

Newsletter of the Institute for Public Policy

# KYRGYZSTAN BRIEF



Issue No.3, February - March 2006

**Topic of the issue:*****Ishenbai Abdurazakov:***

“We need an ideology which will serve our national goal. At the present stage, there is only one goal – to progress, to move forward and not to turn into a world village, an ethnographic museum.” – p. 5

## CONTENTS

<b>National ideology: forward or backward?</b> <i>Muratbek Imanaliev</i> .....	2
<b>National ideology: choosing the direction</b> <i>Roundtable transcript</i> .....	4
<b>Guest of the issue:</b> <i>Sultan Raev</i> .....	13
<b>Appointments problems in civil service</b> <i>Roundtable transcript</i> .....	15
<b>Who in Kyrgyzstan supports liberal democracy?</b> <i>Melissa Burn</i> .....	24
<b>Self-identification of modern Kyrgyz society</b> <i>Elmira Nogoybaeva</i> .....	29
<b>Social and economic risks and their impact on the political stability in Kyrgyzstan</b> <i>Gulasel Abylova</i> .....	32

## ABOUT IPP

**The Institute for Public Policy (IPP)** is an independent, non-partisan research and policy-making institution, based in Bishkek. Its goals are to develop and promote participatory approach in establishing public policy; to strengthen expert analysis in order to promote effective decision-making in matters of public policy and to create an independent platform for dialogue on public policy issues. The Institute provides expert consulting, research and surveys on Central Asian affairs, conflict management services as well as implementation of educational and cultural projects aimed at good governance.

**Institute for Public Policy**

42/1 Isanov kochosu  
Bishkek 720017  
Kyrgyzstan

**Tel/Fax: +996(312) 215763**

**Email: office@ipp.kg**

**Website: <http://www.ipp.kg>**

**The publication was supported by grants from:**

**OSI Assistance  
Foundation**

**UK Embassy  
Almaty**

No part of this publication may be reproduced without permission of the Institute for Public Policy



## NATIONAL IDEOLOGY: FORWARD OR BACKWARD?

Muratbek Imanaliev \*

National ideology is a topic worth discussing, at least currently. Hence, the state recently became concerned with this issue: an ad hoc commission was set up, tasked with drafting a project for Kyrgyzstan's national ideology and submitting it to the President and parliament by February 20. Such a situation should be well known to middle aged and elderly people, paralleling our recent history: a strive to send down from above some sort of a "Code of a constructor...." Probably, this code will be something of a combination (though not a synthesis) of traditionalism, liberalism, communism and, perhaps, nationalism. I suppose that the main thesis of this intellectual product will resemble the following: "The Kyrgyz national state will strengthen democracy and market economy, although strictly controlling these spheres by taking into account the traditions and history of the Kyrgyz people."

Perhaps, national ideology (if it is indeed needed) comprises certain cultural, political and economic reference points, which are formed on the basis of a national value system. However, to be guided in this context by something from the distant past means building an ethnographic museum – a quasi-state, which will be visited by a few foreign tourists – lovers of exotic.

To start with, it is obvious that we should acknowledge at the level of national consciousness and perception the achievements of others. Rather than imitate and copy, we should learn what is considered to be advanced and progressive in the contemporary world, as Japan and other Asian states have done for example. Acknowledging other's achievements does not mean mechanically applying them in one's life and trying to become "civilized clones;" rather it means carefully and critically absorbing the best features. It is only the intellectual elite that can learn from other's experience and achievements. The intellectual elite is

not merely the totality of highly educated people; it is a highly qualified group of people with ideas, which will take the country out of crisis and lead it forward. However, it is important to remember that formation of elites is a matter of time. It is also known that national culture and religion are not hindering this process, unless the latter are dressed up ideologically, including forms such as chauvinism, nationalism, fascism, etc.

Therefore, I will express a contradictory and paradoxical view (which is debatable moreover): National ideology should be de-ideologized.

It is known that to build a competitive state, three mandatory elements are required:

1) a socio-economic basis, 2) totality of cultural values, and 3) behavioral parameters of the leaders of the nation.

A socio-economic basis, as I view it, means the formation of a socio-economic space which is harmoniously built into international economic relations. A socio-economic space is a national economic culture which denies earning through begging.

Cultural values are not necessarily only material and spiritual achievements. They are, first of all, a culture of interactions between people of different categorical sectors. They are also a culture of abiding laws, which unfortunately is lacking in Kyrgyzstan. Unless the question of "**What is stronger in Kyrgyzstan – a law or family connections, a law or a phone call?**" does not disappear from our lives (in favor of law), there is no point in talking about abiding laws.

Behavioral parameters of leaders mean a behavioral culture of the elite, which is still non-existent in our country. Why leaders or elite in particular? Because it is the leaders who lead

\* Muratbek Imanaliev is President of the Institute for Public Policy, Associate Professor of the American University-Central Asia.

the people, and not vice versa. I am not talking about future generations and other things, which is related to the nonmaterial sphere of our people's lives.

In order to achieve the abovementioned goals, we should start with building or creating the following foundations:

- Self-identification of the citizens of the country;
- Formation of elites;
- Creation of a national value system.

Self-identification is a very complicated process. Ethnic, civic, economic, or cultural self-identification – what comes first? I believe we should promote all.

Political, economic, intellectual, military, or academic elites – which is more important? I think all are important.

Formation of a national value system, as it appears to me, should start from the only correct idea, related to identity and elites. That idea is the following: nation as co-citizenship, and responsibility for each and all.

And the last question – why seven? The answer is simple – seven is a lucky number for Kyrgyzstan.

The following “Project for the future Kyrgyzstan” is a call for discussion and reflection.

### Project for the future Kyrgyzstan

#### 1. Seven priorities:

- priority of Kyrgyz statehood;
- priority of forming and consolidating an “internal national power base;”
- priority of democratic government;
- priority of independent attitudes;
- priority of complete integration into the international community;
- priority of security and progress;
- priority of mountains and water.

#### 2. Seven cults:

- cult of the future of the nation and belief in God;

- cult of ancestors;
- cult of family;
- cult of freedom;
- cult of law;
- cult of education;
- cult of health.

#### 3. Seven freedoms:

- freedom of the individual;
- freedom of speech;
- freedom of conscience;
- freedom of choice;
- freedom of movement;
- freedom of owning property and handing it down to children;
- freedom of fully enjoying one's achievements.

#### 4. Seven qualities:

- quality of individual persons;
- quality of government;
- quality of labor and its results;
- quality of housing;
- quality of nourishment;
- quality of water;
- quality of land.

#### 5. Seven senses:

- sense of patriotism;
- sense of duty;
- sense of solidarity;
- sense of dignity;
- sense of novelty and progress;
- sense of justice;
- sense of comfort and its achievement.

#### 6. Seven conditions:

- condition of unity;
- condition of forming and realizing the National idea;
- condition of possessing a national economic culture;
- condition of the absence of hostile environment;
- condition of developing political, intellectual and economic elites;
- condition of balanced relations within a triangle of “individual-society-state” and of forming a new behavioral culture;
- condition of support on the part of the world community.



INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY

7. Seven evils:

- evil of provincialism and marginal thinking;
- evil of universal vulnerability;
- evil of alcoholism, drug addiction and criminality;
- evil of laziness and dependence;
- evil of excessive illusions and mythmaking;
- evil of failing to acknowledge other's

- achievements;
- evil of traditionalism.

**50. We are no better and no worse than others.**

NATIONAL IDEOLOGY: CHOOSING THE DIRECTION

*A roundtable on the topic of national ideology was held at the Institute for Public Policy on 22 February 2006. Ishenbai Abdurazakov, former State Secretary of the Kyrgyz Republic; Valentin Bogatyrev, Director of the International Institute for Strategic Studies under the President of the Kyrgyz Republic, adviser of the President of the Kyrgyz Republic, and Muratbek Imanaliev, President of the Institute for Public Policy were invited as the main speakers. Independent experts, representatives of research centers, political parties and public organizations also took part in the discussion. The discussion touched the issues of national self-identification, national goals and practical implementation of ideology. Below is the transcript of the roundtable.*

**Ishenbai Abdurazakov:** There is a lot of talk about ideology at present; however, it is unclear what type of ideology people are talking about, as the notion of ideology has many meanings. One can talk about ideology merely as a system of various ideas – political, economic, legal, etc. One can talk about moral norms, which is also a part of the world-outlook approach to the realities of life. Some say that religion is not ideology, but as a matter of fact, it is also ideology. Ideology is manifold. It could be class-based, which is Marxist ideology with utterly different principles, different approaches, and which has pretensions to offering global solutions to issues faced by humankind. You also know how it ended. Nevertheless, there are a lot of questions, and it is premature to have a final say over their resolution, because Marxism, as it appears to me, is a secularized ideal of justice, transformed from Christianity to political reality.

**There is a lot of talk about ideology today; however, it is unclear what type of ideology people are talking about.**

should either talk about some ethno-cultural ideological approach (specifically about a Kyrgyz ideological approach) or about the ideology of a country, a state, in which not only ethnic Kyrgyz reside. If we talk about state ideology, then we should have other parameters and approaches, i.e. it is necessary to approve those ideological norms which would be shared by all citizens of our country; otherwise, it will not work. Those who carry a banner of ideology claim that it is impossible to live without ideology. They claim that all shortcomings, all evils are due to the obscurity of the existing ideology. People, especially those of the older generation, claim that under the Soviet system there was a certain organization of work, that we used to reach certain goals or over fulfill plans, that the crime rate was not as high as today, that there was no prostitution, that relations between people were not as rough as today. There was a certain system, which is non-existent today, but it is impossible to mechanically apply that system in today's reality. Others claim that we, Kyrgyz, once upon a time lived in ideal society with no theft or crime, that everyone deferring to seniors, that there were many things resembling Confucianism... As evidence of this ideal life, they cite proverbs, sayings that have survived. But the folklore reflects negative, sarcastic, and

Today, we live in a pragmatic world, realistically speaking. What should we talk about then? We

**Ishenbai Abdurazakov**

1991-1994 – Consul General of the USSR/  
Russia in Sapporo, Japan;

1994-1996 – Adviser to the President of the  
Kyrgyz Republic;

1996-1999 – State Secretary of the Kyrgyz  
Republic.

Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Dip-  
lomatic Academy of the Ministry of Foreign  
Affairs, Member of the Board of Trustees of  
the American University – Central Asia.

ironic assessments as well. This is on the one hand. On the other hand, many cultural values reflected a certain level of development. If people lived in mountains and they did not have certain material values; each had as much as the other did. Therefore, was there any point in stealing anything? But at the same time, theft thrived in a different form – abaction.

On the one hand, to apply values of distant history is utopian; on the other hand it is unclear how can we restore the past back under conditions of market economy. Therefore, it appears to me that we should not talk about some moral ideology; instead, we should talk more about a national goal. Do our people have a certain dream – what kind of people do we want to become? Do we want to become people according to our epic notions, which as a matter of principle is impossible? Or, do we want to adjust to the present day and utilize the yet unspent, living intellectual potential of our people? If we pose questions this way, then we should reason differently. Then issues of creative activity and moral health of the society come into the foreground. What is creative? Each person, citizen, Kyrgyz should be able to create something; and to do this he or she needs knowledge. There is need for science and technology – things that will enable our people to move forward, to raise the level of culture, and to coexist on equal terms with more developed countries. We do have such abilities. We often criticize ourselves, Kyrgyz, for being lazy, and we should admit that it is indeed so. When I compare in general our society, our public with other countries, specifically Far Eastern, it seems that we are so lazy; that is the limit. We do not like laboring much, but realizing the necessity of labor is a completely

different notion, is it not? This is where some issues related to our present values originate.

Many say that Western ideology and Western values contradict our national foundations. I absolutely disagree with this. We have pure Kyrgyz, Islamic and Turkic values. In many instances they came into contact or related with other similar values, and no culture, no civilization can claim a monopoly in producing and maintaining moral or other values. If we refer to Islamic values, we can locate the same values in Christianity. Scholars know very well that the Koran, and Islam in general, is a continuation, a branch of Christianity. For a long time Islam was viewed as a Christian sect. Those who have read Dante's Divine Comedy know that Muhammad was sent to hell for becoming a sectarian, having abandoned Christianity... Our moral and other legacies are no different in terms of quality from many others. Especially if we compare it with Chinese-Confucian values, then we will see many things in common. It is a different matter that the ideas of Confucianism were gradually being implemented in life during the course of many years, and have become a norm of life for many. We keep talking about them over and over, but observe them very seldom – nobody can deny this.

We need an ideology which will serve our national goal. At the present stage, there is only one goal – to achieve progress for our country; to move forward and not lag behind others; not to turn into a world village, an ethnographic museum. We are as smart as others are; therefore, we should utilize our potential. Now many say that globalization is a misfortune, God's punishment. Yet, it is reality and we cannot escape it. Civilization is bypassing us, but the sooner we adapt, the better for us. We should prepare for this eventuality.

**Muratbek Imanaliev:** The main problem of our people is that we do not have anything to push off from. The history of our people is nothing more than a myth, a mythologized understanding of what happened. Like Chukchas, for example, have a conception that they have traveled to the Moon. It is the same situation here, but more overgrown with legends. Mythologized calques of one of the histories of another people.

**Muratbek Imanaliev**

President of the Institute for Public Policy  
In 1991-1992 and 1997-2002 served as  
Minister of Foreign Affairs of Kyrgyzstan;  
1993-96 – Ambassador of Kyrgyzstan to the  
People's Republic of China.

Imanaliev is chairman of the political council  
of the Justice and Progress Party; co-founder  
of Jany Bagyt Movement and Associate  
Professor at the American University –  
Central Asia.

The problem is that there is no documented history, even nowadays. History is not only about events; history is philosophy, mode of life, economics, fundamental things which the people had. People often talk about certain traditions which were very good. I often argue with our so-called traditionalists that traditions as constructions of social, political, and economic life, as I see them, have not survived. They survived as certain thesis information in the historical memory of the people. For instance, they tried to revive a court of the elderly – to “exhume” it, to pull it out from the grave. But it failed, as in reality the memory of the people has preserved only a thesis that this court of the elderly once existed. They cannot figure out how the court functioned. Therefore, in forming a national ideology we do not have anything to push off from. As a result, there is a problem of the identity of the nation. Since there is no documented history, we scarcely see ourselves within some geography, within a frame of reference, such as those that are known to European people and certain groups of Asian people. For example, if we take a broad, large-scale, galactic identity, then it is not even clear whether Kyrgyz are Asians or non-Asians. This big question deals with a more specific system of coordination, related to regional identity and identity in a nomadic world. Since there is no basic identity element of our history, it is very difficult to move forward.

Living in the year 2006, we try to imitate Americans or Europeans like novices; we want to live like them. But the problem is that all four world revolutions occurred far away from the vast region that we are living in. I mean the English, French, American and October

revolutions, no matter how paradoxical it may sound coming from me. As a matter of fact, in 1917 the local population, including its intellectual elite, absolutely did not understand what had happened. For many people, a red tsar replaced a white tsar, which did not provide a push off for identity either.

A culture of thinking is a very important component, and it requires years and certain efforts on the part of the nation in general. From my point of view, several layers represent a world outlook structure. What we currently feel is a layer of shamanism: some pre-historic conception of oneself and the surrounding world. There is barbarian communism, which was absolutely inapplicable in Central Asia. There is Islam, though it is only ceremonial Islam, particularly in northern Kyrgyzstan. Theology as the study of religion is non-existent here. Nobody here dealt with it properly – only strangers. In general, the population does not accept or understand Islam. Finally, what we acquired is some mosaic of very fragmented elements – liberalism for example, which we also understand utterly ridiculously: “well, since there is democracy and liberalism, it means that you can do whatever you want.” It is striking that these four layers did not result in synthesis; they function separately. Therefore, depending on the situation, a certain layer operates in each person. For example, when a person sits in the “White House” and holds negotiations with someone from the West, he is a liberal and a democrat to the core because the layer related to that specific situation and perception starts operating in him. At home, the same person behaves as a feudal lord – talks about Islamic ceremonial things, that a wife should obey her husband, etc. When it comes to health, he remembers some shamanistic things.

All these things are important for an understanding of where we could proceed at all. Therefore, from this point of view, I think that it is very difficult to talk about a certain national ideology, to try to do something so that everyone would understand it. The search for all of this is taking place during very difficult times of general degradation of the country. When I talk about degradation and dehumanization of

social relations, it does not mean that we are entering some darkness. Degradation and dehumanization, as you may know from the laws of dialectics, possess hidden positive element which could push us forward. It could indeed happen, if we do not cross the line, of course, as in Africa. Therefore, in this case I also think that we should talk about a certain national idea, a national dream.

The material aspect of life, unfortunately, has absorbed the nonmaterial, spiritual sphere of the life of humankind for several recent centuries. The so-called American dream, American dollar, and American flag have struck an especially difficult and unbalanced blow. People want to live rich lives by any means – some by stealing, others want to honestly earn, etc. In contrast, the national goal should be free from being an ideologized or overly materialized idea, because authentic values address spiritual life, not material. For instance, relations between the elderly and children – respect to seniors. Unfortunately, I do not see any respect on the part of the youth towards the seniors, or of men towards women.

I am convinced that the nonmaterial sphere of life plays a bigger role compared to material, i.e. the economy, etc. I will mention the following example: In 1963, Korea and Zambia had the same starting positions in economic terms. In ten years, the Korean economy exceeded the Zambian economy four times, notwithstanding the fact that Zambia still exports strategic raw materials, whereas Korea did not enjoy such opportunities. It means that something other than materialism is the basis for the development of the economy. It could be the same Confucianism – certain national Korean values.... Remember the year 1998, when Koreans stood in lines and handed over their valuables in order to save their country. Could the same thing happen here? I doubt it – not because the population is poor, but because there is an entirely different system. I think it would be preferable to achieve all of this by relying on the very important postulate that the nation is a fellow-citizenship of people residing in this country. This is a very serious problem for me. Is the titular ethnicity – Kyrgyz,

its elite, intellectual part, if it still has internal mechanisms for self-development – able to advance the idea that all ethnicities living here are fellow-citizens? Currently, 20 percent of the population of Kyrgyzstan (irrespective of their ethnicity) are not citizens of this country. People have Russian or Kazakh citizenships, and in the south Uzbek citizenship. That is, they do not see themselves as citizens of this country, and try to acquire the citizenship of their historic homeland.

Besides a culture of thinking, which could be developed only on the basis of very serious education, I think that it is very important to have a national-economic culture, that this is a very important aspect. If you deal with political science, then you should know that a socio-economic basis, cultural values, and conduct of leaders determine a country's development in one direction or another. Therefore, economic culture is very important. We should learn to do something well, and learn something new. Of course, there is also the culture of abiding law. It would be very good to adapt this culture in Kyrgyzstan. Currently, legislation as such exists on its own, while real life also exists on its own. Therefore, the formation of a culture of abiding law is also a major issue for us. First of all, Kyrgyz should answer the following question: what is stronger in this country – a law or family relations, a law or a phone call? This is very important.

**Valentin Bogatyrev:** I think it is complete nonsense that they are going to write some ideology, because ideologies are not written. There are many ideological spaces coexisting in Kyrgyzstan, and division into our own space or that of aliens follows adherence to certain ideas. Indeed we deal with four ideas of different origins: traditional Kyrgyz ideology, Soviet, Western, and, lately, we feel the influence of Islamic ideology. When I talk about influence, I do not mean Kyrgyz Islamic culture, which is characterized by a particular softness; I mean modern Islamic culture in a sufficiently politicized format. This Islamic culture is one of the determining ideological factors which influence ideology.



### Valentin Bogatyrev

Director of the International Institute for Strategic Studies under the President of Kyrgyzstan and Adviser to the President of Kyrgyzstan

In 1988-91 served as Deputy Minister of People's Education of Kyrgyzstan; 1989-95 – director, co-director of Central Asian School of Cultural Politics; 1995-2002 - director of the Institute for Ethnic Politics. Bogatyrev is chairman of the Board of Trustees of the European Club in Kyrgyzstan.

What do those writing ideology want? They say: we will choose some package and declare it a national idea. Immediately I have several questions: What principles and what basis will guide their choice of sampling? Who will decide that specifically these or those ideas should make up national ideology, and why they? It is completely unclear. On what can we base it? There are many examples in history. You can look backward to the past and rely on some cultural values, or you can look forward and define what goal we want to achieve. Our commission on ideology has not done even this work, although it would make understandable how and on what principles we will form this ideological picture.

There are various ideologies, all of which have a right to exist. And there is a question: Why and what for? Who will use this or that ideology?

Ideology emerges only when the people face desparation. Desparation is a situation in which it is impossible to resolve one's problems with the help of available resources and means. It seems to me that we are in this very situation, and it results in very large activeness in life. For instance, Kazakhs are better off; they have a lot of money and they do not want to change anything, whereas we want to change many things. All these talks about ideology, searching for a national idea – all of this means that finally there is a need in the society to answer the question: what should we do next? I absolutely agree with my colleagues: the main thing is the issue of national goals. This is a key issue. How can you draft a constitution and start reforms

without knowing the purpose for which you are doing it?! In order to achieve a certain goal, you need a certain constitution – for instance, strict and authoritarian – there is only a President in the country, no parliament at all. In order to achieve a different goal, you need a completely

**Ideology emerges only when the people are not able to resolve their problems with the help of available resources and means.**

different constitution – with no President at all, but with national *kurultai* – a grand assembly. However, the work being done now is useless, a political “game.”

Goals are a very interesting issue. Nazarbaev recently stated: “Kazakhstan should be among top 50 most developed countries of the world.” It is a great goal. The entire country accepted this as an idea. What is it based on? There is such a notion as Kazakh pretension. These are good quality people; these are very ambitious people; and it is through ambitions that one makes history. How about Kyrgyz? What should be the basis, so that we stand up and move? I do not have the answer to this question. As long as there is no answer to this question, all these ideas about a country of service, industrial plants, and ethno-museums will not go anywhere. We published a book titled “Kyrgyzstan 2025,” which has a set of strategies. But this projection does not mean that we know how to enact it so that something would happen and a real ideology would emerge, so that it would become a real driving force. Besides problematisation, we should be able to form a goal, and for that one more thing is needed. There is such a notion as an active ideological system. A church is an example of an active ideological system. This is a mechanism with the help of which you can “put” ideas in people's heads. Political parties, though not all, are such systems.

**Ishenbai Abdurazakov:** Like the Party of Justice and Progress.

**Valentin Bogatyrev:** The first word of the party's name is obvious – “justice,” because injustice was a driving force on March 24th, whereas the word “progress” is not that clear.

You did not mention what you mean by this word. If you answer this question, the party will immediately move forward, because for now our understanding of the word “progress” is: “what belonged to you belongs to us now”. Those events in Iskra are not an interethnic problem, but a problem of “poor hating the rich.” This came from the Soviet system.

**Nur Omarov (Political scientist):** The problem of practical implementation of ideology was mentioned earlier. Askar Akaev worked on this a lot, and with Bakiev coming to power they artificially set up a commission... Of course, I agree that it is useless work to write an ideology, but there were different motivations for it. Akaev’s national ideology, based on the seven precepts of Manas, was born with romantic expectations (people who drank cognac with Akaev as a professor of physics in 1985-86 are still alive, and they remember him talking a lot about Kyrgyz and statehood in general). As for Bakiev, a product of the Soviet party nomenclature system, he has traditional motives, and he is guided, in particular, by substantiation of the interests of the new ruling group.

One of the problems of modern Kyrgyzstan is the absence of modernized principles, which decreases inner potential. To speak figuratively, Kyrgyzstan resembles a person whose head is turned at 90 degrees. What does it mean? We are right in saying that there is a need to create an ideology which would be accepted by our multiethnic population. On the one hand actually, we have just started creating a national state - mythical statehood that is supposedly 2200 years old or Manas that we are trying to push off from, etc. On the other hand, we have to quickly adapt and develop in the world of competition and globalization. It is very difficult for Kyrgyzstan in this regard. On the one hand, it is necessary to revive the state, but Akaev’s false slogans of the seven precepts of Manas were throwing us into a feudal abyss. As a result, we have indeed created a feudalized state, where progressive principles are just thin layer on the bog of feudalism. On the other hand, it is necessary to move forward, but how is it possible without nourishing a progressive environment? All the premises are of external

impulses. The whole process of democratization in the 90s, and even the events of March 24th had a certain external impulse to which the internal environment reacted inadequately. The expectations of those who had given these impulses were completely thwarted.

I agree and join you in that ideology is necessary, probably as an ideology of co-citizenship. Again, the problem is how to create it? A very good book was published in 1998 that I wish every official had on his desk, including the President. The title of this book is “Europe’s Experience for Kyrgyzstan.” It is meant for creating countries, and it promotes the idea of protestant ethics by Max Weber, and in particular, legal basics of the sense of justice, as well as the ethics of fair business. I think these are the very things that are to become a basis for national ideology. They cannot be artificially inculcated, since it requires a considerable period of time and effort. I guess in 15-20 years, by the time our society develops, that very ideology and its preconditions will mature enough to be introduced. But for now, every new leader will bring a new ideology with him.

**Gulsara Jakupova (Association of “Partnership of Professionals for Development of Kyrgyzstan”):** I have a question to Mr. Bogatyrev. You said that ideology appears when there is problematisation in the society. Indeed, if we take Germany after the war, India during colonization by England, or the communist regime in USSR, we can see that the strongest and most successful ideologies were created under conditions of problematisation in the society. Germany recovered in a short period, India succeeded in overthrowing England’s regime in a nonviolent way, and the entire capitalist world was the external enemy of the USSR. Perhaps, certain enemies should be determined so that a successful ideology will appear and be practiced.

We do not have identity; if there is no historical documentation and literature, we do not know what ethnicity we are, who we are, or what blood is running in our veins. Actually, I think there is not any ethnicity at all in Central Asia, but a mixture of blood just as in the whole world. Our big misfortune, our enemy, is



immorality – shamelessness. This is the factor that resulted in the situation that we have today – double standards among political elite. Primarily, the country's leadership says one thing, and then they do quite different things. Our generation grew up in conditions of double standards, and our children are growing up the same way. Absence of identity or formation of culture, immorality and shamelessness, double standards – these are things that keep us from breaking through. This is what we have to work on, and this will serve as a basis for our national ideology.

**Valentin Bogatyrev:** The presence of an enemy is of course a good motivator. A second good motivator is starvation, and a third one is national humiliation. There are many motivators like these. It seemed that we had to bear everything: humiliation, starvation, and fear. But how many of you consider gain as an enemy? How many of you think that a person should not live at the expense of others? After all, real life is built in a different way. People see that those who steal, lie, and extract live well...

**Ishenbai Abdurazakov:** We deviate a little bit from the historical method when we consider such things as a genetic code or cultural code. I carefully studied the history and way of life of many nations in order to understand why Kyrgyz are so lavish. It turns out that generosity as a rule is related to underdevelopment of market relations. "Stingy capitalists" of western countries are the result of commodity-money relations. That is a reflection of certain differences in values. And the second factor is the parallel existence of different norms of behavior. We should overcome this inevitable historical stage of development. However, when we jump over some stages, we acquire something that we do not feel in our own skin and heart. There were few real communists during the Soviet time; they almost did not exist. Many people treat democracy as a fashion nowadays too; however, they have entirely different ideas in their hearts. That is why many people, even the educated, say that the President is our Padishah, which becomes a basis for further reasoning. Once he is a Padishah, being a god is also quite possible.

This is the source for treating the President as if he were a Padishah, and this is the source for most of our misfortunes. We are talking about democracy, but as a result of flawed practice, it becomes an abusive notion. It is our own fault, since we distorted all of these ideas. Now we are saying that we need to return to authentic values of democracy. Our world would have become different long ago if we followed the Quran or Bible. The point is that double standards always existed, and continue to exist. As for the unity of moral conceptions, it exists only among a very thin stratum of society; the entire society never had it.

**Atadjan Yazmuradov (OSCE Academy):** We have our own approach to this issue in our country. It is very interesting for me to observe your discourse; this is a generic issue for Central Asian countries. Mr. Imanaliev mentioned Korea. Korea is a very interesting experiment. North and South Korea seem to be one country, but at the same time, the results are so different. To what extent does our history determine our present and future? We say "traditional society," "democracy"... There is a theory that society develops stage by stage: agricultural, then industrial, and postindustrial. Each society has its own system of economic relations, and possesses systems of politics and general culture accordingly. Attitudes towards society, oneself, and the government differ at each of the stages.

**Valentin Bogatyrev:** The thing is that the world lives in a post-democratic space nowadays. Democracy is in the past already. What we are observing now in developed countries, in America, above all, is a post-democratic space. They do not have such a notion of democracy as we do here. Things that we allow ourselves here are impossible in America; it is simply impossible.

**Elmira Nogoibaeva (International Institute for Strategic Studies):** We talk about tribal relations and then criticize it as tribalism, but at the same time we yearn for respect towards seniors. Do you not find that one point contradicts the other, since respect towards seniors is the very basis of tribal relations? This is just a remark. My question is the following:

how do you understand ideology? Is it an ideal world, an ideal place for a certain nation, or is it something rational or, counted, even a kind of technological project?

**Atadjan Yazmuradov (OSCE Academy):** You mentioned the concept of challenge – you referred to national humiliation, a negative challenge. Some countries respond to the challenge and advance up one stage; others collapse. Each responds to challenge in a different way. Japan is an industrial power that has been developing, that has an impulse. They had a national idea, and they moved forward and developed even before this challenge.

**Muratbek Imanaliev:** Movement is not universal. What is the difference between the Chinese and barbarians? Chinese can overcome difficulties, both natural and manmade. Humiliation is a certain obstacle that a nation or a human overcomes. For the Japanese, the war was a big humiliation. But a much bigger humiliation is history of Africa. No matter how African intellectuals and politicians understand this situation, they cannot do anything. There is no movement forward; Africa remains as backward as it had been before. None of the African countries coped well enough to rise to their feet.

**Ishenbai Abdurazakov:** Humiliation still needs to be realized. The Germans and Japanese started the war, stating that they were the best nations in the world. Germans thought that Aryans are the best of all, and therefore are destined to rule the world. Japanese considered themselves as Oriental Aryans, and therefore had the right to rule the whole of Asia. Africans did not have such an idea, and what is happening there is not a humiliation for them, they do not realize it. Being backward is not a humiliation for them, but a natural condition.

**Muratbek Imanaliev:** There is a difference between Japanese and Kyrgyz. When a Japanese says, “I am Japanese,” this is national ideology. When we say, “we are Kyrgyz,” this is not national ideology yet, because we are not simply Kyrgyz, we are also someone else. This is the problem with tribal relations.

**Ainura Cholponkulova (Association of “Partnership of Professionals for Development of Kyrgyzstan”):** I would like to go back to the question of identity. I guess you are right that we just have not formed as a nation, and hence cannot develop. I will not compare us with other countries, but look at the lives of ethnic minorities who live next to us – Koreans, Chinese and Uigurs. Again, we are back to national values. For example, Koreans value collectivism in its positive meaning. They start doing business with whole families quite successfully. The same is true with Uigurs. In our country, where it is pretty difficult to live even for ethnic Kyrgyz, other ethnicities live well nevertheless. When ethnic Kyrgyz start doing business, then within some time our friends and relatives start quarreling with us, fighting, etc. It is all due to our laziness and envy. If our neighbor, an ethnic Kyrgyz, is richer than we are, then it is somehow bad, and we are discontent, rather than being glad that there is one more rich person in Kyrgyzstan.

And there is a related question for everyone: how long will we think of what to push off from? Perhaps we need some pragmatic goal, since everyone wants to live well, to see tangible results. We need a to identify a goal which will meet modern market demands, and to move towards it.

**Muratbek Imanaliev:** I think the biggest problem at present for the Kyrgyz nation is emigration of the population; and unfortunately, this process will continue. This problem results from a distorted policy of the government – I wonder at the fact that the government created a special agency to facilitate emigration of people. This is a striking fact; there is not such a thing elsewhere, even in Africa. It is obvious that none of them will return. We should try to improve our economy and create jobs instead of looking for jobs abroad. As it is the able-bodied part of the population which leaves, this sort of exodus will result in what has been happening for centuries in Africa – export of the most capable men and women from Africa. And given the fact that we are not 75 million like the Turks, but just over three million, then I think that a search for some kind of identity, a national idea or the like, will be a very difficult



process. Plus, we have to take into account that a quarter of the Kyrgyz population is already not living in this country, while the rest is preparing to leave,

**Valentin Bogatyrev:** I think Mr. Imanaliev is both right and wrong. The real goal is to live well, and therefore the quickest solution to this problem is to leave for somewhere else. There are no well paying jobs here like in Kazakhstan, Moscow, or London. Maybe the state is right in doing something to make the exodus of its citizens civilized, so that they will have at least certain rights abroad. Although, in principle, this emigration certainly is a washout of the best, most active part of the population.

It is not duty bound, but I want to say that now I understand what Bakiev thinks about this issue. At least he says that today we should open everything here that can be opened by using local resources and raw material, so that plants and factories will work. Of course, this way you will not be able to solve all of the existing problems, because there are serious problems with agriculture too. We gave land for private ownership; as a result, we started over producing agriculture, and now we face the problem of exporting it. But we cannot work in external markets, as we have never done it before and we cannot do it. It is very difficult to join world production lines. Therefore, the solution to the problem lies in developing directions which would allow people to live and earn well as they deserve.

**Ishenbai Abdurazakov:** Envy is not our monopoly. It is a universal human phenomenon; it is the same everywhere. There is nothing wrong if there is solidarity at the personal level, especially in villages where the well-off will be helping worse-off relatives; it is normal. We talk about the harm of clan politics only at the government level, when incompetent people occupy executive offices.

I agree that there is a flight of qualified citizens, as well as merely able-bodied. It is a reality; it is due to the hardships of life. But I do not share the pessimism of Mr. Imanaliev, as I am sure that not all of those who leave stay abroad. Of course, provided that we will have normal conditions for doing business and for working, a good part of them will return. We could gradually make up for basic fundamentals. At the moment, the

main shortcoming is that the Penal Code and other laws are not being enforced. We declared a juridical society, but laws are not enforced. Even an established business becomes an object of the arbitrariness of some people. A state functioning in accordance with law, with independent, impartial courts, and with all other features of democracy did not properly evolve here.

Yes, we have problems with processing agricultural produce. As a result, although we could produce many of our own products, we consume imported juice of dubious quality. No matter how much we talk about substituting imports, there is no corresponding economic policy. Even though the new leadership poses economic issues, it does it like the director of a Soviet enterprise. There is almost no talk about implementing real market mechanisms. If we want to develop not only in political aspects, but also economic, then let us act logically. We do not have logic, and nothing changed after March 24th. The people, the leaders of this revolution, did not think of changing our politics. Our task, the reason why we get together and discuss these issues, is to develop our country in the right way – not just orally but in practice. That is when our people will have the opportunity to work normally. That is when, perhaps, those who have left will return, and the youth will stay here after receiving their degrees. We should talk not about some ideology, but about preserving these cadres and keeping them busy at home. This is our future.

## GUEST OF THE ISSUE

**SULTAN RAEV:**

“THE STATE SHOULD PRESERVE AND DEVELOP THE NATIONAL CULTURE – THAT IS AN IDEOLOGY FOR US”

**The guest of the issue is Minister of Culture of the Kyrgyz Republic Sultan Raev. He is a well known Kyrgyz playwright and journalist. Today, Sultan Raev heads a newly established ministry aimed at reviving the national culture. He is also a member of the governmental commission for development of the new national ideology.**

*IPP: Sultan Akimovich, you head the newly established Ministry of Culture. Please tell us about the functions and authorities of this ministry. What are its objectives and tasks? Why did the necessity to assign culture to the authority of a separate ministry emerge?*

**Sultan Raev:** During the last 15 years, the sphere of culture became second-grade in our country. Not a single penny was allocated for the development of culture; there was absolutely no new staging in the theater of opera and ballet during these years. In our villages, culture is in a very deplorable state. We have a very weak normative and legal framework: there are only six laws on culture, and the basic law on culture adopted in 1993 is morally outdated.

If there is no structural body in the government responsible for culture, it is hopeless. Even such a small country as the Altai republic has its ministry of culture. A ministry holds a certain status, and I believe that this kind of approach by the government to address this issue is the right one. Our philosophy is that culture is needed not just for the sake of culture, but for the people.

*IPP: Lately there is much discourse about the national ideology. The Ministry of Culture, I assume, is directly involved in this discussion. Please tell us, what is the problem here – why did we take up the ideology issue so zealously?*

**Sultan Raev:** When we talk about ideology, a certain stereotyped understanding of this word is triggered. Ideology, above all, is a system of ideas. For us it is now important to define what kinds of ideas are necessary for the development of the country. When one speaks of ideology, it is always associated with the communist ideology. However, there is a dramatic

difference between what we want to create and the communist ideas. Currently, globalization processes are under way and cultural borders are disappearing. Whether we want it or not, we will live by the economic laws of the West, which is the market economy. However, for Kyrgyz it is crucial to preserve our nation and state, and the essence of the ideology is that we must preserve our language and culture. For example, Malaysia and Indonesia are experiencing the same problems: they remain under the influence of China. We can simply get lost in the globalization process. Moreover, there are some dangerous tendencies. UNESCO published a document last year in which the Kyrgyz language was included in the group of disappearing languages.

*IPP: You are a member of a special governmental commission for development of a new ideology. How is the work progressing, and are there any results?*

**Sultan Raev:** We held meetings and roundtables. There are several versions of the ideology concept. There is a version prepared by Sarygulov, one by the Academy of Sciences, and one prepared by me...

*IPP: What is your concept about?*

**Sultan Raev:** Ideology is not a declarative document. The Constitution should be the basis of any ideology. Ideology should define the major developmental directions of Kyrgyzstan. Our state above all is a democratic one. The government should respect human rights, we should enjoy freedom of expression, and we should live in a legal state. The ideology should reflect what is provided for by the Constitution. For me, the major interest of the concept is the idea of preserving our statehood.



**IPP:** *What do you include in the notion of the national idea, which will unite the whole nation? What do you put the emphasis on – the Kyrgyz or the Kyzgystanis?*

**Sultan Raev:** Our state is not a mono-ethnic one. All – the Kyrgyz and the non-Kyrgyz alike – are citizens of one state: Kyrgyzstan. Human rights, the rights of each citizen, are uppermost. All should be equal. This is an issue of state and national unity. Each citizen should live in a decent society.

**IPP:** *What should unite all Kyrgyzstanis?*

**Sultan Raev:** “Kyrgyzstan is our Homeland” – this should unite us all. The state is not an empty word; the state – is I. Each person should have this feeling. Each person should feel his or her responsibility before the Homeland. This is not a vain slogan – this should be an everyday motto for each person.

The Seven Legacies of Manas is a surrogate, which was imposed from above. I have read thoroughly the epos, and I did not find seven legacies. People should first of all believe in the ideology, and belief is a very complex thing.

**IPP:** *But now the concept is being developed by the top again. Are we not repeating the mistake by passing the idea from top to bottom?*

**Sultan Raev:** We have carried out a sociological survey that covered total of 27 000 people representing different population strata. Ninety six per cent of the respondents answered that we need an ideology. However, as to what kind of one, opinions differ. We traveled to the regions and discussed these questions. Everyone says that we need an ideology. An individual without a guideline is dreadful. It does not matter whether the initiative comes from the bottom or the top. If a concept will be proposed, we will conduct nation-wide discussions. We should define guidelines in which society should live, and to where it should go.

**IPP:** *What is the status of the concept development?*

**Sultan Raev:** Currently, there are several versions of the concept developed; a working

commission is reviewing them together with the Jogorku Kenesh. Probably some combinations will be worked out...

**IPP:** *How can a common national idea be developed when we do not have a common information field? In some regions of Kyrgyzstan, not a single Kyrgyz television channel broadcasts, and people watch 5-6 channels of the neighboring countries.*

**Sultan Raev:** You are right. This is more an issue of information security. A comprehensive approach is needed here. It is not enough simply to draft a national ideology. Development of the concept constitutes only 3% of the work, while 97% consists of practical steps for its implementation. I am opposed to mandatory publication of the adopted concept in mass media. We are just defining the priorities of what kind of society we will live in further. For instance, the national idea in Russia is to save the federation, which is a very important issue. National ideological documents are being developed for Ukraine as well, and I believe that it is time for us to think about the future too.

**IPP:** *Do you remember, once an opinion that Kyrgyzstan could disappear as a state was voiced in Pozner's program...*

**Sultan Raev:** This is nonsense. Lately, the problem of “south vs. north” is often discussed, but I think that the division will not take place. On the contrary, we should become united. The common people never talk about the south-north divide; this is a policy issue. There are only 2.5 million Kyrgyz; this is like a small micro-district of Shanghai. Therefore, the major issue for us is to preserve our statehood.

**IPP:** *You said that a concept is an internal document, which defines the general direction. What should the government do to implement its provisions?*

**Sultan Raev:** The government should preserve and develop the national culture; this is an ideology per se for us. The ideology is realized step by step, and one should not expect results in a year. A systematic approach should be adopted everywhere: in culture, sport, and education.

**IPP:** *Your plans as the Minister of Culture?*

**Sultan Raev:** Interesting activities are included in the program of 2006. Following our initiative, a universal festival of eposes will be held. The first jazz festival with participation by groups from Kyrgyzstan, Uzbekistan and Tajikistan will be held on April 20-23, 2006. Jazz groups from America, Germany, France and Russia will also attend – we have received confirmations

already. As the festival is an international one, this means we should conduct it at the corresponding level. My friends from Moscow are helping.

In addition, I am finishing my work on a novel – “The Last Prophet.” I started it in 1994 and now I am about to finish it.

## APPOINTMENT PROBLEMS IN CIVIL SERVICE

*A roundtable on “Appointment problems in civil service” was held at the Institute for Public Policy on 31 January 2006. Jantoro Satybaldiev, Member of Jogorku Kenesh (Parliament) of the Kyrgyz Republic and Narynbek Kasymov, Deputy Director of the Agency of the Kyrgyz Republic on Civil Service were invited as main speakers. The topic was not chosen randomly: as many experts argue, inconsistency and incompetence of appointments in civil service have become a major political problem. The excerpts of the roundtable proceedings are provided below.*

**Jantoro Satybaldiev:** Everyone agrees that personnel matters. Under a normal personnel policy, when you hire competent staff you are ensured success. But if we conduct flawed personnel reform, then we get corresponding consequences. The present administration is repeating the same mistakes as the previous one. You have observed this in the example of the governors of Jalalabad and Talas Oblasts. Very rough mistakes were committed here. Although, the President later found a different solution, which was better than the initial one. However, the problem of rotating the governors of these oblasts could have been resolved earlier. In Talas, they even started discussing whether all southern officials should resign. I see two reasons for this conflict. Firstly, Jeenbekov was one of the initiators of taking over the oblast administration in 2005, and considers himself as one of the authors of the revolution of March 24th. Therefore, the option

similar to what Akaev resorted to in dealing with his governors and ministers did not work. The current President and his administration should remember the way they came to power.

These mistakes repeat in other instances as well. For example, we could not restore order at Karakeche enterprise for several months, which damaged not only the economy, but also our image. Before, Karakeche would supply the Thermal Heating System with some 60-80,000 tons of coal annually. Having failed to resolve the problem with Motuev, we supported Kazakhstan’s economy instead.

The scenario is the same with the Teleradio Corporation: there was a national television – now it became a state television, and they consider it a reform. The “reform” was only in changing disobedient vice-presidents of the company. The government is just declaring further democratization of mass media, whereas in reality everything is going back to the previous state of affairs.

I met with the workers of the railway. All they wanted was to have a professional administration....

Although we have an Agency on Civil Service, there was not a general personnel policy under the previous administration, nor does the

### **Jantoro Satybaldiev**

Member of Jogorku Kenesh of the Kyrgyz Republic.

In 1999-2000 served as Minister of Transportation and Communication of the Kyrgyz Republic.

He also served as a Mayor of Osh city in 2001-2003, and Special Representative of the President on energy security with the status of deputy Prime Minister.



current administration have it. Competitions that are being held to fill vacancies could be called prearranged, as the only public aspect of them is vacancy announcements for positions of secretaries of state, whereas their selection is a matter of technology. I welcomed the creation of the institute of Civil Service Agency; however, the institute of secretaries of state is premature for Kyrgyzstan. To introduce it, we have to change the system of government. The previous administration was good in manipulating with catchy words; the new administration continues along that path. The essence has not changed. Basically, the offices of a minister and a secretary of state are parallel; they compete with each other. A minister is a political office, whereas a secretary of state decides on personnel policy and finance.

Unfortunately, we do not train personnel, although there is an Academy of Management under the President, which I think has good resources and it is possible to train specialists there. Those who graduated from this Academy hope that they will make a career, but unfortunately, many of them are unemployed. Even if they are employed, they do not work according to their major. Unqualified people are appointed to high-ranking offices. As an example, I could mention the recent formation of the Cabinet and appointment of directors of state agencies. Among these ministers and directors, one may name only two or three persons who are ready to fulfill their duties. The Prime Minister does not have complete power over them; therefore, there is an open rivalry between him and the chairman of the National Security Service. In this case, one or both of them should resign.

**Narynbek Kasymov:** Yes, indeed the problem of personnel policy emerged not today, but still exists from before. We could talk more about problems: failures while forming a Cabinet and making appointments. I think the main problem is that there is no established system of working with personnel. Such a system was built before, during the Soviet times: selection, placement, and education of personnel – all of these conditions were observed. A trade union trained its own personnel, the Communist Union of the Youth its own members. The Party system

### Narynbek Kasymov

Deputy Director of the Agency of the Kyrgyz Republic on Civil Service.

In 2002-2005 – he served as the chief expert of the International Institute for Strategic Studies under the President of the Kyrgyz Republic, projects support department.

2005 – Expert of the organizational work and control unit in the administration of the President of the Kyrgyz Republic

had a very wide network. I worked in youth communist bodies. There was very rigorous training, and only those who underwent those trainings were selected and further trained as officers for leadership of Party organs. Back then of course, there was very strict discipline. If you had any fault, you received a reprimand, and then you were deprived of your Party-membership card, which meant the end of your career. With independence, this system was destroyed. “Laboratory assistants” and their relatives came to leadership.

All of us worked with that team. I would like to note that the first president, Mr. Akaev, used virtually all personnel potential. His only fault was that he appointed his friends and relatives to high-ranking positions, and in the end, his entire family started ruling the country. That is when the personnel policy failed. A revolution broke out in March, and the whole of the last year abounded with “revolutions.” Then the Cabinet was formed until fall.

I have spent my entire life working on personnel issues, and therefore I know that pressure on the part of members of parliament played a big role in the recent appointments. This team was made of representatives of several political forces, all of them pursuing their interests, claiming that they were part of the revolution and therefore that their people will work here or there. There is tremendous pressure, and I wonder how you can talk about competency and professionalism in such a situation. Mr. Satybaldiev is right in pointing out that some political offices are occupied by absolutely incompetent people.

While debating the structure of the Cabinet, many MPs did not want to include the Civil

Service Agency. However, it is demanded by international donors. When I worked in the administration of the President in 1998-1999, we were the first to study international experience. Why is there such an agency within the structure of a Cabinet, and why were offices of secretaries of state established? I will explain the rationale. Under Akaev, there were frequent changes of Cabinet: a new minister would fire all of the old staff and hire only his relatives. The next minister would do exactly the same. But the new staff would not know how to work. Just imagine a veterinary surgeon working in the chancellery.... That is when information leaks and petitions remain unaddressed.

Bureaucracy has both positive and negative features. In the West for instance, bureaucracy performs superbly and benefits society. It is obvious that they have a different history and a different attitude toward law. If you read our Law on Civil Service, it is near ideal. However, its implementation is plagued with our *kyrgyzchylyk*, whereby we try to bypass any article or any law; and it is already in our blood. The Law makes it clear why secretaries of state were introduced: they make sure that administrative positions are stable, that competent staff is hired, that there is no tribalism, clan politics, or nepotism within staff, that employees are not abused or fired when there is a change of political leadership, and that administrative resources are preserved. Such goals and objectives are good, tested in many developed countries. However, with the appointment of political leadership, even at the level of departments and so forth there is again *kyrgyzchylyk*, and you cannot get away from it. You understand that now we have problems with employment: there are many unemployed, and it pays well to work in such ministries and agencies....

Our Agency has been working for a year and half, and I can claim at least that the new leadership is trying to enhance its role and prestige. We face very big tasks. We have already held seminars for civil servants in Bishkek and central organs of Chui oblast. Now we will hold them in the south: Naryn and Talas. Based on my own example, I could say that before there was a completely different system

of retraining personnel, and now we are trying to switch to a new system. At present, there is no training of personnel – we have totally untrained people – whereas before, one had to move through all stages of chancellery work and work as chairman of the rayon (district) executive committee, second secretary of the rayon party committee, then go through the school of the Central Committee somewhere at the level of department head, and only then would one be promoted to an independent office and a position as the first secretary of an oblast (provincial) party committee.

**Jantoro Satybaldiev:** Had the President or the head of his administration invited Jeenbekov and explained the motivations behind the rotation, everything would be different. It should not be done the way they did it – at the end of a meeting, they unexpectedly announce that he was fired.

We are failing in training personnel. Why was the Civil Service Agency created? Intentions were good, yes, but a corrupt system of civil service was put in place from the very beginning. We take as examples advanced states like Holland, America, and England, with centuries long traditions, but we are not ready for this! We cannot even form a parliament with party lists. We do not have a system of training personnel; for fourteen years we have crippled many people. Under Akaev you were in charge of personnel in the administration of the President – you were also a part of it just like me.

**Narynbek Kasymov:** There is something being done. While working in the organizational department, I have employed the first graduates of the Academy of Management. The following year there were many willing to study at the Academy. Later they stopped dealing with employment, and now there are many unemployed graduates. So much money was spent on their training, and it turned out that it was for no purpose.

Now there is a different issue. Our Agency reaches out to donors who will help in training and retraining civil servants; presently the Japanese government is considering a possibility



of training twenty civil servants in Japan. The entire leadership of our Agency was changed, and we set feasible tasks. Now we have started forming a national personnel reserve. I was a member of a selection commission on placing college graduates on the national personnel reserve. What bright students we have! These advanced individuals know languages; they are open, straightforward, and fearless. We have placed eleven graduates on the national personnel reserve. They should gain certain working experience; they should be sent for training; and we will fill vacancies from this reserve. Out of 22 civil servants of Issykkul Oblast, we selected five. Requirements are very tough – tests and interviews.

Today we have gained the President's endorsement; time will show how all of this will be implemented, but we are going to be persistent and will not allow any revival of the previous system. In Issykkul for instance, we have gathered 130 civil servants who deal with personnel issues. We trained them on filling out declaration forms and other things. We will keep working, as there is a lot to be done. We will try to improve the situation in this important sphere.

**Jantoro Satybaldiev:** Mr. Kasymov, train civil servants – most importantly – not to take bribes. I think that it should be done in this way – that civil servants are accountable and transparent; any state official should be elected, and only then will we get positive results. And for this purpose we had a very good school – the decentralization of government. We made village administration elected; there was political decentralization. If we were to carry out administrative and financial decentralization, it would be a very good school for career growth. If we were to carry out administrative and territorial reforms sooner, we would start electing heads of aimaks (provinces), and then we would have much better training of personnel than today.

If we do not carry out a reform of wages, then your secretaries of state and those placed on the reserve will take bribes. You said wages are good in ministries and agencies. Do you know how much a minister makes? 200 US dollars.

Those who come to him to solve their problems receive ten times less, but he still looks first at their hands. There will not be order under such a system in civil service.

During a recent parliamentary hearing on the work of law enforcement agencies, one official, a general, said that he appointed his subordinate for a good position because his father is a general. That is the principle guiding the staffing of civil servants. How about others who do not have a general for a father?

**Emil Kalmatov:** Mr. Kasymov, what does your Agency have to do with the appointment of akims and governors? Is there any formal procedure for interaction between your Agency and the administration of the President?

**Narynbek Kasymov:** Our Agency does not have anything to do with appointment or rotation of governors, as these are political offices. We work only with administrative offices, starting from secretaries of state and below.

**Emil Kalmatov:** So, it turns out that the administration of the President appoints them, and they themselves staff their team, i.e. you are not allowed to be part of the selection procedure. Then what is the point of having your agency? Now they say that only natives of one rayon are working at “Manas” airport. Young specialists who have worked there for several years are either being fired or oppressed; their salaries are cut, and they are forced to leave. You prepare and train specialists, but they leave for Kazakhstan or elsewhere. It turns out that you are wasting money, investing not for the sake of our country.

**Elnura Osmonalieva (Students Union of Kyrgyzstan):** How does the mechanism of the reserve work at all? How do you employ graduates: you recommend them or send the list of them to someone? Do you divide into ranks those who recently graduated or who are already working as civil servants?

**Narynbek Kasymov:** The national personnel reserve is just being formed, and we are trying to place on reserve genuinely promising personnel. Each institution of higher education submits to

us their list of graduates with distinction and activists. Each civil service agency refers to us their promising personnel who may occupy positions of leadership tomorrow. We have an agreement with the administration of the President. We will be training them – we are planning to send 20 people to Japan, 15 to European states, and the rest will be trained locally at the Academy of Management. Each ministry and agency reports on openings, and we will fill those vacancies from the national personnel reserve.

**Chinara Omurkulova (Resident Director of IREX):** This spring, IREX, along with the Association of Professionals for the Development of Kyrgyzstan, organized a meeting with Kulov. We invited alumni of many exchange programs, i.e. people who studied or interned in the best American institutions of higher education. A call made by Kulov was the result of that meeting. Later, I asked many participants whether they had submitted applications to the Civil Service Agency. And everyone replied that there is no point, as the old system is still in place; that it is not worth going there and becoming a cog in the old system. And this is true. There is no point of attracting fresh, smart heads into the old system in order to get an obsolete “product.”

A second issue: tasks facing the country are so intricate, multifaceted and complex, and therefore concentrating power in one hand is unthinkable. Take a look at how management tasks are accomplished in our agencies. It is called “heroic leadership” – when a leader single-handedly deals with all problems and tasks. Meanwhile, all his subordinates are walking elsewhere, resting.... In reality, it is imperative to transfer part of one’s leadership to other people, to trust them. But for this purpose, people should clearly define their mission. The problem of personnel we are discussing lies in the absence of the vision of the country’s development in general. For instance, the Bishkek Business Club has got a great vision of this development, and now the main task of the Club is to share this vision with every member of the society, so that every member of our society shares this vision, and in every workplace these tasks are realized.

As for personnel ... according to my activities, I meet with people who studied abroad. Many of them are already working abroad – independent of Kyrgyzstan, on their own, as they are indeed smart heads. They often tell me that basically no one from our leadership is interested in them. And even when delegations from Kyrgyzstan travel abroad, they are afraid of these young specialists, as if they are spies. This is the legacy of totalitarianism, when everyone is viewed as a spy instead of gathering information needed for Kyrgyzstan. It hurts our country, as gathering information means also working with people, with personnel. Besides, there is a large group of great people (mainly middle-aged) who have gained considerable experience working in international organizations and projects. These people know what the system of internal control in an organization is. They know how to avoid problems of nepotism. They know what internal control of finances is, that it is forbidden for the same hands to reach into a purse. They know the system of management which exists in international organizations (as a rule, those organizations which come to work in Kyrgyzstan have clearly defined procedures of finance and human resources). It appears to me that these people should not be ignored.

Since there are not many vacancies as you noted, the main task is to establish some successful entities within ministries and agencies in order to aggregate and accumulate this knowledge: the experience of those people who have returned after their studies and are now living here. Besides, we cannot ignore people who are being admitted to universities abroad on their own. A great number of our people are studying abroad, but their academic work – papers and dissertations – are not used. However, with the help of those academic papers and student research, we could accumulate expansive analytical potential for our agencies, because these students are using great libraries, and they have access to all subscriptions, to all world databases. We should use the experience of these people in order to change the current situation in Kyrgyzstan.

**Muratbek Imanaliev:** Good specialists and good management will be in demand when there is a normal public administration system.



At the present stage of our development, a problem of world outlook has emerged: are we able to govern ourselves? This is not a rhetorical question, and the answer is not definite either. As the system of public administration was not established in this country, there is no demand for outstanding personnel with degrees from Harvard, London School of Business, etc. The problem is that 15 years ago communist or totalitarian *vojdism* (authoritarian leadership) changed to liberal *vojdism*. We failed to create a presidential system. Characteristic features of *vojdism* are: permissiveness of the President; vertical and horizontal integration; ruling clans, tribes, certain regions, and localities through relatives, associates, etc. Given such a system, there is no need in personnel with degrees from Oxford and Harvard. It is enough to graduate from any university or just to buy a degree in order to get a job. Anything associated with the personnel agency is merely an attempt at disguise, because neither this agency, nor the Academy of Management, nor the national personnel reserve, nor those people studying abroad have anything to do with personnel policy or forming a corps of public officials.

The main issue is: what is stronger in this country – law or family bonds? This is the issue we should address, because both former and current leaders, unfortunately, are not presidents in the classical understanding of this office; both are *vojds*. Both fail to understand that a President is a person who has to regulate first of all himself.

**Ainura Cholponkulova (UNDP):** For the last 15 years, donor assistance has been directed at training civil servants as well, which is also a component of personnel policy. The target groups for trainings have been employees of junior and middle levels. However, the problem is that former party officials, functionaries who have worked under the Soviet system of state apparatus, came to power. They came with old knowledge, supplemented by *kyrgyzism*, tribalism, and regionalism. Therefore, I think that now the donor assistance should be directed at training high-ranking officials of all levels.

And another issue: I myself worked as a civil servant, and I noticed that the politicians that I worked with are not inclined to training. They

have a stereotype that if I am a governor, Member of Parliament or minister, then I know everything, and there is nothing for which to be trained. Whereas in foreign countries, there is a system of continuing education for all levels of civil servants. There are programs for junior and middle levels, as well as for high-ranking officials. As it appears to me, the problem is that you train only junior and middle level personnel.

Upon returning from training abroad, the majority of my former colleagues leave the civil service due to low salary and lack of career growth. Many of them leave for international organizations or go abroad, where they are offered better employment. Thus, the old system dominates and prevents growth of junior and middle level civil servants. Therefore, today our politicians and state officials, including the President and Prime Minister, should not be shy to be trained in new technologies, communications, political leadership, managing personnel, human resources and so forth.

We talk a lot about the importance of economic and political development in strategy. While building plans for their future, South Korea and India have included the formation of new technocratic bureaucracy into their plans. South Korea still keeps sending its promising leaders abroad to acquire education, and they return to work in companies and civil service. Today these countries are going through a stage of rapid growth! As for us, we rather had such a program as “Cadres of XXI Century,” but nobody cared about our fellows abroad, and nobody needed them here. For instance, in authoritarian Uzbekistan there is a similar state program: fellows sign a contract with ACCELS, an American educational program, according to which graduates must return to their home country, where they are immediately offered a position with the civil service with a commitment for three years.

Whereas in our country, in response to Kulov’s appeal, only one person out of 200 applied, because they were offered such strange positions. Our guys – managers and directors of various projects – who administer resources worth 200 thousand to one million

dollars, they write grant proposals, they have great experience working in international organizations, and they are offered such a low salary in the civil service. They have already grown up beyond this.

Recently, while discussing the concept of foreign policy, I was very surprised to see that there are many elderly experts in the expert group. But we should openly and honestly tell them that now we have to involve more young people with fresh ideas, as we are living in a market where we have to earn by ourselves. However, our state apparatus, represented by high-ranking officials, seems to be living according to some Kyrgyz management – we cannot even call it Soviet. Therefore, in my opinion, we have to create advisory councils that would include young professionals, and the older generation has to learn to listen to us because we are the ones who are going to live further.

**Emil Kalmatov:** Soon the parliament will be considering the annual budget. Could you somehow in connection to this event raise a problem of personnel policy? For instance, it is well known that the administration of the President is a huge structure that requires expansive resources to maintain its activities. Is it possible to make a connection between personnel policy and the national budget, or are these two things entirely separate from each other?

**Jantoro Satybaldiev:** The administration of the President declared reduction of some departments up to ten percent, others up to 40 percent. But this is not likely to happen. Since we do not define the structure, the only leverage of influence is approving the budget. We want to eliminate duplicating structures, to cut expenditures rather than personnel. Therefore, we decided to cut funding.

**Shair Juraev (IPP):** My question is concerning the Agency. You do a good job by posting on a website the income declarations of politicians. Are there any sanctions on those who fail to do that?

**Narynbek Kasymov:** No. Only 38 percent of MPs turned in their income declarations, the rest do not want to do that.

**Jantoro Satybaldiev:** I think we have to declare expenses rather than incomes. We show our incomes, but drive such fancy cars....

**Emil Kalmatov:** To solve the problem, you suggest decentralization and election of governors and akims, and nothing more. How realistic it is that a parliamentary form of government can solve all of the problems concerning personnel policy?

**Jantoro Satybaldiev:** I agree that 75 MPs will not be able to govern the state; it is impossible. We have to change the system. If we declare a parliamentary system of government, we have to create integrity of institutions and laws.

**Damir Bisembin (Partnership of Young Professionals for Development of Kyrgyzstan):** In my opinion, decentralization and election of akims is not enough. First of all, it is necessary to raise the prestige of civil servants and the civil service. A person working in the civil service tries not to advertise it, whereas a person working for international project or joint venture is proud of that. We do not have resources to raise the salaries of civil servants; hence, maybe we have to raise their prestige first of all. For instance, give some privileges or offer certain benefits.... Mr. Imanaliev, I have a question for you since you are a former official who worked for a long time in the ministry, and are now working in the non-governmental sector. In your opinion, how can we, without raising salaries, attract to the civil service those young and talented specialists who graduated from the foreign universities and have great experience (I mean middle aged, 30-40 years old)? How can it be done so that they would be happy to join the civil service and use all their knowledge and skills in their work?

**Muratbek Imanaliev:** It is difficult to invent a “remedy” to solve this problem. The only thing I can state, given terrifying poverty in a country where there is no budget and no resources at all, the only way to solve this problem is not a material aspect, but spirituality, patriotism. I will cite an example. (Of course, for this purpose they employ not the best methods of bringing people up, but I think it also should be done.) South Korea lagged behind North Korea in



terms of basic indexes; it was a less developed agricultural region. What did Korean leaders do? They staked on Korean nationalism. They sent people to study under American and European grants, but with a condition that nationalistically or patriotically minded individuals voluntarily returned to Korea. Of course, some of them remained abroad. However, one should not forget about the system of economic responsibility for parents and relatives that exists there.

As for us, the majority of people who graduate from western universities do not return. Two percent of Kazakh citizens with western education return to Kazakhstan. I do not know about the situation in Uzbekistan; they probably use other measures since it is a state with dictatorial elements of government.

Of course, the financial interest of people is an important element, but there is no money. Should we count on Soros like Georgians? It is abnormal when a Prime Minister receives his salary from a foreigner.

The problem is that, unfortunately, we do not have a system of fostering patriotism; the state does not work on cultivating a spirit of homeland in its citizens. While communicating with students of American University – Central Asia, where I work, I have found out that few want to stay in the country, although all of them are representatives of the titular ethnicity. Patriotism is a feeling, and hence it requires a sort of fatherly attitude in response. Although it may contradict the spirit of our discussion, I am deeply convinced that this country needs not a mere President-vojd but a President-father. This is a very important circumstance, and we do not have a person who could sacrifice himself. All our presidents and prime ministers are people who desire to live well. Nobody wants to pull a stake from himself, to wear rubber boots, and so on. Before becoming successful states, all of the European countries and North America had dictatorial systems of politics, because it was rational dictatorship that pushed forward the economy. Only provided that there is a certain level of development could you start talking about democracy, decentralization, etc. Take as an example the history of any developed

country, the USA for instance. Nobody can convince me that democracy started there in the 17th century; you cannot throw out slavery, the last American slave died in 1964.

As for us, we play democracy, because all we have is a so-called procedural democracy. Civil society is an artificially created entity. It did not emerge from the needs of the public. This idea was brought in from outside. The main task of civil society, if it is well founded, is in socializing a person. Civil society did not accomplish this task, and even worse, it led to public commercialism of individual needs and social relations. As a result, we ended up with escalating processes of the dehumanization of social relations and the degradation of social consciousness. We have to honestly admit this. This is what we have to start with.

They say the state does not create favorable conditions. Yes, I agree. But you see, the problem is that young people who study abroad simply do not want to come back. This is a big problem. In case they return, they will not go to work in the Ministry of Education, even for \$200. Instead, they will go to an international or private organization for \$500. The quality of government, absence of a system of public administration, absence of demand for normal, strong people, leads to a situation whereby Harvard graduates are simply not wanted here. It is enough to graduate from a local university and help one's parents – that is it.

I would repeat once more that the situation in Kyrgyzstan is such that political conjuncture is heavily personified from the very beginning. This is the way Kyrgyzstan chose, because Akaev came to power. Whether by chance or not, he came. If Masaliev had come to power, the situation in the country would be quite different. This is absolutely obvious. Personification in defining the way forward is still the most important political resource in this country. Development of the country depends on the President's conduct. We do not learn anything; in order to learn, we have to acknowledge something. We do not want to acknowledge other's achievements. When we admire Japan, we admire only Toyota, but never the Japanese brain or the organization

of Japanese society. This is what we are not willing to learn. Mythologized ways of thinking leads to formation of illusions concerning the future; this is a sociological axiom, a well-known phenomenon.

**Elvira Sarieva (Internews):** I think you have drawn too gloomy a picture. As a matter of fact, both those who live abroad and those who work here in international organizations are concerned about their country. There is a vicious circle: professionals say, “we would work in civil service, but the salary is low,” whereas the government says, “we would pay more but there is no money.” There is an idea that this mechanism should be destroyed from inside.

**Muratbek Imanaliev:** I do not understand what you mean ‘to destroy from the inside.’ Would you explain it, please?

**Elvira Sarieva (Internews):** I mean that young personnel join the civil service, regardless of the salary or positions. Thus, by creating a critical mass, they change the system itself, because there is no point in waiting until the President changes his mind and re-evaluates his own activities.

**Muratbek Imanaliev:** The problem lies somewhere deeper. There is no tradition of self-government, no tradition of statehood; all of these must be created. The problem is not with young Kyrgyz and old Party personnel. China is not the only example of a Communist government (though they are a little different now). Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos are communist countries, too. Of course, the system of government has changed slightly; nevertheless, communists are in power there.

The thing is that we have to find our own way of governing the country. If we are successful in this, then this system will function regardless of the person in power.

**Daniar Imanaliev (“Alga, Kyrgyzstan!” party):** Going back to the issue of personnel policy, I would like to ask a question of Mr. Kasymov. Today in Kyrgyzstan, people are divided into Akaev’s people and revolutionaries. I became a victim of this policy, since I was fired for allegedly not taking part in a coup d’etat and

allegedly being one of Akaev’s people. This happens everywhere: disagreeable people are being labeled as Akaev’s people and being fired. Is this a problem of current personnel policy – rotation of personnel when Bakiev appoints a person but the staff does not accept the appointee? What is the fault of those people who were working for the sake of Kyrgyzstan, and suddenly, with the change of President, became enemies? For instance, I was not even acquainted with Akaev, and it is astonishing that I was fired under this pretext.

**Narynbek Kasymov:** There are many such cases. Akaev also fired all communists when he came to power. As for me, I was working in the Central Committee of the Communist Party. Under Akaev, I was a head of the organizational department in the administration of the President. Now I am working at the Agency. Of course, they appoint their people to lucrative jobs... You have to approach this problem philosophically; this is life.

**Daniar Imanaliev (“Alga, Kyrgyzstan!” party):** What is the role of your Agency then?

**Narynbek Kasymov:** According to legislation, we are adopting international experience; everything is ideal on paper, but when it comes to reality kyrgyzchylyk is taking over. Nothing was done in fifteen years, whereas now we are trying to improve something in a year and a half... Everyone is to be responsible, law-abiding, and then there will be order.

**Ainura Cholponkulova (UNDP):** A question to Mr. Satybaldiev: how can we create a mechanism of continuity in the parliament? With new MPs coming, 60 % of the supporting staff was changed. Consultants and experts were fired; MPs brought their own people. There is no continuity at all, and in this sense, the parliament is much more vulnerable. And a second question: have you changed your consultants?

**Jantoro Satybaldiev:** The second question is easier for me to answer. I did not change them; I hired those who already worked there. My assistant is Apsamat, Masaliev’s former assistant. As for supporting staff, it will be



changed anyway. We have to change the system of forming parliament; that is when professional personnel will be hired.

**Chinara Omurkulova (Resident Director of IREX):** In fact, if people are going abroad, this does not mean that they are not patriots. Before, I thought that a patriot was a person who sits here, boils in this mess, and eats from the same pot. However, according to my friends' experience, those who go abroad and help from there are no less patriotic than those who stay and "boil" here. What can we talk about when a state official at the level of a Secretary of State says that we should nominate personnel according to their family or clan belonging rather than their professionalism and competency?! I think that we, representatives of civil society, should openly express our disagreement with this sort of things. Especially since now, it is very difficult to define who is from where. It may be that my parents were born in one place,

but lived and worked their entire life in Osh Oblast.

**Muratbek Imanaliev:** This is neither a social nor an economic problem – this is a political problem. This is a serious blow to the country's sovereignty. Reduction in population is a terrible thing. At the moment, some 80,000 former and current citizens of Kyrgyzstan are living in Kazakhstan. Some 350,000 of our citizens are permanently living in Russia, including those in the second generation. Very few of them will return here. The same happened to Turks in Germany. All of the three million Turks who moved to Germany stayed there; their second and third generations are naturalized Germans, which is an alien element for Turkey. However, three million may not be that big loss for Turkey, which has a population of 75 million, whereas two millions is too much for Kyrgyzstan. This problem concerns me very much.

## WHO IN KYRGYZSTAN SUPPORTS LIBERAL DEMOCRACY?

Melissa Burn \*

Recent IPP articles show that discussion over the best form of government for the Kyrgyz Republic has intensified, especially in the current atmosphere of questioning the relative powers and responsibilities of the President, Prime Minister and Parliament. As the debate continues in the capitol, mostly among political elites or well-educated observers, it has been difficult to know for certain what "the public" thinks. Most Kyrgyz citizens are more focused on surviving from day to day than they are on abstract arguments over the form of government. This is understandable, given the real and pragmatic challenges facing families in the republic.

There is also some question as to whether people share a common understanding of concepts such as, "democracy", "civil liberty", "presidentialism", "parliamentary form of government" and other terms. And, some ask, if the economy remains weak, what use is this "democracy" that everyone says is

so wonderful? The glowing promises made by political leaders and outside experts for more than a dozen years have not resulted in substantial improvement in the lives of ordinary citizens. Some people even feel that their lives are worse now than before. So, to the public, it might not matter very much what happens in Bishkek or what politicians say. People believe that, apart from tribalism and other forms of personal favoritism, the government and many elected representatives ignore their constituents after the election is won.

Does this trend mean that people in Kyrgyzstan do not care about democracy, or that they are not suited to it or "ready" for it? The issue has been raised many times since the Central Asian republics gained independence. Political leaders, media analysts, social scientists and others disagree on the answers to this painful and divisive question. Underlying the question, of course, is the fear that the whole democratic enterprise is doomed to grinding

\* Melissa Burn is a PhD Candidate from the Institute for Conflict Analysis & Resolution, George Mason University, Virginia. The 2005 survey data discussed here was collected for her doctoral dissertation.

delay or eventual failure because of factors built into the society. Social factors generally fall into two broad categories: culturally-based expectations for group and leader behavior, tribalism, on the one hand and the priority given to stability and order, discouraging change and open political competition, on the other. Regardless of whether or not one believes that democracy, nominal or liberal, is the best form of government for Kyrgyzstan, it is useful in the current context to examine the level of support that it enjoys in the republic.

### Social Factors

Accusations of tribalism at the elite level are a potent weapon and any discussion of such ingroup favoritism becomes so politically “hot” that the complaints are immediately taken up by the community rumor mill. As a result, it is difficult to know whether the public accepts such behavior as an expression of clan obligation (as some people suggest) or whether most people regard tribalism as illegitimate. Political leaders in other republics and some commentators in Kyrgyzstan insist that with such cultural foundations, transition to a true multi-party democracy based on platforms rather than personalities will require generations of re-socialization. The cultural basis for tribalism – showing preference for members of one’s tribe, clan, or extended family – is clear in nomadic Kyrgyz culture, behavior which was in some ways strengthened by the Soviet economy of scarcity that encouraged reliance on informal networks for day-to-day living. But, it is not at all clear that clan favoritism is the only rule by which people make political decisions in modern Kyrgyzstan. Many people have other bases on which they decide who to trust and who to rely on for help, though extended kin group relations remain the cornerstone of social life for the majority of citizens in the republic, especially the ethnic Kyrgyz. And of course, Russians and other non-Central Asian citizens who are outside the clan system have their own ways of deciding who to trust, who will help them, and who deserves their political loyalty (if anyone does). When the state fails to fulfill people’s needs and expectations, they naturally turn to informal networks that meet those needs. Who can blame them? But, is it

really true that people only vote for someone from their own clan, their own district, or whoever pays the most for their vote? These are important questions and more information is needed before they can be answered.

The issue of order and stability is similarly potent. Collectivist cultures, as both traditional Kyrgyz nomadic society and the subsequent Soviet system were, tend to value order and stability over innovation and risk. And, since the rights of the community are elevated above individual rights, there is often considerable pressure to conform to group opinions. Still, most people are generally capable of considering their options, looking at the examples around them, and learning to take steps toward what they see as a better way of doing things. However, because order and stability are prioritized and they are a standard part of the public discourse, accusations that a political actor or movement will cause disorder and chaos undermine support nearly as much as claiming “tribalism”. If a society values order and stability above personal liberty and authentic political competition, then the prospects for democracy are constrained because, as everyone knows, democracy can be very chaotic, especially in the early stages. Is this the case in Kyrgyzstan? Again, more information is needed about what the public thinks.

As the events of March 24th showed, popular legitimacy is crucial for any regime. Different people, however, have different ideas on the best way to build and sustain widespread legitimacy. Everyone agrees that corruption and tribalism must end and the government must be reformed, but there is little agreement on what this should look like. Knowing more about what people want can help clarify the agenda. One important question, for example, is whether people will trust a political party more (or less) than they trust someone from their clan or district? How malleable are people in this regard? By legislating party politics, can true national parties develop or will people just transfer their loyalty to parties dominated by their clan or other identity group? How can parties attract constituencies that integrate different ethnic, social, and economic groups?



This is another way of asking what kind of boundaries there are between groups, how deep are the divisions, and whether the boundaries are flexible enough to let new people into the community. Research and practical experience show that where group identities are threatened, especially during times of intense competition for scarce resources, group boundaries tend to harden rather than becoming more open, and tension between groups escalates. This means that transitions are especially difficult times to build bridges of trust and common interest between groups that see themselves as distinct from and in competition with one another. That is not to say that it can not be done, only that it requires careful thought and strong commitment.

One interesting result of research into social groups is that, the more united a society is, the more important regime legitimacy becomes. Divided societies are less able to confer legitimacy (because they disagree about what it means) and, also, more easily manipulated by elites serving their own selfish interests. So, a strong republic with a legitimate government requires cohesion among the various groups in

**Divided societies are less able to confer legitimacy and more easily manipulated by elites serving their own selfish interests.**

society, at least in terms of a political community. When different social groups recognize one another as belonging to the same civic or "moral" community, they are more willing to

extend rights and protections to each other. When people know they are respected and not marginalized, they cooperate with one another, creating the dense network of civil ties that strengthen society. This is why the process of building national political parties goes together with creating linkages between different social groups. If parties develop only along ethnic, clan, rural-urban, or north-south lines, the divided society that results can not provide the legitimacy needed for effective governance in Kyrgyzstan.

### What Do People Want?

In the late spring of 2005, a small social survey of 500 respondents throughout Kyrgyzstan asked people's opinions on many of the issues relevant to the current discussion. The questionnaire was given to a random sample of people of all ethnicities in urban and rural settings of five oblasts plus Bishkek. Some of the questions came from earlier surveys and the results can be compared to see how attitudes have changed over time. A survey is only one tool for understanding people's views, of course, and can never give the final answer on important questions. However, surveys do assess the diversity of views among various segments of society and show which people hold these views. For example, do people support democracy and, if so, which people are more likely to support it than others? In fact, when asked whether they agree or disagree with the idea that, "democracy may have problems but it is better than any other form of government", 76% of Kyrgyzstani respondents

Survey Statement	Agree	Disagree
Our country works better without a lot of opposition politicians criticizing the government.	28%	61%
The press and media in this country should not criticize the government and president openly.	32%	64%
Giving people more say in government decisions is more important than maintaining order.	64%	27%
People should be free to say what they want, even if it increases tensions in society.	76%	20%
Citizens should have the right to publish newspapers that express any and all political views.	84%	12%

agreed and only 13% disagreed (the rest were not sure). Of course, 47% also agreed with the statement that “democracies are not good at maintaining order,” which suggests that, while many Kyrgyz citizens prefer it as a political ideal, they recognize that it can be chaotic.

Given that people have different ideas about what democracy means, it is helpful to know what they think about specific aspects of political competition and civil liberties. The following table lists several questions and the responses people gave to them. (In each case, the percentage of people who were not sure how to answer is not shown but may be discerned from the data.)

These results show that there is substantial support among Kyrgyz citizens for these aspects of liberal democracy, though some elements are more strongly supported than others. For example, support for press freedom is not as strong as support for individual free speech rights. Perhaps people have more confidence in themselves and their neighbors than they do in the mass media. When asked which was more important, order and stability or free speech and public participation in government, democratic “voice” won by a large margin.

Two questions solicited opinions on the power of the president relative to other branches of government. In response to the statement, “A government led by a strong, respected leader is better for the country than a government where power is shared with the parliament and the judiciary,” 59% disagreed and 31% agreed, suggesting support for a strong parliament and independent judiciary. However, a majority (57%) also agreed with the statement, “It is good to have a strong leader who is not limited by parliament and elections,” which shows ambivalence about how power should be distributed in government.

When the data from 2005 are compared with earlier surveys, it becomes clear that support for liberal democracy is higher now than ever before, with some reservations. In a survey in 2001, 54% of Kyrgyzstani respondents said that free speech was more important than strict order. In 2005 that number had grown to 76%.

**Support for liberal democracy is higher now than ever before, with some reservations...**

In 2001, 50% of people said that the president should not be permitted to dissolve parliament and rule by decree; in 2005 that number had grown to 75%. Regarding the president’s right to limit travel abroad, respondents who reject this option increased from 54% to 80%. When asked if the president should be permitted to cancel elections, in 2001 57% said this was not permissible but in 2005 82% rejected it. In the earlier survey 46% said that it was good to have a strong leader who did not have to share power with parliament and the judiciary, but this was reduced to 31% by 2005.

The insecurity caused by harsh accusations in the media and the chaos of mass disturbances has had a measurable impact on citizen attitudes, however. Support for censoring the mass media to establish order increased from 25% in 2001 to about 36% in 2005. In 2001 only 25% of respondents felt that it was acceptable for the president to forbid meetings and mass demonstrations. This number had grown to 38% after the March uprising. Perhaps these increased percentages are a temporary reaction to the March 2005 events but only time will tell. The message from the survey data seems to be that people support free speech and political competition but their threshold for verbal warfare in the media and chaos in the streets is limited. Too much disorder erodes support for liberal democracy, as one might expect anywhere in the world. But, even after the events of early 2005, the percentage of people who said that democracies are not good at maintaining order decreased from 61% in 2003 to 47% in 2005.

Particularly at the national level, it is important for candidates to be able to garner support from districts other than their own. And, too, if political parties are to become truly national, they must reach out to constituencies from a broad cross-section of society. Most people (65%) disagreed with a statement that they would always vote for the candidate from the voter’s own district. When asked if they would consider voting for a well-qualified candidate from a different district, an overwhelming 95 percent said they would.



This suggests that there is a solid basis for developing national parties and candidacies, if candidates are well-qualified and reach out to a diverse interest base. However, among those with a strong sense of identity based on their kin group or on their home district (which was indicated by a variety of themes including that they would always vote for their relative and only for someone from their own district), support for political competition and free speech were much weaker than among the population as a whole. It seems that when people show a strong preference for their own “ingroup”, whether based on clan or district, they are also less interested in some aspects of liberal democracy.

When asked about tribalism in government, the results were also encouraging. In response to the statement, “It is wrong for a high government official to give special treatment to people from his home district by giving them jobs in his ministry,” 81% agreed that it is wrong and only 16% disagreed. However, people acknowledged in interviews that if they were in a position of power, their relatives would come to them for favors and it would be difficult to refuse because of the high value placed on helping relatives. Therefore, a second item was included in the survey which stated, “If I were an official, I would definitely (obligatorily) help my relative if he needed a job or needed help with a business.” To this, 30% agreed and 65% disagreed. Of course, not everyone will answer such a question honestly. However, the data show that most people either reject clan favoritism or they recognize that it is strongly stigmatized, which is also important.

Another element of tribalism is the practice of kin groups agreeing to vote together as a block. When asked to respond to the statement, “If my father told me that he and my uncles were all voting for a particular candidate, this would strongly influence my choice of who to vote for,” most respondents (64%) disagreed though a substantial minority (33%) agreed. This sort of collaboration by constituents, in and of itself, is not necessarily a problem. In mature democracies, for example, labor unions often encourage their members to support a particular candidate. If the goal is liberal democracy, each

member of the collective must feel free to vote their conscience and, if they agree to vote with their relatives, they do so because they believe it is in their best interests, not simply because of social pressure to conform. In another measure of voting along clan lines, respondents were asked whether they agreed that, “I will always vote for my relative if he or she is running for political office”. Fifty-nine percent disagreed with this statement and 36% agreed with it, arguing against fears that people use clan solidarity as their primary rule for voting (though it strongly influences their choice).

In contrast to the general willingness to vote for well-qualified leaders outside their own clan or district, people were more ambivalent when asked about attitudes toward other ethnic groups – whether someone would vote outside their ethnicity and whether minorities should have representatives in high government positions and in parliament. About one-quarter of the population expressed very open and inclusive views, the majority (66 percent) was in the middle, and ten percent expressed very biased ethnocentric views (strongly favoring their own ethnic group and showing prejudice against other ethnic groups). Of particular importance for building an inclusive political community, those who scored higher for ethnocentric views were also much more likely to see democracy as disorderly, more likely to say that the political opposition and media should not openly criticize the president and government, twice as likely to say that citizens should not be able to publish any and all political views, and more likely to disagree with the idea of citizens having more say in government.

**Those who say they would show favoritism in politics and public policy to their own clan, district, or ethnicity, are less supportive of liberal democracy than the majority of Kyrgyzstanis.**

It is not clear from the data in the survey why there is a link between ethnocentrism and resistance to liberal democracy – surveys are good at describing and poor at explaining – but the pattern is clear. Those who say they would

show favoritism in politics and public policy to their own clan, district, or ethnicity, are less supportive of liberal democracy than the majority of Kyrgyzstanis. This does not mean that people who have a strong attachment to their family and home are anti-democratic. Rather, it indicates that people who base their political decisions on these things are less supportive of liberal democracy.

## Conclusions

What do the results of the survey tell us about support for democracy in general, and liberal democracy in particular? Most Kyrgyzstanis support democratic competition and free speech, though harsh public attacks between political forces and chaos in the streets reduces this support. One result of this is that there is more support for the free speech rights of citizens than of the mass media. Stability and order are important, and having a strong president seems to be associated with these desires, but most people also want a strong parliament and judiciary. There is reason to believe that national political parties can grow and build broad constituencies, provided their candidates are well qualified and they make a point of reaching out to diverse groups rather than setting groups in competition with one another.

One troubling result of the survey is that there are still strong divisions within Kyrgyz society,

and people who show the most favoritism to their own ingroup, whether it is based on clan membership, district, or ethnicity, are the least likely to support liberal democracy. While the survey data can not explain this, research into social identity can. When a group is strongly prejudiced against others, members of the group assume that outsiders are just as prejudiced as they themselves are. So, members of a group who show strong favoritism to each other believe that outsiders will discriminate against them. If someone believes that other groups in society can not be trusted to treat them fairly, they will not want to see those people in positions of power. As a result, someone who shows strong ingroup favoritism does not trust the democratic concept of “government by the people” because he or she is afraid of what other groups might do. Given that any government needs popular legitimacy and that a strong society with many interconnections between groups enhances legitimacy, such social divisions can undermine any government, democratic or otherwise. One key lesson from this insight is that a political leader who tries to build support by inflaming ethnic, clan, or regional competition, aggravating the fears of social groups, undermines governance in general and democracy in particular. To further democracy, leaders must do two things: find ways to facilitate trust and cooperation between social groups and encourage open but orderly free speech and political competition.

## SELF-IDENTIFICATION OF MODERN KYRGYZ SOCIETY

*Currently, the people of Kyrgyzstan are experiencing a “time of quest” for their identity. The major questions that need to be answered today are “Who are we?”, “Where are we heading?”, “What do we have, can we have, and want to have?” Here, as is known, the so-called national identity level – self-identification of the people, self-identification of each member of society, and self-identification of each individual, plays not the least role.*

**Elmira Nogoybaeva \***

The irony of fate is that the very “search for self” in the 1990s was one of the factors that lead to the collapse of the Great Empire - the USSR. That was a time of escalation of a number of unresolved problems within the enormous (and by nature synthetic) society called “ the soviet people.” Local, national and regional conflicts emerged every now and then, leading

to changes in the political situation, and to the start of an irreversible processes in the end. The self-identity “gene” of the peoples of the Great Empire, which was in slumber for 70 years and recently awoke from a lengthy sleep, destroyed the identity that was imposed by the mighty empire (which attempted to design a new community – the soviet people). The attempt to

\* Elmira Nogoybaeva is a chief expert of the International Institute for Strategic Studies under the President of the Kyrgyz Republic.



unify entire strata of peoples' historical, cultural and traditional values infamously failed.

A new epoch and a new paradigm took over. For each former Soviet Union country and each ethnicity, the time for self-identification came regardless of the structure, welfare or receipt of such compensations as freedom, political independence, or sovereignty. Thus, starting from 1995, ethnic identity growth intensified in post soviet countries. Efforts were made to reevaluate their pasts – their places in the world history and culture; a new attitude towards the religion and their traditions formed. Their searches for self in the past intensified in order to explain themselves in the present, and to justify the “legitimacy” of the present, so to speak.

This process has been characterized by crucial reconsiderations of the recent past and by revival of that which had been forgotten undeservedly, particularly by the revival of national cultural traditions, history, and language. Here it becomes obvious that the state nationality policy of the USSR that had been pursued for 70 years inflicted serious damage on “national peripheries,” with serious consequences. This policy was expressed in particularly through complete Russification, through biased valuation of “white sports,” through interpretations of the histories of various “small” peoples and states of the Great Empire, at times simply belittling the dignity of these people through historical falsifications. Thus, almost two generations of the Kyrgyz, Kazakh, and other nationalities practically lost their national languages, which became merely colloquial dialects or “kitchen” languages, bluntly speaking,. Taking into account the fact that language always serves as one of the critical factors for the formation and sustained development of ethnicity, entire nations were being deprived of ethnic development.

On the other side of the equation, this period was characterized by a feverish search for evidence that might prove that “we exist,” and not only exist, but also that we are rather significant. A whole series of myths appeared to prove this point, starting from myths about the age of our nationality extending back to

its origins – its cradle and roots. Approaches to reveal the “historical truth” in Central Asian post-soviet republics began to acquire an increasingly hypertrophied character.

Thus, based on the ancient sources that detail the past, the picture we see is that tribes later blended into common bowls of national formation – they started to define figures. In 2002, Kyrgyzstan officially marked the 2200th anniversary of the Kyrgyz nation. Meanwhile, through a well-known work of the Turkmen leader Saparmurat Niyazov, their history is traced back 5,000 years and starts with the forefather of the entire nation – Oguz Khan.

New hypotheses and attitudes toward symbols and prominent national figures (such as Manas for the Kyrgyz nation, Amir Timur for Uzbeks, Sultan Sanjar for Turkmen, and so on) acquired different meanings; these initial meanings are complemented by an ideological component. A tendency emerged to search for confirmation of the legitimacy of the existing regimes and their policies through the creation of ideological myth. To polish the historical facts, “formation images” of nations took shape – attributing to ethnic communities specific cultural, status and other characteristics.

In this period, the identification of divisions in the community that separate “ours” from “outsiders” became apparent and grew stronger. At the same time, formation of the position “us vs. them” is characteristic for all subjects attempting to identify themselves in the comparison of “I-another/others.”

There exist several directions that are used or potentially can be used as a consolidating constant in self – for identification of Kyrgyz society.

*Ethnic nationalism* is one of the most widely spread self-identification elements. Calls for “revival of the nation” were heard more often during the critical periods for the country, certainly including such reservations as “healthy nationalism,” “sound nationalism,” and “national spirit,” with reference to the experiences of other countries such as Japan, Turkey, and the USA. This practice is not peculiar to our country.

In Russia, the political rhetoric of Rogozin, Zhirinovskiy, Limonov, and other party officials, including communists, has appealed to national revival of the state. Even very democratic states could not avoid this tendency in certain periods of their development. The most illustrated example of an appeal for the position of “sound nationalism” is the discourse of D. Howell<sup>1</sup> of the Tories of the Great Britain, who was a member of Margaret Thatcher’s Cabinet of for some time.

In the history of the Kyrgyz people there are practically no manifestations of nationalism, particularly in its reactionary form. The ideology of the “Manas’ legacy” and the celebration of the 2200th anniversary of the Kyrgyz people, which obviously aimed at the minds of ethnic Kyrgyz, did not yield any firm values in the society. In a multi-cultural and multi-ethnic Kyrgyzstan, where the Kyrgyz live surrounded by many other ethnicities, a concept to unite the entire Kyrgyz nation – all Kyrgyzstanis, regardless of their ethnic background – based on so called *civil* nationalism seems more viable and acceptable. The traditional way of life of a multi-ethnic society, based on the principle of interpenetration and mutual enrichment of cultures, has long been a fundamental factor for the stability of society in Kyrgyzstan. Probably this is why one of the most efficient strategies of former president Askar Akaev was his policy which stated that “Kyrgyzstan is our common home.”

*Religion* is another potential direction for national identification. Kyrgyz society is considered to be Muslim, and certain political forces are trying to appeal to Islam as a decisive trait of the Kyrgyz people’s identity. However, throughout many centuries, the territory of what would become Kyrgyzstan was distinguished by the integrated coexistence of many peoples, confessing various religions – Tengerianism, Zoroastrianism, Buddhism, Christianity, Judaism, Islam, and others. Since its independence, representatives of the various confessions that surged into the country have

hurriedly begun to fill the gap formed during the soviet period. Currently the religious situation in the country is characterized by revival tendencies; this point applies to Islam in particular.

An appeal for consistent *territorial value* - “Ala-Too land” or “Tian-Shan mountains” can also be mentioned. Can we state with complete accountability that certain territories were “Kyrgyz lands from the earliest days?” It is not a fact that current “Kyrgyz territories,” land and boundaries, always belonged solely to the Kyrgyz as such.

Communal ownership of land, especially with nomadic cattle breeding across the major part of current Kyrgyzstan, provides grounds for talking about the connection of the Kyrgyz people to only part of the territory, pastures and separate plots. Moreover, the soviet period, with its unique policies of national ownership, practically erased the hereditary, tribal, and clan connection to land as private property. If restoration of historically formed private ownership, based on pre-revolutionary legislation, is currently in progress in the Baltic States and in some places within Russia, this practice seems practically unreal in the Central Asian states, especially in Kyrgyzstan,.

In the life of Central Asia, in the self-identification of its peoples, the most essential, meaningful identity is the lowest, basic level of self-consciousness and public relations – the system of sub-ethnic family and tribal (or clan) relations. Within the framework of traditional Central Asian societies, prevalent even today, these relations play the decisive role in the processes of socialization, of identification, and of solving the majority of issues, especially in rural areas. In Kyrgyzstan, more than two thirds of the Kyrgyz ethnicity live in rural areas, and the remaining “urban” part is closely related to villagers through close family relations and bonds. Such a system of relations and ties within the society is characteristic to other

<sup>1</sup> “Great Tories of the past, wrote Howell, were nationalist in a special sense, in which we should also be ones. Not nationalist of the troublesome sort that constantly watch the foreign devils to blame them for all sins, but those who are simply conscious that each nation differs from the rest, and therefore comfortably exists only with its own institutions and specific peculiarities and that these specific peculiarities per se are an integral part of the national existence, and the people feel lost and anxious if they are lost.” D. The Conservative Tradition and the 1980s. Three Gifts of Insight Restored. L., 1980, P.6.



nations living in the Fergana Valley, particularly to Uzbeks and Tajiks, who have a peculiar legend of their origin that is similar in content to the Kyrgyz Sanjira .

The system of *family and tribe/clan* relations became the core of social structure. Governments could be ruined, perish and reappear; dynasties easily replaced each other at the reigns of government in the administration system; but the micro-structure of the society, i.e. firm corporations, remained almost without changes. Moreover, newly established government entities eagerly took the old structure under their protection, and carefully protected it from changes. Therefore, political and even social crises usually did not lead to internal structural renovation.

As a rule, clan corporate relations are interpreted as a negative phenomenon in contemporary scientific and political literature. It is called

“tribalism,” and viewed through a prism of so called “archaic” traditional society <sup>2</sup>.

In conclusion, I would like to mention a rather well known fact. Identification of each individual with a strong community (holding constant issues of economics, human rights, freedom of expression and etc.) significantly improves the self-esteem of that person. In other words, the more stable and developed a society is, the more stable is the social identification and psychological comfort of its community members, and, no matter how paradoxical it might seem, the less the ethnic identity is expressed.

Thus, in gaining “outside” stability, gradually identification on the ethnic and territorial level are reduced, and professional and personal identification comes into the foreground; as a result, the feelings of anxiety disappear, and gradually confidence in the future appears.

## SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC RISKS AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE POLITICAL STABILITY IN KYRGYZSTAN

*Economic and social wellbeing is the basis of political stability in any country. In Kyrgyzstan unfortunately, these components of political stability are increasingly shattered nowadays by periodic, negative developments and occurrences. A decline in the authority of power, of the government, is apparent, which indicates and portends serious social problems.*

**Gulasel Abylova \***

The inability of the government to handle developments and sustain a relative balance of interests became evident in several contexts: (1) the forced capture and retention of the Karakeche coal mine by Motuev, (2) incessant rallies either in approval or disapproval of the appointment of officials, and (3) a short-term, yet a very symptomatic conflict in Iskra village.

Social tension amongst the people is also aggravated by various indicators of economic decline. Living standards remain low for the majority of the population: more than 45% of

the population lives in poverty, and people living in conditions of extreme poverty constitute 13.4%. A growing gap between rural and urban areas is observed: approximately 80% of the country’s poor population lives in rural areas. Outflow of qualified specialists from the country is still under way: currently more than 500,000 citizens of Kyrgyzstan, mainly young people, are working in Russia, Kazakhstan, countries of Western Europe and North America, and elsewhere. Moreover, their rate of return remains very low.

<sup>2</sup> Different authors researched this problem in Kyrgyzstan during different times, including the doctor of legal sciences professor Nurbekov K.N., who attempted to show more objectively the retrospective genesis of the Kyrgyz society in his work “History of state and law in the Kyrgyz Soviet Socialist Republic.” In the conditions of the USSR, with the prevailing “Class” approach, it was practically impossible to conduct this type of serious scientific work. As for modern works on clan/corporate relations as one of the ways to national identity, such works remain mostly insufficient and one-sided.

\* Gulasel Abylova, a chief expert of the International Institute for Strategic Studies under the President of the Kyrgyz Republic, is a participant of the project “Policy debate and good governance”. This is the third essay in a series of articles by participants of the project

Escalation of social problems and the weakening of the government's role can be explained according to the following reasons:

- *Lack of a nation system of values.* The population of Kyrgyzstan has not yet formed into a unified group, consolidated on the basis of co-citizenship. Ethnic, tribal and territorial forms of self-identification prevail, which predetermines the government's weak influence as a platform for uniting the whole population. One the results of the events of March 24th, 2005 was the outright ignoring of laws and decrees by the official authorities, which is evident from the seizure of the Karakeche coal mine, confusion around the appointment of governors<sup>3</sup> and rayon akims<sup>4</sup>, and other staffing issues.
- *Rampant spread of corruption.* Akaev's corrupted regime was one of the major causes of the events of March 24th. Though the idea of fighting against corruption was one of the major points in the officials' rhetoric, no cardinal changes have been observed in either legislation or practice. This problem holds economic consequences: lack of effective laws and regulation for obtaining permission to carry out business activities; lack of legal and efficient channels for dialogue between the government and private business, leading to the failure of the country to achieve the level of economic growth sufficient to ensure the servicing and repayment of the national debt.

Resources meant for improvement of the administration system and development of democratic institutions were used inefficiently, thus decreasing the earlier estimated return of the foreign loans. When providing assistance, insufficient attention was given to the level of preparedness of the recipient state and its institutions to receive the assistance and to use it adequately. Due to an opaque political system, inefficient use of foreign loans was permitted, the money of foreign tax-payers

allocated for the country was not always used for its intended purpose (as people who did not even intend to develop the country got hold of some of it). The need to service debt significantly decreased the amount of resources available for the government to allocate to the support of small and medium business development, to start up state enterprises standing idle, and to address social issues.

- *Decline of economic indicators/growth of income discrepancies amongst the population.* The economy of Kyrgyzstan is still functioning, yet not growing. The ensuing poverty, lack of workplaces, growth of social and economic discrepancies between the regions, and loss of general inclusiveness in the development of the economy create risks for the integrity of the national economy. There is no real support for entrepreneurship. Small enterprises, cooperatives, and other small unions of workers that do not require significant expenses for technical equipment or power supply have significant possibilities to create new work places. However, this sector lacks relevant normative and legal precedents, which also hampers economic growth.

As the rural economy fails to provide the population with food, the majority of food and agricultural products are imported from neighboring countries. Rural producers are left without state support. Particularly, the supply of fuel and lubrication materials is not regulated, thus leading to considerable interruptions in its supply to producers during the peak season. Provision of farming equipment and realization of markets are not defined.

Social tension amongst the population was accumulated during the rule of the previous government as well: inefficient state administration, double standards of principles, and dissatisfaction of the population with the social and economic policies of the government actually lead to the events of March 24th. Inefficient state institutions, massive and costly

<sup>3</sup> Head of regional (oblast) state administration

<sup>4</sup> Head of district (raion) state administration



administrative territorial divisions, unstable legislation, rampant corruption, and a race for revenues among authorities became the major obstacles for the development of the national economy or solutions to social problems.

A year has elapsed since the revolution, and it seems that the time has come to sum up the results. However, the future prospects of the state are not yet defined. The authorities have not started to elaborate the country's development strategy. Political intrigue is present in the actions of the officials, which further exacerbates the general instability in the country.

In order to improve the existing situation in some way, it is necessary to fulfill certain conditions:

First, for further development of the country, tougher, more responsible and decisive actions need to be taken by its management. This step could rehabilitate the people's trust in the government. Special attention should be devoted to limiting the participation of the political and economic elites in the "pie-sharing." It is necessary to make a tradition of regularly reporting on and holding accountable officials for any actions or inaction.

Second, there is an urgent need for public participation in budgeting; this will make the government accountable, and raise the public trust the government. The solution lies not only in strengthening the legal basis for fighting against corruption, but also in improving the political system, as well as increasing the transparency of state and local budgets.

The strategy of the state policy on employment should be aimed at preventing the growth of unemployment, and at alleviating the impact of factors that cause unemployment and increase social tension. It is necessary to motivate young specialists living in rural areas (with higher wages, housing, land plots, etc) to stay there and not leave for cities or neighboring countries in search of jobs. Development of local self-governance would support improvements in the efficiency of local public services provision.

With the existing sharp income gap amongst the population, it is crucial to preserve general

access to services in the social sphere – in health care, education, and culture (they should at least be free of charge at the level of socially guaranteed standards, stipulated by legislation). It is also necessary to guarantee everyone with basic standards of housing. Only in this case will it be possible to realize the necessary quality of work force, relatively equal start up opportunities for young people, and basic living standard and social protection of the population, as well as to alleviate social tension.

The events in Iskra village showed that the decision-making procedures used by the government give more causes for further escalation and fomentation of conflict than for its prevention. The government should take decisive, possibly even strong measures to eliminate similar incidents.

In order to achieve long-term political stability and integration into the world economy, the government of the Kyrgyz Republic should take steps to reform its political system. In particular, it is necessary to conduct constitutional reforms and transform the current presidential system of governance, characterized by insufficient accountability and transparency, into a more open, accountable form of administration, based on public participation.

Moreover, political changes should be used to ensure complete transparency of foreign aid distribution. It is necessary to establish periodic public reporting of organizations on how various foreign assistance resources are used, and with what results, as well as political responsibility of the government for inefficient use of foreign aid. This step would require readiness by the government to adopt strategic decisions.

The social sphere directly influences the pace and quality of national economic growth. Furthermore, this influence will only increase. A high level of citizens' material and spiritual wellbeing, a dominating status of the middle class in the structure of the society, and a realization of social partnership principles will determine the long-term economic prospects of the country, as well as its social and political stability.