



The University of Tehran Press

Journal of Iran and Central Eurasia Studies

Online ISSN: 2645-6060

Home Page: <https://jices.ut.ac.ir>

## Transition in Turmoil: Political Instability and Governance Dilemmas in Kyrgyzstan

Subrat Biswal 

Assistant Professor in Political Science, Government College, Koraput, India. Email: [subratjnu@gmail.com](mailto:subratjnu@gmail.com)

---

### ARTICLE INFO

**Article type:**  
Research Article

**Article History:**  
Received 24 September 2024  
Revised 28 December 2025  
Accepted 05 February 2025  
Published Online 05 February 2025

**Keywords:**  
Kyrgyzstan,  
Democracy,  
Authoritarianism,  
Political Instability,  
Amendment.

---

### ABSTRACT

Political instability and issues with governance have impacted Kyrgyzstan's transition to democracy. This abstract analyses the complex relationship between political instability and governance challenges in the country using a comprehensive approach that includes historical analysis and comparative case studies. The political landscape in Kyrgyzstan is characterized by frequent leadership shifts, electoral irregularities, and violent outbreaks, which have hampered the consolidation of democratic institutions. The role of ethnic diversity and regional tensions in exacerbating instability is also examined, highlighting the challenges of nation-building in a diverse society. The lack of continuity in leadership and weak institutions has hindered effective policy implementation and service delivery. The paper also examines the role of civil society, the media, and external actors in shaping the trajectory of democracy in Kyrgyzstan. The findings emphasize the need for targeted reforms to address the root causes of instability and strengthen democratic institutions, fostering sustainable governance and democratic consolidation in the country.

---

**Cite this article:** Biswal, S. (2025). Transition in Turmoil: Political Instability and Governance Dilemmas in Kyrgyzstan. *Journal of Iran and Central Eurasia Studies*, 7 (2), 29-39. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.22059/jices.2025.382802.1074>



© Subrat Biswal  
DOI: <http://doi.org/10.22059/jices.2025.382802.1074>

**Publisher:** University of Tehran Press.

---

## **Introduction**

Kyrgyzstan, also known as the Kyrgyz Republic, is a Central Asian country that implemented a democratic representative system in 1991 after the disintegration of the Soviet Union. Its government system emphasizes democracy and pluralism, unlike other former Soviet Central Asian Republics. Kyrgyzstan has fluctuated between democratic and authoritarian tendencies since its establishment, with three dictatorial presidents deposed since 2005 (Engvall, 2022). In the 1990s, Askar Akayev, a politically unconventional individual from the former Soviet Union, gained recognition as the “island of democracy” in Central Asia (Anderson, 2013). Under his leadership, the country aimed to create a pluralist electoral democracy and an open market economy. However, Akayev’s autocratic approach to governance led to the overthrow of the government in 2005, known as the “Tulip Revolution.” The growing demand for a just and democratic regime has led to a growing demand for a just and democratic government.

Following Askar Akayev’s presidency, Kurmanbek Bakiyev rose to power in the wake of the Tulip Revolution. Bakiyev, who was initially selected as his successor, later emerged as his primary adversary. He held the position for five years until 2010, during which he adopted a more stringent approach, leading to criticism and the suppression of opposition factions (Implementing Democracy: Challenges in EU-Kyrgyzstan Relations, 2021). This led to the ascendancy of the president’s family members as de facto authorities, engaged in violence, corruption and familial tyranny.

In April 2010, a coalition of fourteen parliamentarians under the leadership of Roza Otunbayeva overthrew the Bakiyev government. Otunbayeva demonstrated strong leadership in guiding Kyrgyzstan through a period of intense inter-ethnic violence in June 2010. She successfully spearheaded constitutional reform and conducted parliamentary elections within the same year. The parliamentary form of government in Kyrgyzstan was established with the passage of a new constitution in 2010, but the transfer of authority to Parliament led to limitations on Executive powers. Almazbek Atambayev achieved success in the presidential elections held in the latter half of 2011, consolidating control over all government organizations by 2017. Despite the limitations imposed by the constitution, Atambayev managed to personally choose his ultimate successor.

Sooronbay Jeenbekov, a loyal candidate, was considered a potential successor to Atambayev, challenging the idea of a successor. After just two months in office, Jeenbekov dismissed those affiliated with former President Atambayev from power and denounced his treason in March 2018. This led to a series of indictments, with many implicated in corrupt activities sent to prison. The Jeenbekov administration turned to party advantage through police forces, intelligence services, and the legal system during Jeenbekov’s first year due to ongoing disputes with his former associate. The Jeenbekov administration has shown insufficient efficacy in formulating a comprehensive strategy for economic expansion and addressing corruption. Although the administration successfully curtailed the legal persecution of journalists and activists, the evidence does not strongly indicate a firm commitment to democratic values or the rule of law.

In 2015, the sixth parliamentary election in Kyrgyzstan was held for five-year terms. Despite the majority supporting Atambayev’s decisions and Jeenbekov’s counter-Atambayev actions, the legislative system faced public disapproval due to perceptions of corruption, incompetence, and inadequate expertise among its leaders. Kyrgyzstan is currently facing a challenging phase, with a grim outlook for democracy and the rule of law and growing discontent with the nation’s leadership and constitutional framework.

## **Adoption of democracy**

The democratic movement on the Eurasian continent began in 1975 and ended in the early

1990s, involving over two dozen states. This led to the overthrow of Communist governments in each country. However, the transition to a democratic system is not a linear process, and the success of a democratic government cannot be solely based on its establishment. The arduous nature of the transition process poses significant challenges for nascent democracies, with some resulting in authoritarian or pseudo-democratic regimes, especially in Central Asian republics (Zakaria, 1997).

Democracy is a broad concept with various interpretations, including “government by the people for the people,” which is the predominant conceptualization. Schumpeter’s narrow definition of democracy involves people directly electing their governing body; while David Held’s broad interpretation argues that voting in elections alone is insufficient. Held’s participatory democracy involves individuals consistently participating in decision-making and taking an active role in their country’s political affairs. This approach emphasizes the importance of not only political rights but also economic and social rights (Sorensen, 2018). Both approaches offer different perspectives on democracy, with Schumpeter’s narrow definition focusing on elections as the fundamental element of the political framework.

Askar Akayev secured the presidency of Kyrgyzstan in 1990 and maintained it until 2005. The establishment of the Presidential Council was a response to the Communist Party’s dominance over the government. Kyrgyzstan became the only Central Asian country to adopt an assertive position in response to the 1991 coup. The KGB was liquidated, and assets belonging to the CPSU were seized. This process, which led to the dismissal of A.M. Masaliyev as First Secretary of the Communist Party, was completed after 1991. In 1990, the Kyrgyz Democratic Movement released a draft of a “Declaration of Sovereignty” (Refworld | Kyrgyzstan. Political Conditions in the Post-Soviet Era, 1993). The study examines the political conditions in the post-Soviet era, focusing on 1993, and the discussion of the plan’s merits and drawbacks did not occur until the final disintegration of the Soviet Union on December 31, 1991.

Kyrgyzstan gained independence in 1991 and has since been referred to as the “Switzerland of Central Asia” and an “island of democracy” due to its liberal stances. Its geographical location in Central Asia, surrounded by China, Tajikistan, and the newer authoritarian countries of Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan, highlights its unique political landscape.

With the aid of a well-established multi-party system, Kyrgyzstan’s government was prepared to move towards democracy after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. The 1993 Constitution established a democratic republic with Askar Akayev as the head of government. Despite lacking political experience, Akayev demonstrated visionary leadership. The Kyrgyzstan government formulated laws on “privatisation” to facilitate the transition of the national economy from a centrally planned model to a free market system. The constitution was passed on May 5, 1993, and the governing body established formal symbols to represent its autonomous statehood, including a seal representing the presidency and an anthem. The official languages of Kyrgyzstan are Russian and Kyrgyz, in that order (Constitution of the Kyrgyz Republic and Cabinet of Ministers of the Kyrgyz Republic, 1993).

The Akayev administration is widely considered the most democratic in Central Asia, leading to significant financial aid from the United States and Western nations. Kyrgyzstan has been working to maintain its reputation as a transparent and democratic nation for the first seven years of independence. This effort aims to secure financial support and attract investors (Connery, 2000). Akayev’s increased press freedom and tolerance towards opposition groups make him vulnerable to criticism and leadership challenges, setting him apart from other Central Asian regimes.

The Kyrgyz Republic’s governance and democratisation processes have been dynamic, with disputed results. Over the past few years, the country has experienced significant

political transformations, shifting away from the authoritarian regime since 1991. The political environment is high, with civic organisations and political parties protesting. The country benefits from a free press and has the potential to serve as a paradigm for other Central Asian states. The country's commitment to democracy, the rule of law, and civil rights make it a promising country for Central Asian states.

### **The transition from democracy to authoritarianism**

Kyrgyzstan, one of the fifteen nations that emerged after the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, celebrated the collapse of communism as a victory for liberty and democratic governance.

Fukuyama (1992) argued that the collapse of communism signified the "end of history" (Fukuyama, 1992). Governments and international organizations invested significant effort in promoting and consolidating democratic political systems and institutions in Central Asia and other newly established sovereign states.

Kyrgyzstan, along with other Central Asian nations, transitioned from a Soviet-style authoritarian governance structure to a democratic one and a free market economy. Despite lacking experience in democratic regimes and free market systems, Kyrgyzstan aspired to become a genuine democracy based on democratic ideals. The disintegration of the Soviet Union shifted the country into a new political and economic landscape. Kyrgyzstan has made efforts to position itself as a democratic state, focusing on the rule of law, individual freedoms, and protecting minority rights.

The first democratically elected parliament in Kyrgyzstan enacted land legislation to ensure equitable access, use, and possession for all residents (Huskey, 1995). However, electoral politics and lenient political engagement further exacerbated divisions between Kyrgyz and other ethnic groups, impeded democracy, and led to economic problems. This period marked the beginning of Kyrgyzstan's transition towards authoritarianism, with governments transitioning from democratic systems to authoritarian regimes by the end of the 1990s (Niazaliev, 2004).

Freedom House criticized Kyrgyzstan's democracy score of 5.67 in 2004 for corruption, election procedures, and human rights violations (Freedom House, 2012). The government used authoritarian strategies to address the opposition, journalists, and media entities, highlighting the challenge of developing a robust democratic system and potentially reinforcing authoritarian tendencies.

Kyrgyzstan has experienced two fatal revolutions since 2005, both strategically orchestrated to accelerate the nation's transition towards democratic governance. The first revolution in 2005 led to the establishment of another oppressive regime, while the subsequent revolution in 2010 sparked hope for a transition. Proponents of authoritarian regimes argue that revolutions are catalysts for instability and bloodshed, advocating for authoritarian stability over democratic experimentation (Shishkin 2012).

The majority of referendums held during the Akayev era were used to expand presidential authority. With a directly elected president and a cabinet answerable to the legislature, Kyrgyzstan adopted a semi-presidential system in 1993 (Anderson, 1997). The president was the one who first suggested the referendum, which started a process of constitutional amendments since 1994 that was more heavily influenced by political leaders than popular opinion. Amendments have historically been implemented to protect presidents from constitutional constraints, making constitutional revision increasingly associated with autocratic rule (Sievers, 2013). In addition to Akayev's violations of the law, the referendums also involved important parts, such as the formation of the Central Election Commission and the selection of its members. However, Article 58 of the constitution states that only the parliament has the authority to create such a panel.

Another important problem was related to the fact that there were often violations during referendums. According to many local reports, an estimated 40% of the population is actively engaged in the voting process. According to the National Democratic Institute (NDI), there were several instances of illicit voting, including the act of stuffing ballot boxes, individuals casting multiple votes, and the practice sometimes referred to as “family voting” (NDI Statement Following the February 2, 2003, Constitutional Referendum in Kyrgyzstan, 2003). Another noteworthy aspect of the referendums is the way Akayev used the media for his public statements. In these talks, he used to analyse the importance of constitutional modifications based on referendums. Similarly, the 2007 referendum faced heightened scrutiny under the Bkiyev dictatorship due to many instances of anomalies, manipulation, and fraudulent voting.

Both presidents in Kyrgyzstan have used referendums to strengthen their political power, with Akayev expanding the president’s authority and Bakiev intensifying his dictatorial style. However, there is general agreement on the extent of irregularities, such as ballot stuffing, manipulation of impartial observers, and dubious vote counts. These referendums have faced criticism from regional and global monitoring bodies due to their perceived inaccuracies. The decline of democracy in Kyrgyzstan has limited opportunities for individuals to voice concerns and participate in political discourse without fear of potential consequences.

The democracy index in Kyrgyzstan has declined since 2018, with the 2020 October parliamentary elections being flawed due to violence, protests, and intimidation. Acting President Sadyr Japarov assumed the role without adhering to constitutional procedures. A referendum in April 2021 approved a new constitution, expanding the president’s jurisdiction and reducing the parliamentary size (Eales, 2021).

### **Successive revolutions**

Kyrgyzstan, a former Soviet Republic, experienced three revolutions in 2005, 2010, and 2020, making it the only post-Soviet nation to have experienced such transformative events. The Tulip Revolution, a typical colour revolution, aimed to democratically oust the first sitting president, Askar Akayev. However, the subsequent two revolutions were a consequence of the fragile and precarious system that emerged in the aftermath of the first revolution. The Tulip Revolution emerged as the third occurrence in a series of colour revolutions within the post-Soviet region. The Revolution ultimately resulted in the downfall of the president, marking the end of his 14- year tenure in office.

Significant violence characterised the popular uprising known as the Melon Revolution, which brought an end to Kurmanbek Bakiyev’s rule in April 2010. Roza Otunbayeva and Almazbek Atambayev assumed their respective positions during the April 2010 uprisings, with Otunbayeva serving as acting president and Atambayev ruling for six years in rotation between the northern and southern clans. Atambayev faced differences with Sooronbai Jeenbekov, a friend within the same political organisation who would eventually emerge as a contender for the presidency.

The character of revolutions in Kyrgyzstan remains unpredictable due to factors such as tribalism and the “divided nation” status of post-Soviet Kyrgyzstan. Academicians argue that these two factors are the primary causes of the country’s inherent instability. However, every instance of insurrection is characterised by its unexpected nature, arising from a distinct combination of circumstances and diverse underlying factors. According to scholars, social, racial, and domestic political factors were the main drivers of the revolutions, with a geopolitical backdrop playing a less significant role (Ivanov, 2022).

In the early 1990s, Kyrgyzstan experienced a period of democratisation influenced by civil society action and President Akayev’s efforts to seek Western assistance. However, after the

country's second presidential election in 1995, Akayev consolidated his control over the government. By 2000, Kyrgyzstan had transitioned from an elected democracy to an authoritarian administration. Clan-based politics had a significant impact on the regime, which relied on dishonest patronage networks to steal public funds. As state resources diminished, Akayev strategically concentrated more assets into his network, severing ties with clan leaders and former associates. As opposition from both the elite and common people rose, his administration was doomed.

The southern region of the country experienced protests as the campaign advanced, attracting young individuals and urban residents to Bishkek, the capital city. Civil society and democratic activists successfully mobilised, while regional leaders expressed concerns about patronage and used social networks to support their claims (Radnitz, 2006). Roza Otunbayeva, a former comrade, played a significant role in organising the protests. The People's Unity movement, opposed to Akayev's regime, formed through a public meeting in Jalal-Abad in mid-March 2005. On March 24, the government collapsed, but Collins (2011) notes that violence, looting, and disorder characterized the fall of an authoritarian regime.

Experts have found that the April 2010 uprising was primarily due to significant increases in utility rates, which were introduced on January 1, 2010, and coincided with harsh winter weather. The administration of President Bakiyev was marked by fraudulent practises and political behaviour, including the appointment of his son Maksim as the head of the Central Agency for Development, Investment, and Research in late 2009. The Russian government initiated a propaganda campaign in Kyrgyzstan to influence public opinion against Bakiyev, which contributed to the growing discontent among the population. On March 10, 2010, a large gathering of demonstrators in the municipality of Naryn urged the government to reconsider its stance on rising prices and the privatisation of energy enterprises. This rally exacerbated the government's concerns about potential insecurity arising from opposition gatherings, leading to the implementation of more stringent laws restricting press freedom. Several internet platforms, particularly those associated with adversaries, were compelled to cease operations, including the termination of two newspapers with opposition-oriented content. On March 17th, participants accused the president of usurping authority, engaging in political oppression, conducting deceitful privatisations, and implementing unjustified increases in public utility tariffs. Roza Otunbayeva, the leader of the opposition group, was elected as the head of the parliamentary faction of the Social Democratic Party. Furthermore, it has been said that there would be coordinated demonstrations at the state level to advocate for reforms (Nichol, 2010).

Kyrgyzstan has experienced a period of social and political turmoil since October 4th, 2020, following the parliamentary elections. Protests led by election improprieties led to the ousting of President Jeenbekov. Sadyr Japarov's selection as Prime Minister after the protests resembles a political upheaval in a Central Asian country with a constrained democratic framework. Japarov, with a history of imprisonment and political expertise, has used the protests to advance his personal and limited objectives. After escaping confinement, the supporters used force on President Jeenbekov, forcing him to abdicate and allowing Japarov to assume the roles of Prime Minister and temporary President.

Kyrgyzstan has a history of political coups, but the latest instance involves a group of individuals involved in illicit pursuits and their supporters influencing Japarov's acquisition of governmental authority. They used aggressive methods to achieve their goals, assaulting journalists, hurling rocks at demonstrators, and attempting to assassinate former President Atambayev. The ongoing conflict could be seen as a rebellion sponsored by belligerent ethnic groups in the northern area. The implications of nominating an individual with a criminal

record to the posts of prime minister and president are uncertain, as it remains unclear who would benefit from such a choice.

### **Adoption of a parliamentary form of government**

A plebiscite was held in Kyrgyzstan on June 27, 2010, to adopt an amended constitution following President Bakiyev's removal. The Central Election Commission (CEC) conducted the poll, which took place 80 days after the removal and close to a deadly ethnic conflict between Kyrgyz and Uzbeks. With over 70% of the vote, voters supported constitutional amendments affecting various aspects of the electoral system, separation of powers, judicial system, human rights, and local self-government. According to the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (*Kyrgyzstan Votes to Adopt a New Constitution* | IFES, 2010), Kyrgyzstan is poised to emerge as the only parliamentary democracy in Central Asia after the implementation of certain modifications. The proposed constitution aimed to establish a five-year parliamentary election system and increase the number of seats in Parliament from 90 to 120, with no political party owning more than 65 seats. The amended constitution would provide the prime minister with a higher degree of authority than the president and impose a six-year term restriction on the presidency. The vote took place before the October presidential election.

On December 1, 2011, Roza Otunbayeva voluntarily relinquished her position as Kyrgyzstan's President, and Almazbek Atambayev was elected. Atambayev won Kyrgyzstan's first free and competitive presidential election on October 30, 2011, and conducted its first completely free parliamentary elections on October 10, 2010. Despite facing obstacles due to ethnic violence in June 2010, Kyrgyzstan experienced its first democratic transition of presidential authority in 2011 (Collins, 2012). Atambayev emphasised the importance of ethnic cohesion and stability for Kyrgyzstan's development and urged citizens to challenge the belief that Kyrgyzstan is destined to become a fragile state due to internal divisions. He emphasized nation-building and fulfilling people's expectations, focusing on judicial reforms, combating corruption and organized crime, enhancing infrastructure and energy security, improving communication, ensuring food security, and addressing ethnic relations and language policy.

Despite President Atambayev's potential, Kyrgyzstan faces numerous uncertainties due to legal proceedings targeting journalists, activists, and legislators. The Prosecutor General's Office of Kyrgyzstan has often favoured Atambayev in these cases. In 2017, Kyrgyzstan experienced a nonviolent transition of authority, with previous Prime Minister Sooronbai Jeenbekov chosen as the fifth president. However, the widespread use of state assets to suppress political rivalry raises concerns about political elites' ability to facilitate unrestricted and equitable elections. Prominent adversaries of the president were incarcerated, and vocal media organizations faced financial penalties after questionable inquiries and legal proceedings. The departing president supported his successor, Jeenbekov, while using derogatory language towards his primary adversary, Omurbek Babanov.

The nonviolent transfer of authority through electoral processes in Kyrgyzstan has not addressed the high level of political competition and the lack of genuine political plurality. The Social Democratic Party of Kyrgyzstan (SDPK), led by the president, has significant influence over major political processes, using state administrative authorities during presidential elections. However, the durability of democracy in Kyrgyzstan is questionable due to developments such as the rise of "silent" parties, the prosecution of outspoken political leaders, the suppression of freedom of speech, and administrative influence to ensure the president's successor's victory. In 2017, media freedoms and political diversity deteriorated, with six defamation cases initiated against President Atambayev and presidential contender

Jeenbekov, all leading to convictions of “guilty.” Despite extensive use of political jargon on judicial reform, there has been limited observable change in the rule of law, with courts showing a lack of regard for proper procedure, particularly in politically significant cases.

The 2010 constitutional revision reduced the president’s authority, transferring it to the prime minister, cabinet, and legislature. The president’s tenure was limited to six years, and he retained significant authority in areas like international relations, national security, and veto power. This hybrid parliamentary-presidential system led to a parliamentary election in the autumn of 2010, resulting in contested parties in the national assembly, indicating a significant democratic advancement for Kyrgyzstan.

The establishment of governing alliances in Kyrgyzstan increased political participation, allowing major political groups to participate in parliament and administration. Fresh laws provided elites with a structured platform to resolve conflicts, diverting frustrations from public demonstrations. The political landscape in Kyrgyzstan shifted towards legislative discussions, with President Atambayev taking a less prominent role.

The parliament’s increased powers failed to prevent a resurgence of presidential dictatorship within Kyrgyzstan. Analysts like Freedom House argue that democratic development regressed under the purported parliamentary regime, undermining established institutions, worsening governance, and failing to build a social compact between the public and the state (Engvall, 2021).

In January 2021, a referendum in Kyrgyzstan favoured a change to the country’s political system, involving a transition to a presidential pattern of administration. This change is expected to strengthen the authority of President Sadyr Japarov. Kyrgyzstan experienced significant events in 2020, including the COVID-19 pandemic, resulting in a third uprising and the downfall of the Soorinbai Jeenbekov administration. An interim administration led by Sadyr Japarov assumed power, and a presidential election on January 10, 2021, confirmed Japarov as the elected president. Kyrgyzstan’s electorate held a referendum on January 10 to choose between a presidential or parliamentary administration. A 30% turnout, with 81.3% supporting a presidential system, indicates a strong preference for a presidential system (Turgunbaeva, 2021).

### **Conclusion and Recommendations**

The interplay between democracy and political instability has been intricately woven into the multifaceted fabric of Kyrgyzstan’s contemporary history. The nation’s trajectory towards democratic governance has been characterised by a combination of advancements and obstacles, which are indicative of the inherent difficulties associated with the shift from an authoritarian government to a framework that prioritises inclusiveness, accountability, and public engagement. In the culmination of the analysis of democracy and political instability in Kyrgyzstan, several significant insights arise, accompanied by suggestions that might foster a more secure and democratic trajectory for the country.

In conclusion, the history of Kyrgyzstan during the Soviet era has been marked by episodes of political turmoil and shifts between parliamentary and presidential regimes. Throughout its history, the country has seen instances of democratic potential, as shown by events like the Tulip Revolution in 2005 and the ousting of President Kurmanbek Bakiyev in 2010. However, it has also grappled with persistent challenges like corruption, institutional fragility, and ethnic conflicts. The aforementioned issues have resulted in a dearth of political stability, impeding the nation’s socioeconomic progress and global reputation.

The parliamentary system, while theoretically favourable for power-sharing and inclusiveness, has often been prone to factionalism, thereby potentially intensifying political instability. Moreover, the frequent changes in political leadership have impeded the

implementation of coherent policies and reforms, thereby impeding sustained advancements in the long run. The aforementioned obstacles have impeded Kyrgyzstan's capacity to fully actualize the advantages associated with democracy, including the safeguarding of human rights, adherence to the rule of law, and implementation of transparent government.

**The following recommendations are proposed**

The need for Kyrgyzstan lies in prioritising the establishment of resilient and autonomous institutions capable of withstanding political influences. The establishment of a trustworthy judiciary, unbiased electoral commissions, and efficient anti-corruption entities is crucial to sustaining the fundamental tenets of democracy and the norms of the rule of law.

**Constitutional Reforms:** A thorough examination of the constitution, including extensive public engagement, has the potential to elucidate the allocation of powers across governmental departments and develop unambiguous protocols for addressing political upheavals. Achieving a harmonious equilibrium between the powers vested in the executive branch, as shown by the presidency, and the legislative branch, as embodied by the parliamentary system, has the potential to foster a sense of political stability.

**Promoting Ethnic Harmony:** Mitigating ethnic violence necessitates the use of proactive approaches. The promotion of interethnic conversation, cultural understanding, and equal representation of minority groups within the government may serve as effective measures in preventing conflict and cultivating a more cohesive and harmonious community.

**Dynamic Civil Society:** The promotion of civil society participation entails the encouragement of civil society organisations to actively participate in political processes, thereby fostering more citizen engagement and accountability. Promoting the autonomy of media outlets and fostering an environment conducive to unrestricted public dialogue are crucial measures in advancing the process of making well-informed decisions.

**Election Reforms:** To address the issue of political fragmentation, it is proposed that election rules be amended to foster the establishment of enduring political parties characterised by distinct ideologies. This might potentially enhance the level of organisation and concentration within the political sphere.

**Long-term policy:** The promotion of policy continuity among government transitions is of paramount importance for the attainment of sustainable development. Governments need to accord precedence to long-term objectives rather than succumbing to short-term political advantages.

**Civic Education:** The implementation of comprehensive civic education programs may facilitate people's comprehension of their rights, duties, and the operational procedures of democratic government. Individuals who possess knowledge and awareness are more inclined to actively participate in the political sphere and assume responsibility for the actions and decisions of their leaders.

**International Support:** The provision of technical help and support for democratic changes in Kyrgyzstan should be sustained by the international community. Diplomatic endeavours can foster political stability and bolster adherence to democratic principles.

In summary, Kyrgyzstan finds itself at a critical juncture in its pursuit of democratic government and political stability. Despite the presence of ongoing problems, a distinct opportunity arises to further develop the nation's democratic ambitions and effectively tackle the underlying factors contributing to political instability. Through the cultivation of robust institutions, the facilitation of ethnic concordance, and the implementation of substantive reforms, Kyrgyzstan has the potential to provide the necessary foundation for a future characterised by enhanced stability and prosperity. The endeavour to achieve true democracy requires steadfast dedication from both the government and its population, despite the potential challenges and difficulties that may arise along this long road.

## References

- “Kyrgyzstan.” (2012). Freedom House. Available at: <https://freedomhouse.org/report/nationstransit/2004/kyrgyzstan>.
- Anderson, J. (1997). Constitutional development in Central Asia. *Central Asian Survey*, 16(3): 301–320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02634939708400993>
- Anderson, J. (2013). *Kyrgyzstan: Central Asia’s island of democracy?* Routledge.
- Collins, K. (2011). Kyrgyzstan’s Latest Revolution. *Journal of Democracy*, 22(3): 150–164. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2011.0040>
- Collins, K. (2012). After the Kyrgyz Spring: Challenges to Democratic Deepening. *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 19(1): 21–44. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24590926>
- Connery, J. (2000). Caught between a dictatorship and a democracy: civil society, religion and development in Kyrgyzstan. *Fletcher Journal of Development Studies*, 16: 1-18. Available at: <https://sites.tufts.edu/praxis/files/2020/05/Connery.pdf>
- Constitution of the Kyrgyz Republic | Cabinet of Ministers of the Kyrgyz Republic. (1993). Available at: <https://www.gov.kg/ky/p/constitution>
- Eales, B. J. (2021). *The Rising Tide of Authoritarianism in Central Asia - Australian Institute of International Affairs*. Australian Institute of International Affairs. Available at: <https://www.internationalaffairs.org.au/australianoutlook/the-rising-tide-of-authoritarianism-in-central-asia/>. Accessed on: 2021, May 6
- Engvall, J. (2020). Kyrgyzstan’s third revolution. *The CACI Analyst*, 8. Available at: <https://www.cacianalyst.org/publications/analytical-articles/item/13643->. Accessed on: 2021, September 5.
- Engvall, J. (2021). The Fall of Kyrgyzstan’s Parliamentary Experiment and the Rise of Sadyr Japarov. *The Central Asia-Caucasus Analyst*. Available at: <https://www.cacianalyst.org/publications/analytical-articles/item/13657-the-fall-of-kyrgyzstan%E2%80%99s-parliamentary-experiment-and-the-rise-of-sadyr-japarov.html>. Accessed on: 2021, January 21.
- Engvall, J. (2022). Kyrgyzstan’s Poison Parliament. *Journal of Democracy*, 33(1): 55–69. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2022.0004>.
- Fukuyama, F. (1992). *The end of history and the last man*. MacMillan, Inc. New York. [https://old.tsu.ge/data/file\\_db/anthim/011.pdf](https://old.tsu.ge/data/file_db/anthim/011.pdf).
- Huskey, E. (1995). *Kyrgyzstan: The Politics of Economic and Demographic Frustration*. National Council for Soviet and East European Research. Available at: <https://www.ucis.pitt.edu/nceeer/1995-810-28-2-6-Huskey.pdf>
- Implementing Democracy: Challenges in EU-Kyrgyzstan Relations*. (2021). Available at: <https://www.europenowjournal.org/2021/02/08/implementing-democracy-challenges-in-eu-kyrgyzstan-relations/>. Accessed on: 2021, February 8.
- Ivanov, Y. (2022). Revolutions in Kyrgyzstan. *Handbook of Revolutions in the 21st Century*, 517–547. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-86468-2\\_20](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-86468-2_20)
- Kyrgyzstan Votes to Adopt a New Constitution | IFES - The International Foundation for Electoral Systems*. (2010). Available at: <https://www.ifes.org/news/kyrgyzstan-votes-adopt-new-constitution>. Accessed on: 2010, July 20.
- National Democratic Institute for International Affairs. (2003). NDI Statement Following the February 2, 2003 Constitutional Referendum in Kyrgyzstan [Press release].
- Niazaliev, O. (2004). *Failed democratic experience in Kyrgyzstan: 1990-2000* (Master’s thesis, Middle East Technical University). Available at: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.633.4322&rep=rep1&type=pdf>.
- Nichol, J. (2010). The April 2010 coup in Kyrgyzstan and its aftermath: context and implications for US interests. *Congressional Research Service*. 7-5700, 1-16. Available at: <https://sgp.fas.org/crs/row/R41178.pdf>. Accessed on: 2010, June 15
- Radnitz, S. (2006). What Really Happened in Kyrgyzstan? *Journal of Democracy*, 17(2): 132–146. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2006.0035>
- Refworld | Kyrgyzstan. Political Conditions in the Post-Soviet Era*. (1993). Refworld. Available at: <https://www.refworld.org/docid/3ae6a60910.html>.

- Shishkin, P. (2012). *Central Asia's Crisis of Governance*. Asia Society. Available at: [https://asiasociety.org/files/pdf/120215\\_central\\_asia\\_crisis\\_governance.pdf](https://asiasociety.org/files/pdf/120215_central_asia_crisis_governance.pdf)
- Sievers, E. W. (2013). *The Post-Soviet Decline of Central Asia*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315810713>.
- Sorensen, G. (2018). *Democracy and democratization: Processes and prospects in a changing world*. Routledge.
- Turgunbaeva, A. (2021). What Kyrgyzstan's hasty transition to presidential governance says about the state of its democracy. *Global Voices*. Available at: <https://globalvoices.org/2021/02/03/what-kyrgyzstans-hasty-transition-to-presidential-governance-says-about-the-state-of-its-democracy/>. Accessed on: 2021, February 3
- Zakaria, F. (1997). The Rise of Illiberal Democracy. *Foreign Affairs*, 76(6): 22. <https://doi.org/10.2307/20048274>