depends not only and not so much on this person, as on the will of other subjects of the election campaign. Thus, in Kyrgyzstan, the electoral system transforms into a method of distributing mandates among candidates, depending on the results of voting of voters (<http://krasinskiy.ru/Stand.pdf>- accessed 20/4/2017)

### **Influence of tribals and inter-ethnic relations in the development of the electoral system:**

The peculiarity of the development of Kyrgyzstan is due to several factors that have a serious impact, both on the entire political development of the country and on the electoral process in particular. Such factors may include preservation in the political system of some traditional tribal institutions such as clan patronage, division of the country to the north and south, which, due to geographical factors, has social consequences, expressed in a hidden and explicit opposition of representatives of these territories in the struggle for power and the distribution of power. Here interethnic relations play a great role. The presence of these phenomena in the life of the country complicates the political situation, which, according to many analysts poses a threat not only to the stability of statehood, but also to the very existence of Kyrgyzstan, they also affect the electoral process.

The remaining differences between residents of different regions of Kyrgyzstan are associated with the existence of minor differences in traditions, mentality, and pronunciation. Moreover, there is a traditional division of the Uruu (tribes) and the confederation of tribes, which today have become "folklore", but play a certain functional role in society. The social structure of traditional Kyrgyz society consisted of about forty different tribal unions based on kinship relations. Each tribal union consisted of various family units. These tribal alliances were united into three large confederations: He rope (Right wing), Sol rope (Left wing), and Ichkilik. Each tribal alliance had political sovereignty and its own territory, and this coincides today with a regional division north and south. Regional division and traditional institutions

of solidarity are not a problem of threatening statehood, but they are elements of the country's destabilizing factor, especially in the process of forming state power, namely during elections (Koehler and Zürcher 2004).

In Kyrgyzstan, clanism has always been strong, although there has never been a single dominant clan. Therefore, we should not only talk about the traditional division into the South and North of the country, but also about the purely provincial clans-the Talas, the Chui in the north, the Ichkiliks and the Ouse uul in the south. Divided by birth, belonging to families, often numbering several thousand people, has acquired a new importance for people, becoming a factor of informal social guarantees. The presence in the clan or clan of a person occupying a high post only contributed to an even more explicit hierarchization and mobilization within this family association.

The most vivid example in this sense is the political biography of A. Akayev himself. He belonged to the largest and strongest northern tribe of Sary-Bagysh, and his nomination to power was supported by the Talassian elite-the most "aristocratic" of the region-tribal communities of Kyrgyzstan. With the latter A. Akaev was connected through his wife, who belonged to the clan of the traditional rulers of the Talas Valley, Jegetin from the Kushchu tribe. The northerners also used the liberal-democratic movement of 1989-1991 to push away the leaders of the south who dominated the central party and state apparatus during the Soviet era. In turn, the southern elites assumed the role of defenders of the ethnic interests of the Kyrgyz. The fact that A. Masaliev and his party received massive support in the presidential and parliamentary elections of 1995 in his native South is explained by the interweaving of a number of factors. It is obvious that clan inclination during the election campaign was strengthened by the natural-geographical division of the country into the southern and northern parts. The north turned out to be more modernized, industrialized and "Russified", the people of the north of the country were more freedom-loving and previously led a nomadic way of life. The south, adjacent to the Fergana Valley, was mostly agrarian and much more patriarchal (Koehler and Zürcher 2004).

Under the dominance of various options for state ownership and, in fact, the centralized distribution of public resources, in most cases administrative and political posts are at the national, regional (oblast) or local level the objects of conflict. The goal, most often, is the use of this power to access material and social goods, their distribution in personal, family and group interests.

The most important tool for the struggle for these positions is, as noted, relations of ethnic and political clientelism (dependence). The main institutionalized form of these relations in the political sphere are informal non-traditional structures of power , political clans.

The leading link of political clans is usually a relatively narrow group of representatives of political elite of national and regional level. This group is closely united by the system itself - personal (friendly, related, ethnic, and earthly) or turned into personal (business, professional, property, administrative) relationships. The influence of each of these factors in specific clan structures may be different, but in all cases, family-tribal and tribal relationships are of fundamental value.

### **Mass media in the electoral process of Kyrgyzstan:**

An important place in the concept of elections as an institution for political democracy is given to the political consciousness of voters. On the basis of political consciousness, deliberate decisions are made about participation or non-participation in elections, citizens determine their electoral behaviour. Political consciousness may be low, but may reach a level of political and civic maturity. To a large extent, it is formed spontaneously in which a person even in addition to his desire, one way or another, comes into contact with politics. This is the political consciousness of many people. The most important tools of such socialization is the media - newspapers, magazines, radio, television and Internet resources. Their impact on the political consciousness and behaviour of citizens is enormous. They make a decisive contribution to the formation of electoral culture as an integral element of political consciousness in many people. Without their participation, elections are impossible in modern conditions.

The role of the media in the electoral process is to help citizens adapt to it. Coverage of the election campaign on television not only brings the masses closer to politics, but also reduces the pre-election struggle to the level of sports competition, provoking not only citizenship but also excitement. It should be noted that election campaigns generally have a stimulating effect on the functioning of the entire system of direct democracy and its individual institutions, initiating rallies, demonstrations, and collecting signatures.

In Soviet times, the theme of political elections was presented only as a triumph of socialist democracy. Now, as a result of political competition among campaign participants in the

struggle for the electorate, the thematic and genre diversity of coverage of elections and election campaigns has increased, which has contributed to a pluralistic reflection of complex and controversial electoral vicissitudes in the media.

The use of the media in the election campaign takes various forms, which can be classified both by subject and by content. As for the first of the above mentioned features, it allows us to distinguish the forms of media use: a) election commissions, b) local self-government bodies, c) candidates, electoral associations and blocs. According to the content, the form of use of the media can be divided into the following groups: a) informing, b) providing (paid or free) of printed space and air for campaigning. In turn, informing is realized in the forms of publication and notification.

In the sphere of formation of representative and other elective bodies of power, the role of the media is multifaceted. At the same time, one should distinguish between the use of the media in the election campaign and their participation. In the first case, the media act primarily as a producer of mass information services, through which selective technology is realized, in the second, as an independent institution of democracy. Moreover, both of these media are interrelated and inseparable: on the one hand, the use of media by subjects of political relations, as a rule, involves the involvement of the print and electronic media in the political process; On the other hand, its participation in the political process is ultimately the result of its use by certain subjects of political relations. It should be noted that free and fair elections are carried out not only by providing citizens with the opportunity to vote, but also by guaranteeing their rights in obtaining information about candidates and on the progress of the campaign as a whole. For each voter can reasonably and confidently vote for a particular candidate only having full information about him or her. From this perspective, democratic elections cannot be imagined without the participation of the media. The media are not limited to posting official information on the activities of election commissions. They are active participants in the electoral process and through organizing their work during this period in different directions, and we will turn to the resources of the media of Kyrgyzstan.

The mass media of the country by weight of influence can be divided into three groups. The first is state-owned media, which broadcast official information originating from the institutions of state power. The second group is commercial media, which primarily pursue commercial interests. By publishing political information, they are trying not so much to form public opinion, how much to please the tastes of readers, to raise their rating and

thereby increase the circulation of their publications. Commercial media often in the political life of the republic make a certain amount of negativity and shocking. They are prone to commercial profit to transform their political loyalty to power into anti-government activity relatively easily. This is typical of the moderate opposition and liberal publications associated with certain financial and industrial groups.

And, finally, the third group, a relatively small group of media, is represented by outsider publications. They are quite politicized, sharply criticized the party of power, try to influence public opinion in this direction, but the power of their influence is relatively small.

The mass media of the country can be classified for other reasons. The scale of the audience can be divided into mass and elite; by type of audience: rural, urban; by language into: kyrgyz-speaking and russian-speaking; by nature: informative and analytical. Among all sources of information the most popular in Kyrgyzstan is television. The popularity of television is far ahead of all other sources, the newspapers occupy the following places, this indicates that newspapers are not accessible to everyone, especially remote areas. Then there are broadcasts, magazines, and Internet resources. The popularity rating of information sources often reflects a decrease in the share of the scientific and an increase in the specific weight of ordinary consciousness, since the transmissions are rarely analytical in nature, most often informational. Newspapers in pursuit of circulation rarely publish scientific articles, the lion's share is occupied by the publication of negative facts from the personal life of candidates.

The leading media in Kyrgyzstan is television, and the National Broadcasting Company (KTR) broadcasts it to almost the entire territory of the country. Most of the non-state TV channels and radio stations are in Bishkek and operate in difficult financial conditions. The most influential of the private channels is the Fifth Channel, which covers about 60 percent of the population, the EITR, Pyramid, NTS and NBT channels also play a significant role. After the creation of the first independent company of the Pyramid at the moment, there are 16 TV companies registered in the country, of which they function and regularly broadcast only 7. Broadcasting companies broadcast in two bands: in the meter range and in the decimetre range. A huge difference in television when comparing regions and the capital, Bishkek takes the leading position in this respect. From the TV companies, according to the number of informational programs of the terrestrial grid, KTR, "The Fifth Channel", EITR, Pyramid, NTS, NBT, TV Plus, TV6 are leading. The overwhelming majority of the programs are

broadcast in the state Kyrgyz language throughout the entire republic, and in Russian, the Uzbek language is also broadcast in the south of the republic, where the Uzbek population is predominant. On television, despite the high speed, mass and accessibility, information in general remains superficial, does not meet the needs of the audience (Melvil 1998).

As such it can be said that democracy is not a short term phenomenon rather it is a resource base for the development of the liberal economy and a viable soil reflecting the public awareness of the citizens. The political system of Kyrgyzstan acts as a fuel to the political system to function effectively. At the same time, it does not matter whether the established system does not fit into the elegant models of the transitional paradigm or does not exactly correspond to the Western notion. Therefore, each model of democracy is a unique model for the country to be covered.

**CHAPTER –III**

**NATURE OF PARTY SYSTEM IN**

**KYRGYZSTAN**



The viability of any democracy depends a great deal on the functioning of Political parties. These have emerged as an indispensable part of the current political system. In present structure of electoral democracy, the political party in its various dimensions have become omnipresent in the democratic process. Essentially, they are the connecting link between the individual and the government. Further, political parties integrate, stabilize and simplify the political process. They conglomerate various sectional interests, breach geographical distances and provide voice to often divisive government structures. As such, political parties can well be called the soul of any democratic system.

Political party system refers to the nature and relation of the parties in a specific political system. According to Ware, a party system is distinct for three features: the effective number of parties in the system, their political and ideological orientation, and the way they interact and compete among themselves. He states, Party systems involve both competition and co-operation between the different parties in that system (Ware 1996).

The study of party systems has become more systematic since Giovanni Sartori's classic work "*Parties and Party Systems*", that released in 1976. Ware talks about four major variables in classifying the party systems: the penetration of parties into the society, the stated ideologies of parties, the role of the parties in upkeeping the legitimacy of the system, the total number of parties truly operational in the country. Under the first head, penetration of parties into the society, the link between voters and parties is taken into account, functions such as identification of parties, membership, influence of civil society on them, and their relevance for the citizens of the country. Lack of penetration can result in great degree of instability as well as voter volatility making it easier for the new parties to enter the system. The rise of Respublika and its obtaining 19.17% of the seats in Jogorku Kenesh highlights this phenomenon in Kyrgyzstan (AVCU 2013).

In terms of political orientation, ideology determines the stand of the parties on various issues in the political spectrum. Parties can be grouped depending on their ideology. Klaus von Beyme divides the party groups into nine families: Liberal or Radical, Labour or socialist, Conservative or Communist, Christian or Democratic, Agrarian or Regional/ Ethnic, Right wing and Environmental (Beyme 1985).

The third dimension, the view of the parties on the regime, remains distinct; some parties want to protect and maintain the structure or promote it, others want an entire change. The presence anti-establishment parties in the system is quite problematic and can lead to disorder

if they opt for a violent or revolutionary way of functioning and aim to overthrow the current structure in play. The second and third dimension expose the potential of the party system for polarization. The ideological distance between the parties is referred to as polarization. Sartori points out that, the more distant the parties are, the more polarized the system. The fourth head, the actual number of parties effective in the system, is the most popular criteria to classify party systems. Relevance of a party in the system depends on whether it is part of the government or coalition or has potential for it. The requirement of the party to form a government makes it relevant to the electoral system (Rae 1967).

The multiplicity of parties indicates the degree of fragmentation of the party system. The more the number of parties, the more fragmented the party system. Therefore, fragmentation exists when there are two or more parties competing in the system and none gains the majority in the legislature. They further group together to form a coalition. So, there can be no talk of multi-party or fragmented systems in an authoritarian regime.

### **Stages of evolution of party-structure:**

The increasing role of political parties has become the hallmark of public life in modern social development. The relevance of these parties in the political life of modern society in the fact that they allow to integrate and promote the interests of a particular social strata while giving shape to their political ideology.

The evolution of party structure in Kyrgyzstan can be broadly divided into two stages:

- 1990-2010;
- 2010-present.

A constitutional act in 1990 laid the bedrock of separation of powers for the first time. This in a way helped the survival of the parliament amid severe roadblocks. The 1991-1993 period saw the basis of free elections and multi-party system being laid down in the Constitution of the Kyrgyz Republic. In 1991, there was adopted the law “On civil organizations,” followed by the law “On political parties” in 1999. The latter being liberal, provided for the possibility of formation of a political party with the initiative of just ten people. In that phase, Kyrgyzstan set forth the of organization of legislative bodies. As such, political parties were born and became active players in the electoral process. Since 2000, the conditions necessary for participation of parties in the formation of parliament were set. These political parties have been constituting the Parliament fully through the proportional system starting from 2007 (<http://easttime.info/analytics> accessed on 5/4/2017).

Post- adoption of the new and reformed Constitution in 2010, Kyrgyzstan moved to a parliamentary-presidential model of government. This signifies the transition for a presidential to a parliamentary democracy. The new Constitution proposed the proportional system of elections of deputies to the Jogorku Kenesh, which gave a push to the proliferation of political parties in Kyrgyzstan. All this has led to the fact that today the sphere of parties in Kyrgyzstan is well represented by 192 registered political units, in the process of transition, mergers , reorganization or disintegration, which is also the reason for a weak party system (<http://easttime.info/analytics> accessed on 5/4/2017).

Experts started talking about the crisis of the parties after the split that happened in the parliamentary faction “Ar-Namys,” when 10 its deputies joined the majority coalition. There ringed forecasts of a possible split within the other part of the Jogorku Kenesh, and experts were not completely untrue (Manuel 2016).

### **The Party system of Kyrgyzstan :**

The Kyrgyzstan party system can be classified as multiparty system with the absence of dominant or any major party. The Kyrgyzstan party system can be classified as a multiparty system with no dominant or major party. There are in around 184 parties registered in Kyrgyzstan but only about fourteen are active players in the political system. The legal framework in Kyrgyzstan prevents both unnecessary proliferation and tyranny of one party. The Constitution contains articles dealing with parties; according to the Constitution adopted on 27 June, 2010, one party can receive a maximum of 65 out of 120 seats. As a result of the elections, a political party may not be granted more than 65 deputy mandates in the Parliament (<http://minjust.gov>, accessed 13/4/2017).

This provision was introduced with the purpose of preventing single-handed rule of the president’s party, as it existed during Akaev and Bakiev presidencies. There is negligible evidence of the effect of this provision on the party structure; since no party won more than 28 seats in the parliament, it might have supported the fragmentation of the parties psychologically. Members of the parliament are elected for a term of five years by means of a proportional party list framework in a single nation-wide constituency. The system of proportional representation within a constituency shows fair distribution of seats. There are specific laws framed to prevent fragmentation of parties. According to the law on elections,

a party needs to cross the 5% nationwide limit and receive a minimum of 0.5 percent of the votes in each of the administrative regions and two major cities, Bishkek and Osh, in order to claim seats of the Jogorku Kenesh. Both the national and regional limits are estimated against the number of total registered voters rather than based on the turnout, although in reality the limit to get seats in the parliament is way higher, as shown above. The party Butun Kyrgyzstan was unable to gain any seat in the parliament in spite of getting 8.31 percent of the votes cast. As cited in the OSCE/ODIHR report, the double threshold requirement compromises the objectives of a proportional representation system (OSCE ODIHR report 2010).

The party system of a state is also a representation of various social cleavages, such as regional level, north or south and tribe. The cleavage of north-south is often viewed as one of the main dividing lines in Kyrgyzstan. Regionalism in Kyrgyzstan emerges from the division of the Kyrgyz national identity into *tunduk* (northerners) and *tushtuk* (southerners), in this direction, the four oblasts, Chui, Naryn, Talas, and Issyk-Kul—are attributed to the northern region, and the rest three oblasts, Osh, Jalal-Abad, and Batken to the south. The north has been seen inclining towards SDPK and Ata Meken, while the south sees the influence of Ata-Jurt and Butun Kyrgyzstan. Respublika is quite a balanced party as compared to Ata-Jurt. Even the tribal structure of Kyrgyzstan also influences the party system of Kyrgyzstan. The traditional kinship system retains its viability among the majority of the Kyrgyz population. Major tribe-lineages in Kyrgyzstan include the Saruu and Kutchu (Talas), the Sayaks (Jungal, Susamir), the Solto (Chui), the Bugu (Issyk Kul), the Sari Bagish (Kemin), Kara Bagish (Naryn), and the Ichkilik group of clans (Momunova 2012).

In spite of modernizing the country and changing some traditional forms of affiliations, the Soviet model could not eradicate them completely. The tribal structure that emerged after the fall of the Soviet Union and has been shaping the political arena also. This was the case in the government opposition struggle during the Akaev administration in 2002. However, recent research on the subject suggests that the clan effect is exaggerated. Although no political party is primarily based on tribes, tribal affinities play a role in alliances and votes received from electorates as the parties are mainly leader-based than ideology-based. For instance, former president Otunbaeva backed Babanov for both belonged to the Saruu tribe. Another major social cleavage is based on ethnicity. Because of the Soviet past, Kyrgyzstan has not developed into an ethnically homogenous country. But there are some parties which seem appealing to certain ethnicities than the others. For example, Ata-Jurt and Butun Kyrgyzstan

want to accommodate the Kyrgyz votes more than the others, contrarily Ar-Namys and SDPK attract significant number of minorities' votes as well (Mamunova 2012).

The political sphere can be divided into different political parties holding diverse views and agenda, sometimes opposite of each other, sometimes overlapping. The party system of Kyrgyzstan is quite new and the parties cannot be clearly distinguished from each other. Almost all the parties appeal to public sentiments and socio-democratic ethos, and majority of them uphold warm relations with Russia. The workers remain at the centre-stage for the communists, Ata-Jurt and Butun Kyrgyzstan try to attract Kyrgyz votes with a nationalistic rhetoric. The SDPK used this nationalist sentiment very well in the 2010 parliamentary elections, but it was more balanced during the presidential election in 2011 and acted as an umbrella party. Kyrgyzstan can be considered a high-fragmented but low-polarized country. The polarization is mainly between personalities rather than between ideologies. These political units are just prototypes of counterparts in older democracies but they have failed to fulfill their role in interest aggregation. This is mainly because society is in a changing mode, the post-communist society were not stratified into large social groups with shared social interests (Kurmanov 2004)

The country is also divided on political issues and the parties reflect the political reality of Kyrgyzstan. One crucial topic is whether to establish a presidential or parliamentary system. Main parties like SDPK, Ata-Meken, and Ak-Shumkar led the against the Bakiev regime and advanced the case of a parliamentary rule. Respublika, which was new party built from the ranks of the SDPK, favours the parliamentary rule. Ata-Jurt and Ar-Namys have both opposed the newly formed parliamentary system and want to bring back the older model of presidential rule. The direction and inclination of the country's foreign policy is a major determinant of its political course. Although no party is out rightly anti-Russian, some prefer a nuanced foreign policy, such as parties like SDPK and Respublika, however some claim to be pro-Russian.

### **Penetration of Parties in Kyrgyzstan :**

The period preceding and post-independence saw a great proliferation of political units of various dimensions. Although President Akayev rose as the strongest in the tussle, in early 1990s no organized party system existed either around Akayev or in the opposite faction. Later, various political parties with diverse agendas developed, but few succeeded in gaining broad national followings.

The Communist Party of Kyrgyzstan (CPK), the only legal political party during the Soviet period, was abolished in 1991 after the failed coup against Gorbachev's regime. The Kyrgyzstan Communist Party, was allowed to register in September 1992 as the successor. In 1995 two deputies were elected to the lower house of parliament. The party included significant oppositionists like republic leader Absamat Masaliyev, former first secretary in the CPK. The elections in 1995 also granted a deputy's mandate to T. Usubaliyev, who earlier headed the CPK. Another party with significant number of former communist officials is the Republican People's Party. Two smaller neocommunist parties emerged like the Social Democrats of Kyrgyzstan, which got three seats of upper house and eight seats in the lower house of the parliament in 1995, and People's Party of Kyrgyzstan, that held three seats in the lower house (Kurmanov 2004)

Rest of the parties in existence in 1995 remained as de-facto civic movements. One is Ashar (Help) founded in 1989 as a movement to fight for granting unused land for housing; Ashar gained one seat in the upper house in 1995 elections. Many groups and parties also came under the umbrella of Democratic Movement of Kyrgyzstan (DDK); most influential being Erkin Kyrgyzstan party which split into two in 1992, one retained the same name Erkin Kyrgyzstan, and other was known as Ata-meken (Fatherland). In the 1995 elections, Erkin Kyrgyzstan took one seat and Ata-meken two seats in the upper house. In the spring of 1995, leader of Erkin Kyrgyzstan was arrested for diverting funds from a university in which he was the rector; it is doubtful whether this accusation was true or politically motivated. As a democratic party, Asaba (Banner) also gained one seat of the upper house. Registration was disallowed to another group, Freedom Party, as its platform for the creation of Uygur autonomous district stretching into Chinese Xinjiang Uygur Autonomous Region, what the Chinese government opposes ([http://data.mongabay.com/reference/country\\_studies/kyrgyzstan/all.html](http://data.mongabay.com/reference/country_studies/kyrgyzstan/all.html) accessed 20/3/2017).

For their penetration, parties have not played a big role in independent Kyrgyzstan. In the mid-1990s, early enthusiasm for the democratic parties vanished as republic's economy grew bad and party officials were accused of increasing political corruption. The successors of the communist parties, on the other hand, appeared to gain influence in this period. In the absence of elections, and with President Akayev belonging to no party, it is difficult to

predict the future significance of any of these parties. The following table highlights the electoral performance of the parties in the election of 2000.

**Table 1: Seat share of parties in the election of 2000**

Name of the party	Number of seats
Union of Democratic Forces	12
Communists	6
My Country Party of Action	4
independents	73
others	10

(Source: Florian Grotz & Christof Hartmann(2001),“*Elections in Asia: A data handbook, Volume I*”, p440)

The parliamentary elections saw the rise of Communist Party of Kyrgyzstan, a critic of free-market policies, attracted 28 percent of the votes. , opposition parties retained a high degree of activity but could not form a united front against Akayev’s rule. An opposition front, For People's Power, was built in 2004. The election efforts of parties were hampered by the abolition of party list voting in 2003 (Sjöberg 2011).

As President Akayev stepped down, a major realignment of parties happened but the north-south divide remained a crucial divide between the factions in 2005. However, in April 2006, Union of Democratic Forces brought together seven parties and eleven non-governmental organizations into a coalition which transformed into a leading voice for reform. Among the rest of the opposition parties were the likes of Ar-Namys, Ata-Meken, the Social democratic party , the Pro-Reform Movement and Asaba The parliamentary elections of 2007 for the first time were conducted on a proportional basis by party list; parties hardly had a role before.

Kyrgyzstan has many personality-centric political parties, bereft of clear platforms or inbuilt organizational structures, and most of these parties unprepared to engage in a nationwide contest on their own. Consequently, members of these smaller parties lined up to be a part of Bakiyev's newly formed Ak Jol party, and few individual politicians showed their political flexibility by changing party affiliations. President Bakiyev founded a new political unit, Ak Jol (Bright Path), in October 2007, a week before dissolving the parliament and calling fresh elections. In spite of not leading the party officially, Ak Jol was Bakiyev's creation, and Ak Jol has absorbed various smaller pro-government parties. Ak Jol consisted of many senior government officials and around 20 former MPs as its members (Sjöberg 2011)

The following table shows the electoral summary of 2005 presidential elections;

**Table 2: Position of parties in 2005 Presidential election**

Candidates	Votes cast	Percentage/vote share
Kumaranbek Bakiev	1,312,174	88.9
Tursunbai Bakir Uulu	56,065	3.8
Akbaraly Aitikeev	52,671	3.6
Zhapar Dzheksheyev	13,821	0.9
Toktayym Umotalieva	8,111	0.6
Keneshbek Dushebaev	7,424	0.5
Rejecting all the candidates	12,771	0.9

(Source: <http://www.osce.org/odihr/elections/kyrgyzstan>-accessed 5/4/2017)



However, in the parliamentary election later that year, the ruling party won 69 seats and 6 were won by the opposition. Observers called this an election full of electoral glitches. After the Tulip Revolution, the incomplete results were never allowed to reach completion and the interim President Bakiev shifted the new round of elections to a later date in the year.

Ata-Meken led by former Speaker of Parliament and leader of opposition Omurbek Tekebayev, was quite an old party in the fray, with offices in the entire country. In this election, Ata-Meken positioned itself as an umbrella party for all opposite factions, but Ak-Shumka was the party that actually united with Ata-Meken. Its leadership included many former MPs and important NGO leaders.

Almaz Atambayev's party, the social-democrats put forth its intention to run on its own, instead of assimilating with another party. This party has a long history and is believed to be financially affluent. Party members have been openly supportive of Bakiyev and claimed that they need to be in power to affect change. Atambayev however, was on the list of Social Democrats, as he was trying to promote himself for prime minister once again. Party chief Omurbek Babanov even claimed that Atambayev would continue to head the government's effort to ensure a fair election and improve the economic condition.

The Asaba party, headed by former MP, General Azimbek Beknazarov, has its support base in the south. The party lowered down its Kyrgyz nationalist orientation, and included a popular ethnic Russian, Alevtina Pronenko, to its candidates' list to have an appeal among Russian voters. Beknazarov, however, was considered polarizing figure.

The Communist Party of Kyrgyzstan, headed by Iskhak Masaliyev, saw a steady decline in membership for many years, but it still relies on the support of the older generation, who have been traditionally diligent voters.

Several other parties in spite of having prominent members on their lists lacked mass appeal necessary to get over regional thresholds. Felix Kulov led the list for Ar Namyz party, which has a vast organization but whose support base remains confined to the north. The Democratic Party *Turan* had former MPs Taiyrbek Sarpashev and Kanybek Imanaliyev at the top of its list. The Meken (*Rodina* in Russian) party had ethnic-Uzbek former MP Kadyrjan Batyrov in the top spot, but the party had little following outside the south. In spite of being unsure about Ak Jol getting majority of the seats, the President and the government officials had promised a free and fair election. But it was alleged that the

administrative resources were used to promote Ak Jol. Even the Minister of Justice Kaiypov said that even though they desired to have a transparent electoral process, they will leave no stone unturned to garner support for Ak Jol (<https://www.timesca.com/>- accessed 13/4/2017).

Out of the 2,033,961 votes cast in December 2007, the President's party secured 1,245,331 votes, gaining 71 seats in the 90 member parliament. The Social- Democrats got 188,585 votes and acquired 11 seats, while communists received 140,258 votes and 8 seats. According to the Central Election Commission , the Fatherland Party (Ata Meken) was unable to gain any seat, despite its second-place finish in terms of vote share , for it could not get at least 0.5 percent of the votes in the city of Osh. Ata Meken in all fairness won 30 seats but was offered 12 seats in the Parliament. Tekebayev denied to accept this and asked for 20 seats, but Bakiyev refused to give a single seat to Ata Meken (Sjöberg 2011).

President Bakiyev was re-elected to Presidentship in an 2006 election which many international agencies called flawed. For several years, President Bakiyev tried to consolidate political power by dividing and suppressing the opposition. These Opposition political parties faced harassment, and the government blatantly used criminal charges to threaten their leaders. In 2009 numerous politicians and journalists of the opposition were attacked and beaten up, resulting in the death of Gennady Pavlyuk, a Kyrgyz journalist, in Almaty. Widespread protests in April 2010 in Talas and Bishkek ousted Bakiyev from office. The parliamentary elections of October 2010, considered to be free and fair, resulted in a three-party coalition that acquired power in December 2010. Moreover, in the presidential election of 2011, Almazbek Atambayev, acquired around 60 percent of the votes. Independent analysts considered it to be fairly transparent and competitive, despite minor irregularities. The table below shows the vote percentage and seats secured in the 2010 parliamentary elections :

**Table 3: Position of parties in 2010 parliamentary elections**

Parties	Votes percentage	Seats
Ata-Zhurt	16.10	28
Social-democratic Party of Kyrgyzstan	14.55	26
Ar-Namys	14.02	25
Respublika	13.12	23
Ata Meken	10.13	18
Butun-Kyrgyzstan	8.76	–
Akshumkar	4.76	–
Zamandash	3.82	–

source: ( <https://www.timesca.com/>accessed on 5/4/2017)

The *State Ethnic Policy in the Kyrgyz Republic* of the Ata-Jurt party was severely criticized by many observers .They blamed that it contradicted not only the founding values of the constitution but also the internationally accepted principles of human rights. It was only framed to promote the concept of Kyrgyz ethnicity as the central tenet of nationhood. It was further alleged that the draft's purpose was to promote Ata-Jurt's version of nationalism before the presidential elections.

Almazbek Atambaev, the leader of Social Democratic Party of Kyrgyzstan was declared as the winner of the presidential election in November 2011, after securing around 63 percent of the votes. Adakhan Madumarov, heading the *Butun Kyrgyzstan* (United Kyrgyzstan) party, won a closely contested race for the second spot. He gained 14.8 percent to march ahead of the third-placed Kamchibek Tashiev of Ata-Zhurt. None of the rest 13

candidates got more than 1 percent of the votes. A grand coalition was formed comprising *SDPK*, *Ar-Namys*, *Ata-Meken* and *Respublika*. Parliament gave its approval to the new government with Omurbek Babanov, head of the *Respublika* unit as the new prime minister of Kyrgyzstan. Following Atambayev's inauguration on December 1, parliament formed a new coalition of four out of the five parties that held seats.

In the elections to the 120 seats of the Supreme Council in 2015, the candidates were elected through the system of proportional representation with an electoral threshold of seven percent. A limit of 65 seats as the maximum limit was fixed for all parties. And each party list had to compulsorily have minimum 30 percent of the candidates from each gender and at least 15 percent from ethnic minorities. Clean elections were ensured by the introduction of biometric voter registration. This could silence the rigging charges unlike the previous elections. Many political parties were formed in the run-up to the election which was often an attempt by the wealthy lot to further their political ambitions. More than 10 percent of the candidates were prevented from contesting the election because of criminal charges against them. The OSCE viewed that many people could not get the chance to vote as they had not registered in time. The mode of financing to the parties also had the scope for improvement in order to raise transparency. However, a constitutional referendum was held in Kyrgyzstan in December 2016 in which amendments were approved by 80 percent of the voters. The changes proposed included the increasing of power of the Prime-minister, the Supreme Council and massive reforms in the judicial system.

The following table clearly shows the electoral score of the major parties in the 2015 elections to the Supreme council:

**Table 4:Position of parties in 2015 elections**

Parties	Popular votes	Vote-percentage	Seats
SDPK	435,804	27.35	38
Respublika/Ata-Zhurt	320,115	20.08	28
Kyrgyzstan Party	206,094	12.93	18

(Source: <http://www.shailoo.gov.kg/>-accessed 1/5/2017)

**Significant parties in Kyrgyzstan:**

**(a) Asaba**

Ch Bazarbaev was the man behind the founding of Asaba in 1991. Being a nationalist party, its cited aim was "national renaissance" in Kyrgyzstan. In order to achieve its goals, the party deployed various techniques like renaissance of Islam, the adoption of mixed economy. It secured only 4 seats in the 1995 elections. The support base of the party is diverse. The Asaba party attracts the economically marginalised as well as the youth voters. But the party faces limitations in resources and has its base in and around Bishkek (Vassiliev 2001).

**(b) Ata Maken**

Ata Maken party was founded in 1993 after a segment of 'Erk' seceded and established an independent party with Kenenbaeva as the chairman. The party calls itself a firm supporter of liberal democracy and reformist ideology. Ata Maken has its base among businessmen, agriculturists and intellectuals. It has its followers in the parliament and continues to enjoy moderate influence in the country (Vassiliev 2001).

**(c) Party of Communists of Kyrgyzstan**

The Communist Party of Kyrgyzstan (CPK) was the only legally political party established during the Soviet years. It was abolished in 1991 after a failed coup against the Gorbachev regime in the Soviet Union. As a successor known as Party of Communists of Kyrgyzstan registered in September 1992. The party has a belief in human rights and constitutionalism. At one time, it was the most influential political force with the largest membership. This party has its social base among workers, farmers, intellectuals, youth, pensioners etc. It also enjoys the crucial support of the bureaucracy in the state (Vassiliev 2001).

**(d) Social Democratic Party of Kyrgyzstan**

The Social Democratic Party (SDP) was established in July 1993. 47 The party believes in democratic norms, law governed civil society, freedom of individuals, diversity of ownership including state, collective and private ownership. The SDP is a regional party, which claim membership of 2000 people (Vassiliev 2001).

**(e) Democratic Movement of Kyrgyzstan**

The Democratic Movement of Kyrgyzstan consists of around 30 different groups. It was founded in May 1990. Since 1990 it became the country's leading political force. Its chairman was Kazat Akmatov. The Movement with other groups (*Ashar, Ashaba and Erkin*) had been involved in the struggle for land distribution and in other economic and political reforms. According to the Ata Meken chairperson Kenenbaeva, the DMK played the role of a kind of hothouse where the seedling of most of the future parties and independent movements developed<sup>49</sup>". The party believes in democracy, and principles of secularism and liberty<sup>50</sup>. The DMK played a crucial role in the Democratization of the Kyrgyzstan. During the formative years it supported the multi-party system, civil and political rights along with economic freedom to develop a stable and democratic Kyrgyzstan. The party consider the middle class as its main basis of support (Vassiliev 2001)

**(f) Republican Popular Party of Kyrgyzstan:**

The Republican Popular Party of Kyrgyzstan was established in May 1993 by Zh. Regaliyev. It is a regional party. The party is dominated by scientists and academicians but at the same time it got some support from other groups. The RPP had contested the parliamentary elections of 1995 in which it had won three seats (Vassiliev 2001).

**(g) Unity Party of Kyrgyzstan:**

The Unity Party of Kyrgyzstan was founded by A. Muraliev in June 1994. The party have very little popularity among the people of Kyrgyzstan. Despite this the party had contested in

the parliamentary elections of 1995 and managed to secure four seats. The party believes in the creation of democratic society and legal state. The party is working against chauvinism. The social bases of the party are workers, teachers and intelligentsia. The party has little influence in the parliament of the country (Badan 2000)

**(h) Erkin Kyrgyzstan Democratic Party (EK):**

The Erkin Kyrgyzstan Democratic Party (EK) came into its existence in October 1991, when the Kyrgyzstan Democratic Movement (KDM) broke up and the members of the splinter group united together to form a new part . The EK became the first party in the Kyrgyzstan to be officially registered (Vassiliev 2001).

**Table 5 - List of political parties with their heads:**

Name of the Party	Leader of the party
The political party "Progressive Democratic Party" Erkin Kyrgyzstan "(ErK)	Alymkulov Rais Termecikovich
Political Party "National Revival Party - ASABA	Nusupov Doolotbek Apyshovich
Political Socialist Party "Ata-Meken"	Tekebaev Omurbek Chirkeshovich
Political Party "Party of Communists of Kyrgyzstan"	Masaliev Iskhak Absamatovich
Political party "Republican People's Party of Kyrgyzstan	Tentiev Jenishbek Abdievich
Political party "Party Democratic Movement of Kyrgyzstan"	Zheksheev Zhypar Zhekshevich
Political Party "Agrarian Party of the Kyrgyz Republic	Medetbekov Shamshybek Osmonkulovich
Democratic Party of Women and Youth of Kyrgyzstan - "New Force	Shailieva Tokon Asanovna
Public Association "Political Party of the War Veterans in Afghanistan and Participants in Other Local War Conflicts	Tashtanbekov Akbokon Dukenovich
Political party "Zhany Kyrgyzstan"	Sydykov Usen Sydykovich
Political party "Social Democratic Party of Kyrgyzstan	Tursunbekov Chynybai Akunovich

Political party "Party of protection of interests of workers of industry, agriculture and low-income families of the Kyrgyz Republic	Aytikeev Akbaraly Ysyraylovich
Public Association "Party of Labor People of the Kyrgyz Republic"	Omurakunov Emil
The political party "Party of economic revival of the Kyrgyz Republic	Khon Valery Pavlovich
Public Association "Party of Bishkek Citizens"	Otunbaev Bolot Isakovich
The political party "Rodina"	Akbarov Azamzhan Saidullaevich
Political party "Ar-Namys" (Dignity Party)	Turumbekov Kurmanbek Abdykasymovich
Public Association "Communist Party of Kyrgyzstan	Tokombayev Giyaz Asanbekovich
The political party of peasants (farmers) of Kyrgyzstan "Baba Dyikan"	Shabdanalieva Zamira Akieвна
Political party "Unity of the people" of Kyrgyzstan	Kasymov Adylbek Akmatalievich
Public Association Party "Kairan El"	Bakiev Aydarali Kurmanbekovich
Political party "Republican Party of Kyrgyzstan (" PKK ")	Turdumaliyev Sazykbay Abdrakhmanovich
Political party "Party of pensioners of Kyrgyzstan"	Borombaeva Toktokan Zholuyevna
The political party "Erkindik"	Bayguttiev Zhenishbek Seitbekovich
Political Party "Youth Party of Kyrgyzstan"	Kudabayeva Shatkul Isalievna
Political party "Republican Party" Ulutman "	Kasiev Naken Kasievich
The Republican Unified Political Party "Elmuras"	Asanbekov Nurlan Duyshenalievich,
Political Party "GLAS OF THE PEOPLE"	Bayguttiev Zhenishbek Seitbekovich
The political party "Consent"	Kudabayeva Shatkul Isalievna
Political Party of the Regions of Kyrgyzstan "Elet"	Asanbekov Nurlan Duyshenalievich
Republican Social and Political Party "Party of Developers of Kyrgyzstan"	Rysbekov Zhyrgalbek Ozubekovich
Political Party of the Peoples of Kyrgyzstan	Abdyrakakov Beishenbek Toktobayevich



"Elnur"	
Political party of unity and development "Alga, Kyrgyzstan!"	Nurmatov Rustam Mirzaevich
Political party "Builders of Kyrgyzstan"	Momunov Zamir Darvinovich
Political party "Democratic Party" Turan "	Sarpashov Emir-Raadik Duyshekeevich
Political Party "Green Party of Kyrgyzstan"	Bulekbaev Erkin Kasymovich
Political Party "Patriotic Party of Unity of Kyrgyzstan"	Alybek Aibek Tashibekovich
Political Party of Unity and Development "Meken Birimdigi"	Orozaliev Samagan Murzabekovich
The political party "People's Patriotic Party" Eldik Birimdik "	Mamatov Kairat Adamkalievich
Public Political Party "Kyrgyz kylimy"	Tolobekov Batyrbek Sipidinovich
Political party "Unity of Kyrgyzstan"	Alymkulov Bolot Karypbekovich
Political party "Strong Kyrgyzstan"	Alyana Zhenishkovna Salyanova
Political Party of Unity and Development "Ene Til"	Mukanbetova Gulzat Turdukojevna
Political party "People's Movement of Kyrgyzstan"	Viktor Chernomorets
Democratic Party of Kyrgyzstan "Bir El"	Aliev Kanatbek Sydybekovich
Republican Political Party of National Unity "Kyrgyz El"	Usupbaev Anarbek Cholponkulovich, Aamatov Markabay
People's Democratic Party "Aikol-Manas"	Osmonov Shermathat
The political party "People's Patriotic Party" Eldik yntımak "	Chokonov Samat Temirbekovich
The National Democratic Party "Uluu Birimdik"	Kaptaev Emilbek Salamatovich
Political party "Democratic Party" Kalyzkik Biilik "	Baiterekov Kurmanbek
The political party "Democratic Party" Birimdik "(Unity)"	Urumkanov Aseyin Turdukevich
Political party "Kyrgyz Conservative Republican Party"	Usubakunov Bolotbek Mamytovich
Republican Political Party "Independent Life"	Isakova Aidana Taabaldievna
The Republican Political Party "Umai Ene"	Sharipova Salima Kanatbekovna
Political party "We are for progress"	Musabaev Muratbek Turdumbekovich
Political party "Akshumkar"	Sariyev Temir Argembayevich
The political party "Liberal Progressive Party"	Kunakunov Maksat Kasimzhanovich
Political party "Avangard"	And about. Baltagulov Jalalbek Torogeldievich
The political party "People's Patriotic Party of Kyrgyzstan "Tynchtyk"	Ashirbaev Elkinbek Toktgonovich

Political Party "Peasant (Farmer) Party of Kyrgyzstan"	Asylbekov Kutubek Bobekekovich
Political Democratic Party "ATA Zholu"	Sooronbaev Dyishnb Shayakhmetovich
Political party "Wisdom"	Omurkulova Damira Kasymovna
"People's Political Party Ala-Too"	Ismailov Batyrbek Talipovich
Republican political party "Sanzhyra"	Karabayev Ednan Oskanovich
Political party "Party of transport workers of the Kyrgyz Republic"	Abdrasilov Abdrakhim Akchalovich
Political party "Patriots of Kyrgyzstan"	Orozbekov Almas Satarkulovich
Republican Democratic Political Party "For Life without Barriers"	Asangariyev Mirbek Rysbekovich
The political party "Democratic Party" Capital "	Musaybayev Atay Nurbekovich
Political Party "Zhyyy-Mezgil"	Mooladjanov Narkas
Republican political party "Kyrgyz Jeri"	Umuralieva Kalicha Kuseinovna
The political party "Consent, Unity, Cohesion" - "Kuttu Al" (revival of the great heritage of the people of Kyrgyzstan)	Sarygulov Dastan Islamovich
The political party "Patriotic Party" Ata-Jurt "	Kenzhebaev Azamat Arstanalievich
The People's Political Party of Kyrgyzstan "Pure Society"	Koshaliev Amrakulovich Koshaliev; Dushebaev Keneshbek Asanbekovich; Yuldashov Abdisalam Tairovich
Political party "Defenders of the Fatherland and Law and Order -" Chyndyk "-" Pravda "	Beysekeev Syymybek Toktogulovich
Political party "KUT"	Erkinov Temirbek Erkinovich
Political party "Meken Tuu"	Sarymsakov Kenzhaly
Political Party "Butun Kyrgyzstan"	Madumarov Adakhan Kimsanbaevich
Political party "Party of Veterans and Youth of Kyrgyzstan"	Chotbaev Abdygul Abdrashitovich
Political party "BEREN"	Moldobekov Kubanychbek Sakinovich
Political party "Kyrgyzstanstad tameki zhana Pakhta ystyrychy duykandar"	Almazbek Abdizhapparovich Syranov
Political party "El Menen"	Aimanbaev Sabyrbek Kanietovich
The Political Party of the "Workers and Peasants" of Kyrgyzstan	Akmatova Suite Kamalidinovna
Political Party "Zamandash"	Omurbekov Daniyar Omurbekovich, Moldakmatov Zhenishbek Omurgazievich
Political party "ZHASHASYN KYRGYZSTAN"	Usenaliev Aman Ordobekovich
Republican political party "Uluu Kyrgyz"	Kirpasheva Zhypara Toktobbaevna
Political party "REPUBLIC"	Moldozhunueva Aisulu Muratalievna
People's Political Party of Democratic Development "Al Kelechegi"	Ryskulova Chachikey Melisovna
Political Party of the Kyrgyz Republic	Satybaldiev Jantoro Zholdoshevich

"Bakubat Kyrgyzstan"	
The political party "People's Party" Ak-Zhol "	Bakiyev Kurmanbek Salievich
Political Party "Aalam"	Maliyev Arslanbek Kasymakunovich; Joldoshova Jyldyzkan Ajtibaevna
Political party "Freedom of choice"	Lisovsky Vladislav Narcisovich
Political party of driving forces	Yandavurov Zubeida Yubuzovna
The People's Political Party "Ulut Ordo"	Toktobolotov Nikolai Kulgatonovich
Political Party "Abiyirduu Kyrgyzstan"	Kalimbetova Tazhikan Borbugulovna
Political party "Eldik Kenesh"	Nurmatova Roza Sarlikovna
The political party "Socialist Party of Kyrgyzstan"	Masadikov Taalatbek Shamudinovich
Political Party Congress of the Peoples of Kyrgyzstan  (Party of Congress of the Peoples of Kyrgyzstan)	Medetbekov Shamshybek Osmonkulovich
Political party "El Armands"	Isaev Kasym, Niyazov Miroslav Dzhumabekovich
Political party "Komsomol"	Sarymsakov Ruslan Adykanovich
Political party "Commonwealth"	Nifadiev Vladimir Ivanovich
Political party "Party of people's self-government" Ak Sanat "	Turpanov Milan Kalybekovich
Political party "Zhany Bagyt"	Dyryldaev Ramazan Olokevich
The political party "People's Party of Uluttar Birimdigi"	Myrzakmatov Melisbek Zhooshbaevich
Political party "Democratic Party" Azattyk "	Isakov Ismail Isakovich
Political party "Republican Party of Justice"	Djekshenkulov Alikbek Dzhekshenkulovich
Political party "UNION OF PEOPLES OF KYRGYZSTAN"	Seitalieva Gulmiza Askarbekovna
Political party "WORKING PARTY OF KYRGYZSTAN"	Parmankulov Zamirbek Kultaevich
Political Party "Youth Movement on April 7"	Suerkulov Choro Esenbekovich
Political party "Meken Baatrylary"	Sagyndykov Arstanbek
Political party "Jashtar Demokratyk Party"	Kadyralieva Yyrgal Karmyshakovna
Political party "Mezgil agymy"	Sharshembaev Berdibek Ibraimovich
Political party "Mekenchil"	Bazakeev Kubanychbek Zhamanchaevich
Political Party "Egemen Kyrgyzstan"	Meymarkukov Kumarbek Askarovich
Political Party  "Birikken eldik kymyly"	Mukashev Muratbek Osmonalievich
Political party "Uluu Barchyn"	Torogulova Gulzhan Kaparovna
Political Party  «Аымдар акыкатык үчүн»	Elmira Turbenkovna Myrzabekova
Political party "ZHYLDYZ"	Kydyrgichev Avazbek Usenbaevich
Political party "KOK ZHAL ZHASHTAR"	Bektashov Melis Bektashovich

Political party "MEKEN YNTYMAGY"	Asanbekov Temirbek Ishenbaevich
Political party "Mekenchil patriotor"	Sheralyev Toktaly Medetovich
Political party "Strong society"	Begaliev Akylbek Shamalbekovich
Political party "Kyrgyzstan"	Isaev Kanatbek Kedeyskanovich
Political party "Azamat"	Temirbekov Nurdin Kubanychbekovich
Political Party "Butkul Jashtar Sayasiy Party"	Meimanaliev Tynybek Sagynbekovich
The political party "ALP" ("Haykyn Liberalddyn Partyiysy")	Malenov Yrysbek Baidyldaevich, Iskakov Erkin Bolotovich
Political party "Unity and development"	Baltaev Nazar Jyrgalbekovich
Political Party of State Unity and Patriotism "Bir Bol"	Esenaliev Dosaly Akparalievich
Political party "Aikol El"	Albanov Nurzhan Tulgunovich
Political party "Peoples' Democratic Party of Kyrgyzstan"	Medetbekov Artur Kaparovich
Political party "Karkyra"	Kasymov Abdraim Abdyrakhmanovich
Political party "National Assembly of Kyrgyzstan"	Aydarov Taalaybek Sagynovich
Political Party "Country of Unity"	Duisheva Elvira Oskonbekovna
Political party "Soyuz Svoboda.Spravnost.Rodina "	Miyarov Baqir
Political party "Kaganat"	Asanaliev Nurgaly Sagynbekovich
Political party "Al Biiligi"	Borubashov Bekbosun Ishenbekovich
Political party "Bilim" Ilim "Ordos"	Turdubayev Sjezbekbek Zhumasaliyevich
Youth Political Party "ZHASH BILEK"	Suranaliev Talgat Chynybekovich
Political Party "Algyr Kiraan"	Suymaliev Nurzhakyp Okinovich
Political party "KYRGYZ WORKERS PEOPLE PARTY"	Kydyrmyshev Ruslan Zhamanakovich
Political party "For the people" ("El uchun")	Abdildaev Arstanbek Beishenalievich
Political Party "Justice and Development Party (AKP)" AK "	Oskonbaev Beishenbek Mambetalievich
Political party "INTERNATIONAL - LIBERAL PARTY OF KYRGYZSTAN"	Baisalov Kanybek Salykovych
Political party "Taza Tabiyat"	Amankulov Mirslav Akalovich
Political party "Chyndyk"	Kadyrov Kubanychbek Bekbosunovich
Political party of the Motherland and creation of "Ak Sham"	Saparbayev Erlan Turdakunovich
Political Party of Spirituality and Development "AMAL"	Mambetov Nurdin Dzhanyshbekovich
The political party "Liberal Democratic Party" NUR "	Sayak gizi Elzat
Political Party "Labor Party"	Salymbekov Askar Maatkabylovich
Democratic political party "Nurzaman"	Tashirov Yusup, Akunov Urmatbek Bektemirovich
Political party "Support and development of the Kyrgyz language"	Musaev Syrtbai Zholdoshovich
Political party "Ak Bata"	Asakeev Sardar Tychtybekovich
Political party "Kelechek-El"	Zhuroyev Zhanybek Toktonazarovich

The political party "Kyrgyz Liberal Democratic Party "	Kachkinbayev Seytek Sadyrbekovich
Political party "Muras"	Zayyrov Sabyrbek Tokenovich
The People's Political Party "Kyrgyz-Ata"	Keldibaev Tulgun Kyyazovich
Political party "Ishenim"	Abduraimov Zharasul Osmonalievich
Political party "Socialist Party AK KHALATCHAN"	Imashov Ulan Duyshenovich
The political party "People's Party" Kyrgyzstan "	Abdurakhmanov Chingiz Sulaimanovich
Political party "Adilet" Kyrgyzstan	Ashyrbekov Maksat Avtandilovich
Political party "Zhashtar Bulagy"	Sakebaev Samat Bolotovich
Political party "YNYYYGYY-PROGRESS"	Torobaev Bakyt Ergeshevich
Political party "Ak kalpak"	Mamataev Ulukbek Kalmamatovich
Political party "Choi Kazat"	Akimov Turat Kudaibergenovich
Political party "Al Ordo"	Abdyldaev Salamat Bularovich
Political party "Alliance of Political Forces of Kyrgyzstan"	Omurbek Amurburdiev Egemberdiev
Political party "Democratic alliance"	Talabayev Baktybek Djeybekovich
The political party "The Party of Revival" Erkin El "	Askarbekov Mavlyan Amangeldiyevich
People's Political Party "Kuttu Kyrgyz"	Abdildaev Aidlan Nurdinovich
Political Party of Justice and Development "Nyman Nuru"	Alymkulov Rais Termecikovich
Political party "Active"	Imanaliev Kurmanbek Beleukovich
Political Party "People's Party"	Sabirov Avakir
Political party "Menin Bishkegim"	Soronbayev Abdykerim Abdykadyrovich
Political party "AK"	Zhagarov Sagynbek Makishovich
Political party "ASMAN ALA-TOO"	Bekiev Bekbolot Japarovich, Kunai Medetkhan
Political party "Elaman"	Tokombaeva Mukhabbat Tolkunovna
Political party "Kalk Intymagy"	Shaildabekov Azatbek Karmabekovich
Political party "Energetikov"	Israilov Abdylda Nurgazievich
Political party "People's consent"	Djusupbekova Zamira Myrsabekovna
Political party "Reforma"	Akameev Azamat Kubanychbekovich
Political party "Uluu Kyrgyzstan"	Esenkojoev Ulan Shukurbekovich
Political party "Yntymak"	Kulbayev Kurmanbek Musayevich
Youth political party "El access"	Sydykov Abdylda
Political Party "Tabylga"	Babaev Asylbek Askarbekovich
Political party "BIRGE-TOGETHER"	Chumakeeva Zamira Aidarbekovna
Political Party "LIBERAL-DEMOCRATIC PARTY OF KYRGYZSTAN" BAGHIT "	Asanov Samagan Alitorovich
Political party "Zharan"	Ashimov Tilek Kaarmanovich
Political party "TUNUK Kyrgyzstan"	Isayev Sovetbek Asanovich
The political party "Freedom and Democracy"	Japarov Nurlanbek Usenbekovich
Political Party "Onuguu Kyrgyzstan"	Kojomkulov Alaybek Ramazanovich
The political party "Union"	Ismayilov Almaz Omurkulovich

Political party "Kelechek-Future"	Madaliev Rustam Karimovich
Political party "Kyrgyz ulut Ordos"	Amirzhanov Akramjan Ahmedjanovich
Political party "Danaker-Peacemaker"	Bekmuratov Adilbek Adyshovich
Political party "Tartyp-Order"	Marlis uulu Edil
The political party "Ak-Niet"	Bekeshev Dastan Dalabayevich
The political party of the creators "Aruu El"	Zhunushaliev Rustam Rahmanovich
The political party "REPUBLICA-ATA JURT"	Babanov Omurbek Toktogulovich Tashiev Kamchibek Kydyrshayevich
Political party "For Motherland"	Bekbotaev Temirlan Sarymsakovich
Political party "Ala-Too yntymagy"	Zhumakanov Mustafa Beishebaevich
Political party "Human Rights"	Tursunbek Akun
Political party "KEL-KEL" Demokratylk Party "	Abdyraanov Chynyz Sabyrbekovich
Political party "Aikol"	Orozaliev Anarbek Popoevich
Political Party "Patriot Party"	Kramarov Dmitry Alexandrovich
Political party "Mekenim Kyrgyzstan"	Orumbaev Mederbek Amanovich
Political party "Socio-political party" Strength in unity	Abdivaliev Kadyrbek Orunbaevich
Political party "Al Birimdigi"	Dzhunushaliev Tuygunbek Malikovich
Political Party "Aitys-Ata"	Aytyshov Kanatbek
The political party "Ala-Too-Kyrgyz geri"	Sultanov Nurbek Mamatkadyrovich
Political party "Democrat"	Momunkulov Esenkul Duyshonkulovich
Political party "Birimdik Eldik Kyrgyzstan"	Ismailov Nurbek Datkabaevich
Political party "Jany Shaar Party" - "Party new city"	Naamatbekov Tilek Naamatbekovich
Political Party "Kainar" People's Action Party (Source)	Akmatov Aslan Abdybekovich
Political party "ELDIK-PEOPLE"	Badalov Nazmy Azretalievich
Political party "Center for Peace in the Knowledge of Spirit, Science"	Namatova Biyazig Namatovna
Political party "Tazalyk"	Borbashev Karyypbai
Political party "Al talaba"	Dzhumaliev Elmira Busurmankulovna
The political party "Bai-Meken"	Mamatjanov Almambet Mamatjanovich
Political party "Kalys"	Moldakmatov Zhenishbek Omurgazievich
Political party "Taza Kyrgyzstan"	Imankulov Marat Mukanovich
Political party "Patriot тынтymagy"	Shayymkulov Mirlan Dzhumadilovich
Political party "Commonwealth of the people of Kyrgyzstan"	Ladozhinskaya Nadezhda Ivanovna
Political Party "People's Party of Kyrgyzstan Ayimday"	Ibraim gizi Zulfia
Political party "ZHARATMAN EL"	Tuleyev Rasul Dzhumabekovich
Political party "Youth of Tash-Kumyr"	Ubaidulaev Timurlan Orozalievich
Political party "NEW-EPOCH"	Suurkulov Nuris Zhumabekovich
Political Party "Our People"	Rasulov Mairambek Alisherovich

(source: website of the Ministry of Justice of the Kyrgyz Republic)

## **Bottlenecks in the party-system of Kyrgyzstan:**

The party system of Kyrgyzstan suffers from serious limitations most of which spring from its Central Asian existence. These problems in turn cause the party system to develop slowly. Some of these are :

First, the problem pertains to the political psychology. As the the majority of people residing in Kyrgyzstan now are former Soviet people, their conception of parties relates only to the CPSU. This party had a supranational organisation, that affected many spheres of individual and state activity, itself staying beyond criticism. Literally speaking, people believed the CPSU to be an eternal head and breadwinner. This had a deep impact on the perception of all the political parties in Kyrgyzstan and in other former Soviet countries as well. This problem is seen in Russia, Kazakhstan, and several other countries. But in Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan, things are different: it's quite early to talk about the presence of political parties in those countries, except for some political associations, that are called parties.

Second, the problem lies with the people who were intended to establish a political party but had absolutely no experience regarding its formation as such. So, parties in Kyrgyzstan are built in a very simplified way which includes various elements of traditionalism. They are built as political groups having a leader, middle or senior managers and the leaders' relatives or friends and some people who work for money. As such ,the political parties in Kyrgyzstan are few in number and most of them are political clubs rather than parties.

Third, another limitation of the parties lies in the fact that the state in spite of its declarations of support to all the democratic institutions fails to contribute to this in real life. For instance, in Germany, parties that cross a certain threshold in elections to the Bundsrats or the federal government bodies receive financial backing from the state. It exists in many countries to support the institution of democracy and pluralism in the society, including other aspects of political life in the country.

Despite these lacunae, in over 25 years there have been many parties that built the bedrock of democracy in Kyrgyzstan. It's not a small achievement that this country has seen the proliferation of so many parties surrounded by authoritarian regimes. Quite positively, these parties have never questioned the efficacy of democracy for their system, instead they have been the harbingers of the same.

**CHAPTER-IV**

**TRANSITION FROM**

**PRESIDENTIAL SYSTEM TO**

**PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY IN**

**KYRGYZSTAN**



Parliamentary democracy as a form of government has been existing in the world for several centuries, the pioneer being Europe in his regard. The main outlines of the modern parliament were formed in the 20th century, not only in Europe but also in other continents. Kyrgyzstan is just embarking on this path now. The very logic of the complex, sometimes tragic social-political processes of recent years has led to the selection of parliamentary democracy as the desirable one. At the June 2010 referendum, the people of Kyrgyzstan endorsed the proposed alternative. As a result of free elections to the Parliament in October 2010, a parliamentary system of government was established in this country. But, in spite of the fact that the people of Kyrgyzstan made a choice in favour of a parliamentary system of government, the question still remains open, to such a form of government, a novelty not only for Kyrgyzstan, but for the whole of Central Asian region.

Kyrgyzstan's idea of implementation of parliamentarianism emerged in a critical condition, the country provoked a radical change in the political system. The most important point is the development of political parties, since the success of the parliamentary system depends on the quality of the parties, which should be strong and have a clear and elaborated concept of development of the country. And it does not play in favour of the idea of a parliamentary republic. The second important point is the process of implementing the idea of a parliamentary republic. In this regard, the development of parliamentarism led to the rise of the new elite. It is related to how much the elite is obsessed with the patriotic feelings of salvation of the motherland, and how much they are able to solve the deepest problems not from the point of view of the priority of personal interests and ambitions. Thus, the two factors – the development of political parties and presence of the new elite – are working for the implementation of high ideas of parliamentarism.

For parliamentary democracy streamlining the activities of the branches of power in the country became pertinent: legislative (the *Jogorku Kenesh* as the supreme representative body), executive (the government) and judiciary (the Supreme Court), which administrate the state power. Disputes between them could be resolved within the constitutional procedures and through constitutional and legal assessment of decisions in compliance with the principle of checks and balances. The modern constitutional basis of the separation of powers in Kyrgyzstan and establishment of parliamentary rule are mutually reinforcing elements of the constitutional law (Murzaeva 2011)

The evolution of the formation of parliamentarism in Kyrgyzstan is historically linked with the socio-political formations that existed at different times. The development of parliamentarism in the country has deep historical roots. The national representation and representative lawmaking with common features and goals, and with fundamental differences from the classical sample existed and developed at all stages of formation and development of statehood in the territory of modern Kyrgyzstan. The main illustrative distinction of popular representation in the states that emerged in the territory of modern Kyrgyzstan is the presence of the institutions of state and law in the administration.

According to Article 71 of the Constitution of the Kyrgyz Republic dated 2010, the Jogorku Kenesh is the parliament, legislative body with a priority in relation to solutions and determination of the most important decisions and policies of the state. It is unicameral and consists of 120 deputies elected for a five-year term according to the party lists. The elections for a new parliament under the new Constitution were held on October 10, 2010. Almost 90 percent of those voters who attended the referendum voted in favour of the new draft constitution, which involved the transition from presidential to parliamentary form of government. It was a sign that the Kyrgyz people agreed to accept the new political system and were ready to support the democratic process. Kyrgyzstan chose a form of Western democracy, with the expectation that the transition to a parliamentary form of government would minimize the possibility of unlimited personal power in the country.

Among Central Asian countries, Kyrgyzstan was the first to choose the parliamentary form of government, despite the fact that almost all of the 215 countries of the world basically have a presidential form of government; only a small part of them uses the parliamentary form of government. There are relatively few purely parliamentary republics in the world: the UK, France, Turkey, Japan, India, Germany, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Estonia, Italy, Belgium, Denmark, Austria, Switzerland, Finland, Iceland, Ireland, and some others. Extensive powers that the Constitution sometimes gives to the president of a parliamentary republic are usually carried out by the government, which countersign presidential decrees through the head of government. Among the developing countries, there are such parliamentary monarchies as Malaysia, Thailand, Nepal, and Monaco. However, given the real impact of the monarch, here we must note the presence of elements of a dualistic state regime. The main sign of a parliamentary republic – same as a parliamentary monarchy – is the political responsibility of the government to the parliament. In both cases,

the responsibility is purely unanimous: a distrust towards one member of the government, especially its head, entails resignation of the entire government. Instead of retiring government, the president may be required to dissolve the parliament (its lower chamber) and call new elections (McGlinchey 2011).

For the largest and most influential parties, being in the parliament allows to maintain a certain power resource – a time resource to retain and strengthen their positions. But if we consider the situation from a long-term sight, in our view, the expansion of the parties is to some extent a reflection of the natural utilization of the existing political elites. Depending on several factors, the utilization process can either accelerate or go down a sluggish pace.

A multiparty parliament, a coalition government, and a divided executive with a significantly weakened presidency are the main features of Kyrgyzstan's new political system. It is a set-up that the authorities boldly call parliamentary rule, atleast a quest for it.

### **Constitutional history of Kyrgyzstan:**

In the initial years of full independence of Kyrgyzstan, President Akaev appeared totally committed to the reform process . In spite of the declared backing of western powers and donors like the International Monetary Fund, the country faced many economic hardships at the outset. These were a consequence of the fall of the Soviet trading bloc, that even acted as a roadblock for the republic to globalise its economy. The difficulties in the economic sphere had a spill-over effect on the political sphere as well.

The year 1993 saw the blossoming of a major corruption scandal against Akayev's close associates. One of the major names was Feliks Kulov , the Vice President who resigned citing ethical reasons in December. Following Kulov's resignation, Akayev called upon the last communist premier Apas Djumagulov to form the government by dismissing the previous government. Finally, in January 1994, Akayev initiated a referendum asking for a whole new mandate to complete his term in office. As such, he received 96.2% of the vote (McGlinchey 2011).

A new constitution was framed by the Parliament in May 1993. however, the next year, the Parliament failed to acquire the quorum for its ultimate session before to the expiration of its term in February 1995. President Akayev was widely accused of having managed this boycott by majority of the parliamentarians. Contrarily, he blamed the communists of

blocking the proceedings of the Parliament. A major referendum was scheduled in October 1994, which was overwhelmingly approved by voting populace. It proposed to bring two distinct changes in the Constitution, the first that allowed the Constitution to be amended through the process of referendum, and the second that established a bicameral parliament known as the Jogorku Kenesh.

Elections to the two houses of legislature – a 35-seat full-time assembly and a 70-seat part-time assembly – were held in February 1995. The campaigns were considered relatively free and open by a large number of international spectators, although the election-day proceedings were hampered by across the board irregularities. Independent candidates won majority of the seats, showcasing that personalities prevailed over ideologies. The Parliament thus formed, convened its first session in March 1995. One of its initial orders of business was the endorsement of the precise constitutional language on the role of the legislature (McGlinchey 2011).

The Parliamentary elections of 1996 saw the competition between the independent political parties. A February 1996 referendum – in deviation from the Constitution and the law on referendums – amended the Constitution to give President Akayev more power. The provision that parliamentarians would be directly elected by universal suffrage was retained. Although the changes gave the President the power to dissolve Parliament, it also more clearly defined Parliament's powers. From that time onwards, Parliament has demonstrated its independent status from the executive wing (Murzaeva 2011).

An October 1998 referendum finalised some constitutional reforms, including increasing the number of deputies in the upper house, deducting the number of deputies in the lower house, rolling back Parliamentary immunity, reforming land tender guidelines, and modifying the state budget.

Twin phases of Parliamentary elections were held on 20 February 2000 and 12 March 2000. With the full backing of the United States, Organisation of Security and Cooperation in Europe(OSCE) reported that the elections failed to follow the procedures for a free and fair elections. Questionable legal proceedings against opposition candidates and parties restricted the choice of candidates available to Kyrgyz voters, while state-controlled media reported positively on official candidates only and government officials put pressure on independent media outlets that favoured the opposition (OSCE report 2000).

Azimbek Beknazarov, a frontline opposition figure, was arrested by the local authorities, in 2002. Many consider it a politically motivated move. This sparked protests that culminated in clashes with the police, finally the death of numerous people in Jalal-Abad (OSCE Report 2000).

With the approach of May, the authorities extended further their grip on power by imprisoning Feliks Kulov for misuse of office. During the same period the whole government resigned, taking the blame on itself for the death toll during the violent protests. Thus a new government headed by Nikolay Tanayev was formed (McGlinchey 2011).

In November the President faced further challenges, as the opposition declared that it would march to the capital and demand his resignation. Police tried to suppress the protests, many demonstrators were put behind bars. This in turn invited international criticisms for the dictatorial nature of Akayev's rule.

The lower house of Parliament announced in June 2003 that President Akayev along with his associates, would be given lifetime immunity from prosecution, which fuelled the speculation that Akayev might step down.

Various contenders to power emerged in the disputed election of 2005. On 10 July 2005 opposition leader and interim President Bakiyev emerged victorious in the Presidential elections. 2006 turned to be a tumultuous year for Bakiyev as thousands raised slogans against him in the capital Bishkek. He was accused of not fulfilling his electoral promise on further constitutional reforms and being shield to corrupt partymen. Several parliamentarians were put behind bars to suppress the movement (Murzaeva 2011).

The Presidential elections which were due in 2010 were held a year before President Bakiyev was widely expected to retain his hold, while the opposite faction United Peoples' movement announced that it would field Almaz Atambayev, the leader of the Social democratic Party as the sole candidate in the race. The turnout in the election was recorded as 79.3 (Murzaeva 2011).

The OSCE in its evaluation of the elections expressed that unfair advantage and that media bias did not allow voters to make an informed choice. Moreover, they discovered that the election was marred by many problems and irregularities. Atambayev pulled back his

candidacy on the polling day itself claiming widespread fraud. An opposition rally of 1,000 people in Balykchy on the election day was broken up by mob violence (OSCE report 2010).

The capture of an opposition figure on 6 April 2010 in the town of Talas drove more resistance to authority. The protestors seized the governmental building, demanding a new government. Riot police were sent from Bishkek, and figured out how to regain control of the building. Later that day many more opposition leaders were arrested, while the government gained control of the circumstances. The protests continued, however, resulting in the flight of President Bakiyev to his southern base of Jalalabad, and the freeing later the same day of the arrested opposition figures. A new government was formed under Roza Otunbayeva, the opposition leader, while Bakiyev was given asylum in Belarus by its President Lukashenko. The interim government held several consultations on a new constitution that intended to broaden the domain of the parliament while reducing the sphere of the President. A referendum was held on the resulting document on 27 June 2010, and was approved by over 90% of voters, with a turnout of 72%. Elections were subsequently held on 10 October 2010. These elections resulted in five parties reaching the 5% threshold necessary to enter parliament (McGlinchey 2011)

### **The Arrival of Parliamentary Rule to Kyrgyzstan:**

In sharp contrast to the developments post march 2005, when in the Tulip Revolution President Askar Akaev replaced Kurmanbek Bakiev, in the interim period, the government that gained power in April 2010 stated that it would demolish the presidential rule and pave way for a parliamentary system. Amid contrasting opinions given by many including Russian president Dmitry Medvedev, the leader of the interim government, Roza Otunbaeva, stated that parliamentary democracy could only curb the power-hungry tendency of future Presidents.

The new constitution, framed through a national referendum in June 2010, did not set up a parliamentary system of government in true spirit. The institution of President still retained some crucial executive functions. Nevertheless, these reforms created a strong barrier against the emergence of authoritarian rule.

Firstly, the president has lost certain politically important executive functions, which includes the power to appoint and dissolve the heads of local governments or to have any crucial role in ministerial appointments. These powers have been transferred to the parliament. Moreover, the president only serves a single six-year term and must be prepared to cooperate with a

multiparty government. The president is held accountable for national security, but he or she is expected to have a limited say in economic issues and a restricted role in foreign policymaking.

Secondly, the new constitution introduces a debatable clause forbidding any political party from owning more than 65 seats in the 120-seat parliament. While overtly discriminatory, this acts as a hindrance to the emergence of a so called *party of power*, like Bakiev's *Ak Zhol* (White Path) party, from controlling the parliament in similarity with Russia's United Russia or Kazakhstan's *Nur Otan*.

The October 2010 parliamentary elections furnished a clean picture of the significance of the renewed rules of the elections. Contrary to the 2007 elections, when *Ak Zhol* secured more than 78 percent of the seats, almost five parties received equal vote-share. The new structure required a coalition of not less than three of the five parties to gain a majority. This emerged to be a tough task. The coalition formed in the initial stage, comprising the Social Democratic party, the *Ata-Meken* (Fatherland) socialist party (both were active in the April 2010 mobilization), and the *Respublika* party, failed the system's first test when some coalition members defected during the voting process for the position of parliamentary speaker. While this was a negative signal for the new set-up, the next coalition, with the *Ata Jurt* (Fatherland) party replacing *Ata Meken*, created a strange, but more accommodating, combination of parties that survived until late 2011 (Juraev 2012)

The Presidential elections in October 2011 were considered the final step in legitimizing the reformed political set-up. With almost 80 candidates initially registered, the major political battle was between then-Prime Minister Almazbek Atambaev and two of his rivals Adakhan Madumarov (Butun/United) and Kamchybek Tashiev (*Ata Jurt*). This campaign opened up a contest under different dimensions: 1) choice between parliamentary set-up and a strong presidency, 2) the winners of April 2010 vs. the representatives of the previous rule and 3) northern vs. southern elite. In the context of the April and June 2010 violence, many warned about a possible escalation of the situation, especially in case of a second round of elections. Despite these concerns, Atambaev won in the first round with 62 percent of the vote, and virtually no public protests followed. Atambaev's Social Democratic party immediately departed the parliamentary coalition, forcing its collapse. In its wake, a new coalition was created that included four parties and excluded the main troublemaker *Ata Jurt*. The leader of the *Respublika* party, Omurbek Babanov, was elected prime minister, in exchange for supporting Atambaev during the election campaign (Juraev 2012).

## **Kyrgyzstan's Parliamentary Democracy:**

Seven years ago, after much debate, the Kyrgyz Republic adopted parliamentary system of government. Opponents of this new system, both domestic and foreign, saw the change as an inappropriate imitation of Western system. They predicted the new system would not last long, five years at most. The new system should have sunk into oblivion along with the parliament. Yet, the Kyrgyz Parliamentarianism displays its survivability and is in demand. Since the last convocation of the Kyrgyz Parliament started work in 2010, street protests moved inside its walls and transformed into political debates. Apparently the new parliament has satisfied a primary goal: to clear the streets and squares of countless protesters and negativity.

The results of the Kyrgyz Republic's 2015 parliamentary election refuted pessimistic conclusions and furthermore confirmed the universality of parliamentary democracy, perhaps it is not just the privilege of Western civilization. According to expert opinion, the use of new technologies such as biometric data and automatic voting machines helped hold fair elections. The new measures have reduced risks of falsifications of results to a minimum. The election campaign in the Kyrgyz Republic was very public and free political competition as agreed by many observers. In previous elections, voters often already knew the results of the election in advance to the point that they did not believe in the influence of their vote. Voters were, unsurprisingly, not eager to make it out to the ballot boxes. This time, even a few days prior to the election, nobody, including anyone in the expert community, could have guessed the outcome. For the first time in the Kyrgyz Republic's recent history, almost everyone – voters, observers, even political parties (both winners and losers) – accepted the election results. Six of the fourteen parties won seats in the Kyrgyz Parliament (previously, *Jogorku Kenesh* consisted of five parties). The six parties reflect the whole gamut of opinions in Kyrgyz society: from left to right-leaning; from moderates to radicals; from liberals to conservatives; from supporters of integration with Eurasian Economic Union to adherents of a new, independent Kyrgyz course of development (EPRS report 2015).

The referendum in December 2016 sought to determine if changes to the constitution would be made. The proposed amendments aimed to strengthen the powers of Prime Minister and the Supreme council. The referendum also proposed changes to the judicial wing, for instance, a reduction of the parliamentary majority required to unseat judges and setting a supermajority requirement for court decisions. It was approved by an overwhelming majority which showed that the country has come a long way towards parliamentary rule.



## **The Pillars of Pluralism :**

The elimination of a strong presidency and the dominance of a single faction over political power thus appears to have been well achieved. However, given the turmoil in the political system of Kyrgyzstan (and seeing the structure presently at work in Ukraine), one might question the viability of the renewed political system. Two in particular seem to feed the division of power: social and political fragmentation and the interests of predatory political and business elite. One kind of fragmentation is evident through the strong ties that exist between particular political leaders and their local constituencies. The fundamentals of that 2005 situation did not repeat, like the majoritarian idea of electing parliamentary deputies, political elite connections to particular localities remain salient. As showcased by the 2010 elections, Kyrgyz parties continue to rely on local level issues to mobilize votes. In the last local elections, there was intense competition in various towns, the Ata Jurt party received 20-30 percent of the votes cast in southern Kyrgyzstan (Batken, Osh, and Jalalabad) but just 3-6 percent of votes cast in the northern region. In presidential elections, Almazbek Atambaev received around 80-94 percent of the votes in northern areas but only 29-44 percent in southern ones. This division does not only exist north-south. The Ar Namys party received between 20-28 percent in Bishkek, Chuy region, and the city of Osh, but just 4-6 percent in Naryn, Talas, and Batken. This might highlight an urban-rural divide and a tilt towards ethnic homogeneity within populations (Juraev 2012).

Another push factor that accelerates the division into multiple power centers is the tendency of the political elite. The elite of the post-Soviet political era in Kyrgyzstan developed into a parasitic lot vying for private gratifications. The state has been described as an investment market, where posts are bought and sold as said by the political scientist Johan Engvall . With limited state resources and presence of diverse elite groups who have seen power in the past, it is really a tough call for the president to head over resource distribution. Both Akaev and Bakiev tried to create single pro-presidential parties and left behind powerful actors outside the state system, building the foundation for the March 2005 and April 2010 events.

A political system that permits pluralism and political competition appears to be a good match for Kyrgyzstan's highly fragmented society. In turn, empowering fragmented local elites is an important barrier against the monopolization of power within a single centre. Such a system may also create a more agreeable balance of power between various political groups

struggling for resources and reduce incentives for radical change. It is still too early to make decisive assertions, but the factors discussed above should remain salient barriers against a strongly consolidated system of authoritarian rule. The two rounds of regime change (2005 and 2010) are strong evidence of this.

However, there could still be setbacks. A deterioration of the socioeconomic situation coupled with poor government performance could potentially erode support for pluralism among the majority of society and/or create conditions conducive for a reshaping of the regime. Also possible is the gradual strengthening of one political party at the expense of others, which may eventually result in constitutional reversions. In the end, there are also signs that the current system is not really strengthening the rule of law or government accountability.

### **Role of external actors in shaping Kyrgyz democracy:**

In the path of progress, the Kyrgyz Republic has demonstrated a complex path: two colour revolutions, a deep economic crisis, a permanent political conflict, social contradictions, reflected in endless rallies, cultural and other types of identity. Geopolitically the republic causes interest of various powers, the main of which are Russia, the United States and China.

Russia is a powerful ally of a fairly long period of development. However, it should be noted that Russia of the period of the Union and modern Russia as an independent state in relation to Kyrgyzstan are two different entities. Common history is the fundamental fact of unity, passed down from generation to generation. The history of relations between Kyrgyzstan and Russia is not idyllic, having long, centuries-old ties dating back to the 16th century. The collapse of the Union and the acquisition of sovereignty is the last common moment in the history of Kyrgyzstan and Russia, but it was experienced individually and independently. In the first years after the collapse of the once united state for a time was forgotten, for each country the issue of self-determination stood separately, the time of the formation of sovereign states began. Focusing on the internal Russian context, Russia missed the coordinating link in Central Asia, therefore, the restoration of the role of the controlling player in the region over time has acquired significant significance for Russia's foreign policy. Being in the centre of Central Asia, Kyrgyzstan is a regional *Heartland House* for both the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) and the Moscow-Beijing Delhi triangle. Chinese interests in the region till now have been mostly confined to trade linkages aligning

itself with Russia. The importance of Kyrgyzstan as a transit geopolitical and geo-economic unit for Russia makes it interested in the internal politics of Kyrgyzstan. Russia is really a strategic priority in the south, Russia understands this clearly, in connection with which it is not indifferent to the state of the republic, because Instability in Kyrgyzstan directly affects the situation in the region and the self-perception of Russia.

The biased attitude of the United States towards Kyrgyzstan is due primarily to the colour revolutions that occurred in the only country in the Central Asian region. The very idea of revolution in this region stirred the West's consciousness. It's declared aim of democracy promotion fits very well with the setting of Kyrgyzstan.

With regard to Kyrgyzstan's external players two aspects: the state (the Republic's position, which manifests itself in foreign policy), and public (reflecting the ideas and preferences of citizens). While the first aspect is not clear, because Kyrgyzstan is now managing the external players, trying to keep a positive diplomatic relations with each of them the latter reflects the real mood of ordinary people who are concerned about their future in the context of the country's future. In this respect, the case studies that are held for six years in the country, according to which around 85-95% of the population (varies depending on the year), preference is given to Russia as the main external player (Juraev 2012).

### **Regional Context:**

The first successes of the parliamentary democracy in the Kyrgyz Republic are a matter of concern and increased anxiety to the surrounding areas. Neighbouring countries, where power is concentrated in the hands of former Soviet elite, want to isolate this parliamentary model within the Kyrgyz Republic and prevent spilling into their own territory to protect themselves from this infection. This infection is dangerous, more dangerous than the Ebola virus: first, it attacks consciousness and it is very hard to find an antidote. In recent years, barbed wire and watchtowers have sprung up on the perimeter of the Kyrgyz Republic, and contact was reduced to the least. Citizens of the Kyrgyz Republic crossing the borders between of neighbouring countries are considered carriers of a dangerous infection at the border check-points. In the neighbouring areas, TV and other media are used as propaganda tool to build a negative image of the Kyrgyz Republic, creating the picture of a country eroded by this virus. Angry crowds in city square, ruins, and political tension in Kyrgyzstan are common motifs on TV programs, even years after the April 2010 revolution in the country.

After watching and hearing all this ravings, somebody really might ask a question: did Kyrgyzstan step forward or step back into a deadlock? Similar questions might come to mind to those who are not familiar with the history of the Kyrgyz nation. Since ancient times, the social life of the Kyrgyz people was based on collective responsibility. Leadership was elected on the basis of consensus. The power of the Kyrgyz nation was not handed by a dynasty, it had to be asserted by a general *kurultay* (assembly), through the force of compromise between tribes and families. In other words, the elements of a parliamentary democracy in an embryonic form have existed since those times. Today, they are adapted to state-of-the-art requirements. This is the definitive key to success in building a parliamentary democracy in the Kyrgyz republic.

### **Role of parties in making the transition to parliamentary democracy:**

The events of 2010 and the introduction of the parliamentary form of government in Kyrgyzstan have become steps towards the democratization of the state administration system. However, this process weakened state control over society. The entire previous period from the moment of obtaining sovereignty only led the country away from the realization of this goal, and therefore today Kyrgyzstan is a country whose society does not even represent the approximate outlines of its future. The stability of such a system of power is built on principles of using official powers to control natural resources and the country's budget for specific purposes.

One of the main tendencies of modern world social development is the increasing role of political parties in public life. The importance of parties for the political life of modern society lies in the fact that they allow accumulating and actualizing the interests of various social strata and individual social groups, developing their political ideology.

The establishment of the party system in Kyrgyzstan can be divided into two stages: first- a1990-2010, second- 2010 upto the present. The Constitutional Act, which was of great importance for parliamentary democracy, was the Declaration on State Sovereignty of the Kyrgyz Republic of December 15, 1990, since it first established the principle of the division of power.

In 1991-1993 years, the Constitution of the Kyrgyz Republic formed the basis for free elections and multi-party system. In 1991, the law "On Civil Organizations" was adopted, and

in 1999 the law "On Political Parties", which is very liberal and provides for the creation of a political party on the initiative of 10 people. In Kyrgyzstan, since that time, the process of organizing legislative bodies of power has begun, political parties are being formed that are actively involved in the electoral process. Since 2000, conditions have been created for the participation of political parties in the formation of the parliament of the Kyrgyz Republic by the majority system. Since 2007, political parties have formed a parliament entirely on a proportional system.

With the adoption of the new Constitution in 2010, after the April events, Kyrgyzstan moved to a parliamentary-presidential form of government. The new Constitution consolidated a proportional electoral system for the election of deputies of the *Jogorku Kenesh*, which also contributed to the development of political parties in Kyrgyzstan. All this has led to the fact that today the party space in Kyrgyzstan is represented by 192 registered political parties that are constantly in the process of transformation, unification and absorption, reorganization or disintegration, which is the reason for the weak party system (Manuel 2016).

Back in 2011, experts started talking about the crisis of the parties after the split that occurred within the parliamentary faction of Ar-Namys, when 10 deputies withdrew from it and joined the majority coalition. They began to make predictions about a possible split within other factions of the Jogorku Kenesh, and the experts were not far from the truth (Manuel 2016).

In recent years, domestic political literature has been talking about what kind of democracy in this country (as is known, there are different models of democracy in the West), what kind of parliament, parliamentary democracy, acceptable democratization factors, etc., should be which are to a great extent backed by the political parties.

### **Organization and conduct of parliamentary elections in Kyrgyzstan:**

In the modern political process of Kyrgyzstan, of which elections are an integral part, many political forces and various activities of political actors are involved. The subjects of political transition to parliamentary rule realize various methods and procedures of the set goals and tasks. Together they can be designated as political technologies. Electoral technologies are a kind of political technology that affects the masses in order to influence their electoral behaviour and encourage them to cast their votes for a certain candidate. The main feature of

electoral technologies is their focus on the inclusion of socio-psychological mechanisms regulating the conduct of voters, appealing to citizens' convictions, their values, interests, moods, aspirations and aspirations.

Modern technologies for conducting election campaigns have been common activities in Kyrgyzstan, they depend not only on the specifics and characteristics of the constituency and also on the personal characteristics of candidates.

Political practice today allows the use of effective electoral technologies, taking into account those features and specifics that exist in Kyrgyz political life, both in a particular region and the state as a whole. Applied electoral technologies should ensure the coming to power of persons who, in the opinion of the voter, will conduct the necessary decisions. Therefore, selective technologies play an important role in determining the fate of one or another candidate, or one party in the electoral process. Technological knowledge is under development and is not always in demand. However, the features of the electoral system in modern Kyrgyzstan dictate the need for a theoretical analysis of electoral technologies with a view to their implementation in practice, the professional conduct of political counselling, and the creation of an image.

As a rule, the essence of any electoral technology is its creative component. The fact that the ability of the head of the election campaign to use non-standard techniques and methods are of great importance and almost always determine the results of elections.

The electoral process is an element of the political market. Candidates offer voters their programs and promises in exchange for transferring their power to implement specified policies, expression and protection of voters' interests. In this process, the use of electoral technologies ensures success, which can be based on the use of elements of deception, manipulation, speculation on the voters' confidence. Since the first elections, the technology of election campaigns has been continuously improved.

Like any process, the election campaign is in a state of constant change and improvement. Electoral technologies make it possible to organize and conduct a campaign more effectively for a candidate to succeed. When they are developed, factors and conditions that influence voters' decision-making are taken into account. Unfortunately, the theoretical comprehension of the organizational and technological experience of election campaigns is not fast enough,

which is explained by many reasons, including: excessive commercialization of this activity and, accordingly, the concealment of effective working methods. Genuine democratic elections are impossible without the development and appropriate development and use of electoral technologies. Electoral technologies are a kind of indicator on which one can judge the level of development of the electoral system of Kyrgyzstan.

### **Challenges and Opportunities:**

So, the Kyrgyz crowd on streets with countless demands now have enough room in one assembly hall of the National Parliament. There is no doubt about that for the coming years this place will be an arena for heated debates and an incubator for the country's most important decisions--a place directly relevant to the future of the Kyrgyz Republic. With these stakes, the quality of sixth convocation of Jogorku Kenesh has been a heated discussion in Kyrgyz society and on everybody's lips since the announcement of the election results. The new parliament has to solve problems left to it by predecessors: first of all, to form an effective and stable government, which will in turn help with creating jobs, reducing the unemployment and poverty rates, diversifying of national economy. At the moment, the Kyrgyz Republic endures flux of an economic crisis. Its external debt is well over half of its GDP. The number of citizens who have left country to send home remittances is close to one million, a substantial fraction for a six million-person country. How the voters' choices were appropriate for challenges of the current situation is hard to say (Manuel 2016). What does this all mean? Above all, it means that elections in the Kyrgyz Republic have stopped being a ruse of the ruling class. In this country, the institution of democracy has begun to work.

**CHAPTER-V**  
**CONCLUSION**



The journey of electoral democracy in Kyrgyzstan has been directly dependent on the chosen model of the political system, its openness, transparency, pluralism. Be it any country, its way to democracy evolves through a period of time, social and legal state through its political system consisting of presidents, governments, parliaments, political parties, elections, bureaucracy, media and other institutions. And the presence of parliament, elections and political parties is one of the mandatory characteristics of a modern democratic political system. The political system is an important instrument of transformation. Without planning the political system and its further modelling, it is impossible to achieve the goals stated in the constitution.

This study finds that the lack of traditions in the development of democracy has been compensated in the current realities by the adoption of clear, democratic acts and national development strategies. Of course, it seems necessary to fundamentally change the existing patron-client relations that have developed between the state, society and the individual, which is one of the main components of the historical process still undergoing.

The study begins with the hypothesis that parliamentary democracy is a way of bringing stability to the political system of Kyrgyzstan and that the state has taken a shift away from personality-centrism through periodic and systematic election being conducted since the break-up of the Soviet Union.

From an analysis the situation of today, it becomes clear that no particular system be it parliamentary or presidential can usher in real democratic spirit. But the former surely helps the country take a flight away from personality-centrism, which immediately after post Soviet break-up did not give the Kyrgyz populace a chance to experience a collective decision-making process. On the other hand, presence of divergent ideological parties competing with each other, provides voters with the opportunity to participate in the process of forming power structures and governing the state by their votes. Both elections and referendums have been a usual affair for the citizens for Kyrgyzstan. If seen from a general perspective, it seems quite ordinary but when one delves deep into the matter, the very fact that it is still a democracy seems incredible. As a country existing in an arid turf where the existence electoral democracy even if claimed by some countries is just stage-managed to please the international observers and safeguard the image of its authoritarian rulers.

This study has highlighted the role of the political system in revealing the effectiveness of a particular constitutional model, its impact on the process of forming a democratic society and political socialization of citizens is actualized in the mechanism of elections. However, the lack of sufficient knowledge in the republic on its conduct is an obstacle in keeping an optimum democratic quotient, creating important prerequisites for professional management in order to form an effective political system of Kyrgyzstan, following the example of advanced states.

The political system of Kyrgyzstan with independence and subsequent protest movements all the time was built to please certain political forces and individuals, during which the Kyrgyz Republic received such a bureaucratic and oligarchic political system that mainly served the interests of the social upper classes. Hence the origins of the state's inconsistent movement toward an electoral structure that renews itself from time to time.

Current President Atambaev at a recent meeting in April 2017 on sustainable development, summing up his results, shared his views on the strong influence of interest groups and social institutions in the functioning of its electoral system. President Atambaev also called for keeping the proportional system of elections as the best for today by introducing open party lists and depriving the leadership of the parties to arbitrarily change the list of candidates after the announcement of the voting results.

In the package of measures to reform the political system and the management system, this study has tried to understand the latest controversial changes in the Constitution of the country on strengthening the powers of the prime minister, introduced after the 2016 referendum.

One of the main tendencies of modern world social development is the increasing role of political parties in public life which has found a detailed place in the study. The importance of parties for the political life of modern society lies in the fact that they allow accumulating and actualizing the interests of various social strata and individual social groups, developing their political ideology. Kyrgyzstan has seen the proliferation of various parties which often form coalition governments to be in power. It is a healthy sign for a young democracy which wants to move from its image of a fragmented system to a more stable model of government.

The current political process in Kyrgyzstan necessarily finds some genuine political practices. For example, there are ideological parties and political elites, the practice of democratic

legitimization of the ruling class and competition of political groups. The allegation that it is just a circulation of elites has not even spared older democracies and this country is a newcomer into the arena of democratic systems.

To return to the political process of Kyrgyzstan, at least a minimal system, a well-thought-out scheme for managing the country from a single source of power is needed, which in the realities of Kyrgyzstan can only be the executive branch. The debate generally is about the relative distribution of power .

It has been found that in Kyrgyzstan, there is a process of changing political culture, associated with the dissemination of electoral democracy as an instrument and as a form of political self-organization of society. Under the influence of democracy, traditionalism is transformed, and liberal ideas are promoted. Yet, Kyrgyzstan is characterized by a formality that does not allow these values to be transformed into behavioral attitudes of the elite and society. Under these conditions, the forces of the traditional reaction are activated, which sometimes fuels the state of instability of the political system. Therefore, Kyrgyzstan is still in search of its development vector, it is drifting inconsistently between democracy and authoritarian tendencies, as a result of which its political system has not yet completely formed, and its current format is neither modern nor effective, not converting "democratic achievements" into economic good.

As a result of the post-Soviet transformation, a bureaucratic structure has emerged in Kyrgyzstan, that creates the field for electoral processes of the country. This sometimes explains the inconsistent and disordered development of democratic tendencies, when spontaneous, contradictory, and sometimes destructive actions are carried out in relation to the individual, society and the state.

It has also been found in the study that the political parties are gaining maturity, a model of parliamentarism has been chosen, executive discipline and responsibility have increased significantly, legal nihilism and other negative phenomena have been losing momentum which has helped to sustain the various transitions that Kyrgyzstan has undergone .

Parliament, parties and elections are the most important tool for democratic stability and the reproduction of effective power. Therefore, special attention should be paid to their architecture, their interaction. And the work on the content of reforms, the methodology of

development, the ability to make reasonable conclusions from mistakes, and turn minuses into positive things are being mainstreamed.

Democratic changes introduced in the legislation on the parliament, elections and political parties can fundamentally change the design of the political system, the role of parties in the electoral process and, accordingly, the role of parliament in the life of the state. In this regard, it is necessary to propose measures and solutions that make it possible in general to bring together and improve interaction between the institutions of the political system. Factors must be analyzed that need to be taken into account when modeling the political system. But correct and conscious choice of a model is a responsible step, not a technical decision only, so the holding of regular elections remains a prerogative.

The Kyrgyz experience shows that it is necessary for policy-makers to have good skills and knowledge in order to find their optimal models, to be able to combine different institutions, elements, mechanisms. The state should not have one model or system suitable for all times and cases or just emulate Western models.

The study finds that planning of the political system in Kyrgyzstan took place with the involvement of both internal and external agents. Such a voluntaristic approach nevertheless leads the country to serious crises at times. But in successful and democratic countries, the political system is always modeled. For example, presidential, parliamentary and local elections are held flexibly for different electoral systems. The interrelation between the party and electoral systems determines their impact not only on the form of democracy, but also on its fate.

The introduction, for example, of a proportional electoral system in the early phase of the development of democracy, in the absence of established parties, as is the case in Kyrgyzstan, created difficulties for the party system. This in a way led to fragmentation of the party system and mushrooming of parties. Also the proportional system is considered the most democratic and contributes more than the first past the post system, to ensure the implementation of the democratic principle of political representation.

Presidential elections, for example, in France, usually precede parliamentary elections. Thus, the party of the victorious president is given a legitimate chance to form a presidential majority in the parliament, without which it will be difficult for him to fulfill his election promises. But

to get into the right electoral cycle, it was necessary to synchronize the terms of the presidential and legislature mandate. In this regard, the term of the presidential mandate was reduced from 7 to 5 years, i.e. up to the term of the legislature's mandate. In Kyrgyzstan, for comparison, most of the presidential and parliamentary elections were held ahead of schedule or as a result of the dissolution of the parliament, and the pro-presidential majority in the parliament was formed although there were allegations of rigging.

The domestic electoral system is characterized by frequent replacement (four times), as well as different terms of management mandates, has tried to develop synchronism in holding presidential, parliamentary and local elections. This leads to unnecessary financial waste, makes elections in the country ruinous and do not correspond to the country's economic opportunities. The parties should, during the five-year period, approximately 3 times - during the election of the President of the Kyrgyz Republic, in parliamentary and local elections, spend serious finances on elections. Such expenses are not available to all parties, especially to young ones. In developed countries mostly, as a rule, presidential, parliamentary and local elections unite are conducted on the same day. This approach allows a system to create a vertical of power in a natural way, ensure cooperation between local and central bodies, stabilize power, and increase its effectiveness. Thus, in the subjects of the Federation of Russia, where local elections were once turned into an endless process, the law introduced a "single voting day", August 15, 2005. Accordingly, the terms of mandates of deputies of the above-mentioned levels were extended or reduced by law. A single term of the mandate of deputies of all levels - 5 years - was also established.

In Kyrgyzstan it is spontaneous again because this process is not planned and managed by anyone, a multi-party system has emerged that is the most vibrant among all the known party systems. With such a model, parties often form a coalition in order to attain power. And the government change has been rapid in the case of this country but it's not an unhealthy sign for democracy.

In over 25 years there have been many parties that built the bedrock of democracy in Kyrgyzstan. It's not a small achievement that this country has seen the proliferation of so many parties surrounded by authoritarian regimes. Quite positively, these parties have never questioned the efficacy of democracy for their system, instead they have been the harbingers of the same.

Democratization of the political system has become an important factor in the modernization of Kyrgyz society. Elections, being an integral part of the democratic political system and at the same time an integral part of the political process, act as the main way of political participation of citizens, an instrument for changing power through the will of the population, a mechanism for its legitimization and stabilization. They are turning into the main link in the process of democratization of the country.

A very special role in the electoral process is played by the media acting as one of the main tools of political socialization, helping citizens to integrate and adapt to the political process and, ultimately, providing a decisive influence on the formation of electoral culture of the society.

Kyrgyzstan's idea of implementation of parliamentarianism emerged in a critical condition, the country experienced a radical change in the political system. The most important point is the development of political parties, since the success of the parliamentary system depends on the quality of the parties, which should be strong and have a clear and elaborated concept of development of the country. The second important point is the process of implementing the idea of a parliamentary republic. In this regard, the development of parliamentarism led to the rise of the new elite. It is related to how much the elite is obsessed with the patriotic feelings of strengthening, and how much they are able to solve the deepest problems not from the point of view of the priority of personal interests and ambitions. Thus, the two factors – the development of political parties and presence of the new elite – are working for the implementation of the higher goal of parliamentarism. The Kyrgyz Republic's success in building a parliamentary democracy in a country, not to mention in a unhelpful environment, might encourage supporters of this development model beyond its borders too, contrary to the opinion of the sceptics. The appearance of a parliamentary democracy at such close proximity to its neighbours is regarded as dangerous by some and as a chance for changes by others.

Therefore, broadly the study has showcased that the electoral structures set the core foundation of the functioning of a modern democratic state and contributes to the transformation of the political system of the societies in transition as in Kyrgyzstan. With the penetration of diverse parties the state could not for long concentrate power in a some specific group of elites, so there has been a move away from personality centric politics.

# **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

(\*indicates primary source)

Abazov, Rafiz (2000), "Democracy in Kyrgyzstan in the context of recent elections", *Contemporary Central Asia*, 4(2): 51-58.

Ahrari, M.E.(1996), *The New Great Game of Muslim Central Asia*, Washington D.C: Institute for National Strategic Studies.

Aidaraliev, A.A. (1998), "Problems and ways of providing human activities in the mountains of Central Asia", *Himalayan and Central Asian studies*, 2(3): 147-55.

Akbarzadeh, S. (1997), "Political shape of Central Asia", *Central Asian Survey*, 16(4) 517-542.

Akiner, Shirin.(1999), *Political and Economic Trends in Central Asia*, London: British Academic Press.

Anderson ,John.(2002) , *Kyrgyzstan:Central Asia's Island of Democracy?*, London: Harwood Academic Press.

Ayearst, Morley and Munro William Bennett(1959), *The Governments of Europe*, New York: Macmillin.

Badan, Phool ( 2001), "Emerging political system in Central Asia in the post Soviet period", *India Quarterly*, 7 (3).

Bakina, M.A.(1991), *New Political Parties and Movement in Soviet Union*, New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Batalden, Stephen K., and Sandra L. Batalden (1993), *The Newly Independent States of Eurasia: Handbook of Former Soviet Republics*, Phoenix: Oryx.



Beyer, Judith.(2006) ,“Rhetoric of Transformation. The Case of the Kyrgyz Constitutional Reform” in Andrea Berg, Anna Kreikemeyer (eds.), *Realities of Transformation* , 43-63.

Brudny ,A. (1998), "Kyrgyzstan ,Island of Democracy" *Contemporary Central Asia*, 2(1):6-8.

Bunce V. (2003) , “Electoral Systems and Elite-bargaining in Central Asia” , *International Studies Review* , 5(2) : 270-272.

\* Constitution of Kyrgyzstan, 5 May 1993, Bishkek, URL: <http://www.gov.kg/17/4/2017>.

\*Constitution Kyrgyz Republic,1996, URL: <https://www.uta.edu/cpsees/KYRGCON2.htm>-  
[accessed 20/4/2017](https://www.uta.edu/cpsees/KYRGCON2.htm).

\*Constitution of Kyrgyz Republic, Bishkek 2003, URL: <http://www.gov.kg/5/5/2017>.

\*Constitution of Kyrgyz Republic, Bishkek 2007, URL: <http://www.gov.kg/7/5/2017>.

Chenoy, Anuradha M. (2001), *The Making of New Russia*, New Delhi: Har Anand Publications.

Dani, Ahmad Hussan(1993), *New Light on Central Asia*, Delhi: Renaissance Publishing house.

Dahl, Robert A. (1998), *On Democracy*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Diamond, L (1999), *Developing Democracy Toward Consolidation*, New York: Johns Hopkins University.

Engvall, Johan. (2007), “Kyrgyzstan: Anatomy of State”, *Problems of Post-Communism*, 54(4):33-45.

\*Election Code of the Kyrgyz Republic, Bishkek, 1999.

\*Election Code of the Kyrgyz Republic, Bishkek, 2000.

\*Election Code of the Kyrgyz Republic, Bishkek, 2003.

\*Election Code of the Kyrgyz Republic, Bishkek, 2007.

Eugene , H. (1995) “The Rise of Contested Politics in Central Asia: Elections in Kyrgyzstan,1989–90,” *Europe-Asia Studies*, 47(5) : 819- 820.

Fairbanks, Charles H.(2007), “Revolution Reconsidered,” *Journal of Democracy*, 18(1): 42-57.

Fish, Steven (2005), *Democracy Derailed in Russia: The Failure of Open Politics*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gel'man, Vladimir (2003) “Post-Soviet Transition and Democratization: Toward Theory Building”, *Democratization*, 10(2): 87-104.

Glenn, John (1999) , *The Soviet Legacy in Central Asia* ,Basingstoke : Macmillian.

Glenn, John (1999), *The Soviet Legacy of Central Asia*, New York: Palgrave.

Grugel, Jean.(2000) , *Democratization: A Critical Introduction*, Palgrave Macmillian.

Hayek, Friedrich, *The Consitution of Liberties* (Chicago University Press, 1960).

Hey wood, Andrew (2000), *Key Concepts in Politics*, London: Macmillan Press.

Hiro, Dilip (1994), *Between Marx and Muhammad: The Changing Face of Central Asia*, London: Harper Collina.

Hopkin, Peter (1992), *The Great Game in Central Asia*, New York: Kondasha International.

Huntington, Samuel P.(1991), "Democracy's Third Wave", *Journal of Democracy*, 2(2).

Huntington, Samuel P.(1991), *The third wave: democratization in the late twentieth century*, London: University of Oklahoma Press.

Huskey, E. (1997) "Kyrgyzstan: the Fate of Political Liberalization," in Karen Dawisha and Bruce Parrott (eds.) *Conflict, Cleavage, and Change in Central Asia and the Caucasus*, Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Lijphart, A (1980), *Democracy in Plural Societies: A Comparative Exploration*, Yale: Yale University.

Mainwaring, Scott.(1998) , "Party Systems in the Third Wave" , *Journal of Democracy*, 9(3) : 67 -81.

Marat , E. (2015) , "Kyrgyzstan : beyond democratic elections" , [Online: web] Accessed on 15 October 2016 ,URL: <http://www.ifes.org/weekly/analyticalarticles>.

Manz, B.(1994), *Central Asia in Historical Perspective* , Washington D.C: Westview Press.

Matveeva, Anna (1996) , "Democratization, legitimacy and political change in Central Asia", *Iranian Journal of International Affairs*, 7(4) : 834-53.

Megoran, Nick(1999), "Theorizing gender, ethnicity and the nation state in Central Asia", *Central Asian Survey*,18(1) : 121-24

Jalalzai, M.K. (1992) , *Central Asia, Political Situation and Economic Opportunities*, Lahore: Frontier Post Publications.

Juraev,S.(2012), "Is Kyrgyzstan's new system sustainable", PONARS Eurasia policy,[Online:Web] Accessed on 7 April 2017 URL:[http:// www.ponarseurasia.org/](http://www.ponarseurasia.org/).

Huskey, Eugene (1995), "The Rise of Contested Politics in Central Asia: Elections in Kyrgyzstan 1989–1990", *Europe-Asia Studies* 47(5): 813–33.

Kirkpatrick, J.J (1984), "Democratic Elections and Democratic Government", 147(2): 61-69.

Kurmanov, Z. (2004), "Evolution in the Party Structure in Kyrgyzstan," *Central Asia and the Caucasus*, 5 (29):7.

\**Kyrgyz Republic Parliamentary Elections*, 10 October, 2010, OSCE/ODIHR Election Observation Mission Report, Warsaw  
Aras, B. (1997), "US-Central Asian Relations: A view from Turkey", *Middle East Review of International Affairs* 1(1)

\*Official Department of Justice Website accessed on 15/4/2017: <http://minjust.gov.kg/>

Olcott, M. (2005), *Central Asia's Second Chance*, Washington DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Palat, Madhavan K.(1991), "Emergence of Central Asia", *Indian Historical Review*, 18(1):76-92.

Patnaik, A. (1996), "*Central Asia Between Modernity and Tradition*", Delhi: Konark Publishers.

Patnaik, Ajay and P. William (2002), "Contemporary Conference, Present and Future", *Asian Affairs*, 33(1): 18-24.

Petric, Boris-Mathieu (2005), "Post-Soviet Kyrgyzstan or the Birth of a Globalized Protectorate", *Central Asian Survey*, 24(3) : 319-322.

Ploshikh, V.(1998), "Kyrgyz people history and culture" *Contemporary Central Asia*, 2(2): 1-3.

Pye, L.W. (1958), "The-Non-Western Political Process", *Journal of Politics*, 20(3): 469.

Rafiz,A.(2000), "Democracy in Kyrgyzstan in the context of recent elections" *Contemporary Central Asia*,4(2): 51-53.

Roland, Gregord(2002), "The Political Economy of Transition", *Journal of Economic Perspective*,16(1): 29-50.

Rotor, Igor (1992), "Kyrgyzstan: Capitalist Experiment in Central Asia," *Current Digest of the Post-Soviet Press*,44(8): 4-5.

Rustow, Dankwart A. (1999), "Transition to Democracy: Toward a Dynamic Model", in Lisa Anderson (ed), *Transition to Democracy*, Columbia: Columbia University Press.

Sajoo,A.B.(2002), "*Civil Society in the Muslim World Comparative Perspectives*", London: Institute of Ismaili Studies.

Sartori,G. (1976), "*Parties and Party Systems: A Framework for Analysis*", Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.

Silverstein, Brian (2002), " Discipline, Knowledge and imperial power in CentralAsia: 19th century notes for a genealogy of social forms" *Central Asian Survey*, 2(1): 91-105.

Shams-ud-din, *Secularisation in the USSR*, New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House.

Sharma, R.R.(1979), *A Marxist Model of Social Change :Soviet Central Asia 1917-40*, New Delhi: Macmillan.

Starr, S. Frederick (1996), "Making Euresia Stable", *Foreign Affairs*, 75(1): 80-92.

Tabyshalieva, Anara. (2003), "The Kyrgyz Republic on the Verge of Change?", *Helsinki Monitor*, 14(3) 233-241.

Taylor, Michelle M and Casper Gretchen (1996), *Negotiating Democracy: Transitions from Authoritarian Rule*, Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press.

\*Transparency International (2015) , Corruption by country . retrieved October 16,2016 from Corruption perceptions index report : <https://www.transparency.org/cpi2015/>.

\*United Nations (2010), International Human Development Indicators. Retrieved January 14,2017, from Human Development Reports: <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/>

Walker, Edward W(2003), “ Islam, Islamism and Political Order in Central Asia”, *Journal of International Affairs*, 56(2):21-42.

Ware, A.(1996), “*Political Parties and Party Systems*”, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Way, Lucan (2008), “The Real Causes of the Color Revolutions”, *Journal of Democracy*, 19(3) : 55-69.

William, Fierman(1989), "Religion and nationalism in Soviet Central Asia", *Problems of Communism*, 38(4) July:123-127.

William, Tordoff(1995), "Local Government in Kyrgyzstan" *Public Administration and Development*, 15(2): 495-505.

Wheeler, Geoffrey (1996), *The Peoples of Soviet Central Asia*, London: Bodley Head.

Zhang, B. (1993), " Institutional Aspects of Reform and the Democratization of the Communist Regimes", *Communist and Post- Communist Studies*, 26(2): 165-181.