

Political Instability, Revolution: Comparison between Kyrgyzstan and Georgia

Urmat RYSKULOV

Abstract

The goal of this paper is to compare the data such as government effectiveness, voice of accountability, and corruption indexes of the Kyrgyz Republic and Georgia as a consequence of political instability or revolution. The purpose of the country selection was due to their common similarities such as: they both are CIS countries, they both went through a revolution, and the degree of their economies are almost the same. Special attention is given to the reasons of the revolution in these countries as an important fact in the history of the countries. While comparing we can see that the data indicators of both Kyrgyzstan and Georgia were approximately the same in the period of revolution. However, these indicators also show that there was a positive and negative change after the revolution.

Keywords: *revolution; corruption; Georgia; Kyrgyzstan.*

Urmat Ryskulov is a PhD candidate at International Black Sea University, Tbilisi, Georgia, urmatryskulov@hotmail.com

Introduction

Ensuring political stability is one of the most important functions of political institutions. Various political mechanisms are used to provide it. Today, scientist from various fields are developing modern concept of stability.

The term “stability”(from Lat. *Stabilis* – a steady, constant) means consolidating and bringing into a constant steady state or maintenance of this state, such as ensuring consistency of any processes. Any system can be represented as a structure with stable properties. System includes process and event, they can influence on each other (Parsons, 1969).

With regard to the political system the word "stability" refers to its stable state, allowing it to function effectively and develop in the external and internal changes, while retaining its structure. In accordance with the theory, a stable political structure has the high level of public confidence.

It is difficult to imagine the political life without any changes; the changes are an integral part of any process. The vast majority of political leaders, as well as ordinary citizens are interested in establishing a certain steady and stable order which can regulate the process of political dynamics. Paradoxically at first glance, the political instability can be the stimulus for effective changes. Apter¹ in his book “Political changes” indicates that "Political instability in a special sense, it produces a spirit of creativity and innovation”. Political stability cannot be reached in unstable country, these concepts are interrelated, and they cannot exist separately. So the existence of all characteristics of the stable country directly shows the political stability of the country. The lack of these characteristics indicates the problems in political stability. So, the stable state must have the following characteristics:

1. Succession of regimes;
2. Gradual and orderly change of ruling elites;
3. The balance of power structures;
4. Functioning of multiparty system, in which the opposition operates effectively;

¹ David Ernest Apter (December 18, 1924 – May 4, 2010) was an American political scientist. He was Henry J Heinz Professor Emeritus of Comparative Political and Social Development and Senior Research Scientist at Yale University.

5. Plenty of the middle class.

If within a state there is only one factor of stability in the complete or partial absence of other factors, then it is not sufficient to achieve stability in the country. All the factors of political stability are analytically inseparable. At the same time, as practice shows, they are interrelated; the instability of one factor could lead to instability of others. Stability is most likely, if the political institutions of the regime are able to respond to the needs of its citizens (Postnikova, 1996).

Tenderness of state officials makes people to feel comfortable and people begin to trust more to the state officials. Most often, in the claims ranking the first place belongs to those that relate to their economic well-being of citizens. Riots happen when people believe that their economic situation worse than it should be. However, the government is not always able to implement policies that respond to the needs of the people. As a result, frustration and resentment become inevitable. It can be stated that the political system becomes unstable because of the deep split in society - economic, ethnic, regional, and ideological - when political institutions are simply unable to build a constructive dialogue.

Political instability found its reflection in the recent events of the former Soviet Republics. After the collapse of the Soviet Union the former member republics faced a lot of problems, among them was the political crisis, which led the states to political instability. After 15 years of independence three countries had to get over the revolutions. Revolutions were in Georgia, Ukraine and Kyrgyzstan.

Admittedly, the reason of revolutions was a political instability in the countries, as there were no any succession of regimes; gradual and orderly change of ruling elites; the balance of power structures; the functioning of multiparty system, in which the opposition operates effectively; and the lack of numerous middle class. All these factors are necessary for political stability and the lack of them can lead the state to riots.

To understand what motivates people to revolution, I propose to review two post-Soviet countries: Georgia and Kyrgyzstan. Because, these countries have several common characteristics:

1. Became independent after the collapse of the Soviet Union;

2. Had approximately the same political, economic and social situation in the country;
3. In 2004-2005 in these countries the existing regime was overthrown;
4. Similar mentality of the people, regionalism, nepotism and cronyism are very popular.

However, it should be noted that after the revolution in Georgia there is a tendency to improve the economic situation, as shows Transparency International's indexes. Indexes are improving rapidly in Georgia. As to Kyrgyzstan, everything happens on the contrary, an indicator of the indexes deteriorates.

Kyrgyz Republic: Historical overview.

Kyrgyz Republic is a sovereign, unitary, democratic, constitutional, secular, social country.² In August 31, 1991 Kyrgyzstan declared independence. Before Kyrgyzstan was part of Soviet Union and was known as the Kyrgyz Soviet Socialist Republic. After the independence Kyrgyzstan was on the verge of its new history as a sovereign, independent country that was supposed to make own decisions and to protect the interests of its citizens. Following these events, the first step was formation of government and other institutes of state agencies. Askar Akaev became the first president of Kyrgyzstan who was forced to learn how to rule the country along with many other state officials. Before the independence, all decisions were taken in Moscow and officials of autonomous republics were suggested to implement already made decisions. Hence, even senior state officials did not know how to rule. Consequently, in the country where advanced concept of cronyism and regionalism completely accepted, it reflected in all levels of state structures.

Generally, the state has been divided into two sides: north and south part. Moreover, the mentality of both sides is significantly different. It led to many controversies in government, each side wanted to have a majority of seats in the government. Both former presidents were representatives of different sides; Akaev was a representative of the north and Bakiev represented south.

² Above mentioned statements are according to Constitution of Kyrgyz Republic, Paragraph 1, Article 1, 27.06.2010

First president of independent Kyrgyzstan: A. Akaev.

From the year 1990 A. Akaev, was an acting president of Kyrgyz Republic. However, he failed to resign from his position voluntarily, since he was ousted by opposition of the country in March 2005. Main problem of ruling A. Akaev was a desire not to avoid concept of nepotism, cronyism, and regionalism. One of his biggest mistakes was usurpation of power by his family. Well known political scientist (Mars Sariev, 2010) said that the Akaev's Family controlled most profitable businesses of the country, such as alcohol, oil and gas, and construction materials. It is believed that Akaev was supported by northern clan (relatives of 1-2-3 cycle), however, he failed to control his relatives and even could not resist them. In addition, the country has high level of corruption and large number of corrupt officials. It is true that we can never figure out how much the real rate of corruption was. Beside this, the nepotism manifested all spheres of the country as close relatives of presidential couples held senior official positions in government agencies. For example; Altynbek Abdrashitov, spouse's niece Mairam Akayeva (wife Akayev) was consul in New York (Center Asia, 2005). In Kyrgyzstan localism (north and south) is clearly traced in its appointments of senior officials whom most of them were north origins.

He did his best to restore the order in Government, but most of his attempts were not effective, so in 2004 he imposed moratoria on any additional costs for the maintenance of the state apparatus, among them was tighten financial control over expenditure.³

Unfortunately, none of the measures, which the president took to resolve corruption in the country did not succeed. Besides, the scandal with his daughters' election in the Parliament also played the great role in the fall of Akayev's regime. By the way, elections were recognized as "not transparent" and passed with many violations. The head of observers group

³ Bishkek, February 7 (KABAR). During the meeting in the government, the president of Kyrgyzstan Askar Akayev said: "The financial control under the expenditure on the state apparatus should be tightened. The moratoria is going to be imposed on all regulations of the Government, which entail additional costs. Should completely be banned the purchase of expensive cars for heads of state institutions. The expanses on foreign travels of the officials should be limited. Now the heads of ministries and departments have to go to another State only in the case of signing the agreement or treaty. Therefore, it is necessary to introduce a total savings of over expenditure". The part of president's speech.

from the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly Kimo Kilunen stated the following about the Parliament elections in Kyrgyzstan, "Elections does not fully comply with the international standards, requirements and obligations which are presented by OSCE to the electoral process." "However, throughout the country, we noted the widespread withdrawal of candidates, vote-buying and the low level of confidence of the electorate to many candidates, "- said Kilyunen at a press conference (Internet source; News Ru, 2005). The main problems on this election were falsifications which took part on the every stage of the elections.

This and other facts led to such dramatic events, population was angry with the ruling clan. People started to organize demonstrations and protests. A. Akaev and his family members had to leave Kyrgyzstan after the "tulip" revolution in 2005. They find an asylum in Russian Federation. A. Akaev being in Moscow s resigned and officially became the former president of the Kyrgyz Republic. His was replaced by K. Bakiev, who that time was one of the oppositionists' leaders (Akipress, 2005).

Bakiev's Government.

K. Bakiev was the second president of the Kyrgyz Republic, he became a politician in Soviet period, but after the collapse of the Soviet Union he was a Prime-minister of the Kyrgyz Republic. However, Bakiev kept a consistent policy of power usurpation, the first step was the adoption of a new constitution of Kyrgyzstan, which should extend the terms of reference of the president. He actually deceived the public's expectations for a better life after the revolution; it led to a reduction of his rating. In country were a lot of social and economic problems, the main problem was unprecedented rise in prices, especially for bread and other food products. However, instead of solving these economic problems a referendum and elections were initiated, that dooms the country to unnecessary expenses. And all these facts caused dissatisfaction of the people (Usmanov, 2007).

Additionally, cronyism and nepotism became the part of Bakiev's policy, so called "Bakiev's clan" had a huge amount of power. His son Maksim Bakiev played an important role in the scene of Kyrgyzstan politics; he was the Head of Central Agency for Development, Investment and Innovation of the Kyrgyz Republic from 29 October 2009 to April 7, 2010, now many magazines and newspapers state that through this Agency

the most of financial machinations were realized (Grem, 2010).

Besides, president's son was the owner of the most Holiday Houses on the shore of lake Yssyk-kul (Nesinov, 2007). By the Prosecutor the General of the Kyrgyz Republic Maksim Bakiev is accused in money laundering. He establishment Asia Universal Bank (AUB), through this bank he laundered money and a large amount of money was transferred abroad through this Bank in the day of Revolution, this money have not still been returned to the budget.⁴ Maksim Bakiev used the power of his farther for mercenary enrichment of himself and “Bakiev's clan”.

Besides, K. Bakiev was aimed to assume the power in the State, through falsifications in different level of elections. During the parliament elections in October 2007 the maximum number of seats in the parliament won Party “Ak Zhol” (“The white path”), this party was the pro-presidential. In parallel, all opposition parties, like “Ata-Meken” (“Fartherland”), have been deprived of the mandates. Many international observers have blamed the Kyrgyzstan's Central Election Commission of rigging the results.⁵

The same situation was in 2009 during presidential elections. There were identified a large range of violations, thus international observers doubt the fairness of these elections. In Papers were stated that President Bakiev had about 90% of all votes, but the voter turnout was about 80%.⁶ Later Kurultai (the national type of meeting) was held in Kyrgyzstan on March 17, 2010, the main proposal of the meeting was to make president Bakiev to assign. It was the demonstration of people's discontent with

⁴ On April, 7 the day of the revolution, according to the data of National Bank, assets of "AUB" decreased almost in 2 times: from 24 to 13, 5 billion soms, and mainly due to the outflow of funds from non-resident legal entities, the clients of the Bank. The same day deposit was paid for securities purchase, the total payment was 900 million soms, and so far these securities did not reach the bank.

<http://www.regnum.ru/news/economy/1291319.html>

⁵ “Parliament elections were held in Kyrgyzstan yesterday. Pro-presidential party “Ak-Zhol” take about 63%, besides two other parties, who support president of the State, are going to be represented in the Parliament. Neither opposition party overcome the five-percent barrier.” Opposition in the country don't have seats in the Parliament, newspaper “Komersant”, № 232/II (3808), 17.12.2007

⁶ Statement of preliminary findings and conclusions for the 23 July 2009 presidential election in the Kyrgyz Republic Date: 24 July 2009

Bakiev's policy. The resolution was adopted at Kurultai, in the resolution was stated that Bakiev and his son Maksim carried out numerous of financial machinations, including the sale of “Severelektro”, “Kyrgyztelekom” and “Crystall” (Rasov, 2010).

The lack of adequate and responsible policy led to decrease of standard of living, increase of corruption level, increase the level of regionalism, cronyism and nepotism, and decrease the fulfillment of basic rights and freedoms. Manifestation of all these fatal mistakes brought country to economic recession. Mass protests of opposition took place In Spring 2010 and Bakiev had to leave Kyrgyzstan. Today, Bakiev lives in Belarus, as to his son Maksim, he seeks an asylum in UK.

Unfortunately, both Presidents of Kyrgyz Republic had to leave country after the revolutions. Generally they made the same mistakes; the second President could have taken into consideration the negative experience of his predecessor and used another political strategy, but failed. Nowadays the official Government in the country is so called “Temporary Government”, which came after the second revolution in spring 2010; it is early to assess their achievements in the economy of the country. Still, there is no any positive or negative dynamics in the state.

Georgia: Georgia after the collapse of the Soviet Union or the recent history of the country.

Georgia is a democratic, independent, unitary and indivisible state. The independence of Georgia was restored in April 9, 1991, by adopting the Act of State Independence.

The first President of Georgia: Zviad Gamsahurdia.

He was elected in May 27, 1991 and became the first president of the Independent State. It was very difficult time for all post-Soviet countries. The civil war began in Georgia, which led to armed confrontation of sides and as a result of the confrontation the first President of Georgia was killed. Perhaps, Gamsahurdia could have avoid the armed conflict, but maybe there were other reasons which made impossible to prevent the civil war during that period. After his death the President became Eduard Shevarnadze.

The second President of the country: Eduard Shevarnadze.

Shewarnadze won the presidential elections on 5th November, 1995.

The second president of Georgia had a great work experience in international relations, before the collapse of the Soviet Union he was the Minister of Internal Affairs (1968-1972), First Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Georgia (1972-1985), the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Soviet Union (1985-1990). He was an outstanding person with unique knowledge in politics. Despite it Shevarnadze was not able to make the state stable, and in November 2003 he had to resign during the “rose” revolution. The main reason of his failure was falsifications in parliament elections in 2003. During elections some kind of violations was detected, such as, electorate was pressured to vote for the presidential party, so the principle of free elections was not abided. These elections were not fair and clean, but it could have been different, as in 2 June 2003 to the Council of Europe was submitted the Paper by (Michel Krennerich, 2003) “Elections in Georgia: comments on the election code and the electoral administration”. In his researches the author stated that during the previous elections there were a lot of problems with implementation of the electoral law, he marked that previous elections were held with many violations.

These kinds of research had only informative status, but if the Government were able to take into consideration those remarks I think that it could have been possible to avoid the same mistakes. If the effective measures had been taken, it can help to establish political stability in the country. But this research was not taken into account so falsifications in electoral process⁷, problems inside the country, such as poor economic situation, high level of corruption, and low standard of living made people to act. As a consequence President had to resign his obligations. In November 22 and 23, 2003 in Georgia a revolution was held and the opposition, headed by Mikhail Saakashvili, came to power. The Supreme Court of Georgia annulled the official results of the CEC on November 24, 2003. Thus, the new period of life began in Georgia.

⁷The “Fair elections” stated that many violations took place in Georgia during the electoral process, this organization had been monitored the whole territory of the state. “Multiple violations were registered in the parliamentary elections in Georgia”. The source: www.lenta.ru 02.11.2003

The third President of independent Georgia: M. Saakashvili.

M. Saakashvili became a third president of Georgia in January 25, 2004. M. Saakashvili, in contrast to his predecessors was a “new person in political scene of Georgia” because of that point he did not hold any positions in the higher echelons of the country (like minister or Prime-minister of the country). He had a new and fresh vision of the situation, as he was well educated and had lived abroad for a long time. From the very first year of his presidential he took a new path, he made up some reforms, which were very effective and in 2005-2007 the GDP growth rate of Georgia had been increasing more than 9% per year.⁸

In 2006 World Bank informed that Georgia was one of the world leaders on rates of business climate improvement: in the rate of World Bank index on investment climate Georgia took the 37th place, besides the flow of investments increases. In 2009 Saakashvili suggested to include the list of liberal regulations in the Constitution of Georgia (Zedgenizde, 2009). Particularly, the proposal contents the prohibition on increasing taxes and implementation of the new ones. According to these amendments the budget deficit should not exceed 3% and the maximum size of budget expenditures must be 30% of GDP, however the external debt of the country should not exceed 60% of GDP.⁹

The World Bank assigned Georgia the 11th place¹⁰ in the rank of the states where easy to begin business, as to Forbes it granted Georgia the 4th place in ranking the low tax states.

The reform of The Ministry of Internal Affairs is one of the most significant steps which were made by M. Saakashvili after the “rose” revolution. The point of the reform was to establish a new institution which united enforcement power of the former traffic law enforcement and low rank detectives. The control under the MIA officers was tightened and nowadays there is no bribery in Georgia's MIA agencies. The MIA is trusted by the 87% of the citizens. Automobile traffic is mostly recognized as one

⁸ World Economic Outlook Database, April 2008, www.imf.org

⁹ Saakashvili: choosing the way of liberalism, we choose the way of Ilia Chavchavadze. The speech of the president in the Parliament of Georgia on “Act of independence”, See also: www.darbazi.info, 16.10.2009

¹⁰ World Bank rankings, see: <http://www.doingbusiness.org/economyrankings/>

Political Instability, Revolution: Comparison between Kyrgyzstan and Georgia of the most comfortable in the Caucasus region, as police stops vehicles rarely and only if the vehicle had violated one of the Traffic Rules. Also the police do not have a right to examine goods, which are inside the vehicle (Zedgenidze, 2009). These reforms were effective and strengthened the credibility of the Government.

The Comparison of Post Revolution Changes in Economic Situation in Georgia and Kyrgyzstan, 2004-2009.

For effective analysis of the situation in Kyrgyzstan and Georgia I suggest comparing these countries in the Table, we will compare them on different indexes, which can help us to understand the influence of these phenomena on political stability or instability in these countries.

Government effectiveness

Government effectiveness shows that government of the state is not able to fulfill its obligations. This index can also demonstrate the political instability in the country after the revolution. The simple example: after revolution many oppositionists wants to be a part of government and if there is no any authoritative leader of the opposition there can occur the struggle among each other, who wants to have official power and who can use such methods as squeeze, threatening and other illegal methods against former allies. This action also decreases the quality of official's work and facilitates political instability in the country. But if the index of Government effectiveness rise up it means that the level of political instability goes down. Government effectiveness index range from -2.5 to 2.03 where, close to -2.5 refers to low level of government effectiveness and close to 2.03 refers to higher rate of government effectiveness.

Voice of accountability

Voice of accountability means, that the basic rights and freedoms are abided by the state. If the person can realize the basic rights and freedoms in the state it reduces the risk of political instability. Because during the study of the revolution reasons we found out that the last straw of public discontent was a falsification of election results, in this case people think that they are no more the part of the state. But the right to take part in the government of the country is a basic right of every citizen, as well as the right to freedom of speech.

This right is proclaimed in The Universal Declaration of Human Rights¹¹, in other words if people in the country feel that their rights and freedoms are respected it lowers the risk of political instability. Voice of accountability index range from -2.5 to 2.03 where, close to -2.5 refers to low level of voice of accountability and close to 2.03 refers to higher rate of voice of accountability.

Corruption

Corruption is one of the most dangerous forms of crime, because it affects not only one field of the life, but it involves all spheres of life. Corruption by itself is a form of a shadow lobbying; it has many forms such as nepotism, cronyism, localism and others.

Corruption can be classified by:

- subject, that is who is involved in corrupt acts (officials, citizens or high ranking officials);
- profit, that is whether the subjects want to enlarge their benefits or to reduce the waste;
- subjects' interaction is whether the subject is involved in corrupt act by himself or he was made to commit the crime.

Here only the small part of the classification is demonstrated, but we can imagine how harmful and dangerous it is. Corruption can occur on every level of governance and there is no panacea against it. This phenomenon can destroy the country; it can be the stimulus for revolutions and cataclysms in the country, because the systematic illegal actions make people to act and to defend their rights to live in legal state.

Corruption index range from 0 to 10 where, rate of corruption indicator close to 0 represents high rate of corruption and close to 10 for low level of corruption.

Comparison of Kyrgyzstan and Georgia

As we can see from the table 3 in 2005 both Georgia and Kyrgyzstan

¹¹ The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948. Article 21.

(1) Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives.

(2) Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country.

(3) The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

has the same corruption indicator of 2.3, and both of them were ranked in 130 places¹² according to Transparency International. However, after the year 2005 these corruption indicators of both countries are far different from each other, where indicators for Georgia increasing while corruption indicators of Kyrgyzstan are decreasing. Moreover, if we try to understand the reasons of these differences of indicators of both countries we find out that Georgia took important steps on fighting corruption starting from reforms in police structure and effective control over state, public and private sectors. This reform and control over the public and private sector resulted on effective changes and improvements in the country. Additionally, reforms in police structure became self-financing on behalf of penalties and other services, such as, “special” license plate and immediate car registration. In many countries this kind service is corrupted a lot. Therefore, the corruption index may decrease.

On the other hand, President of Kyrgyzstan, K. Bakiev overall impaired the principle of meritocracy, however, cronyism became the part of his policy. Cronyism provides family members unlimited power and stimulates the corruption in the country. As to be in favor of family members, other officials should take bribe, and it reduces the effectiveness of economic policy.

According to Transparency International for the year 2009 Kyrgyzstan is ranked in 162nd place and Georgia in 66th place around the world.

Similar to changes in corruption indexes of both Kyrgyzstan and Georgia (see table 1 and 2) the indicators of government effectiveness and voice of accountability shows us that, when the figures for Georgia tend to positive sign indicators of Kyrgyzstan is decreasing. Moreover, the government of Kyrgyzstan after the revolution had a lot of problem with oppositions and even with each other seeking their own interests and undermining political, economic and social issues of country needed for immediate resolution. Consequently, it led to inefficiency on all sphere of a country and even the basic rights of a society. These undermined human rights and other important political, economic and social issues resulted on ruined trust and belief of society to officials. While government of Georgia

¹²Transparency International, See:

http://transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/gcb/2005

tried to solve present and future issues of political, economic and social issues of a country together with oppositions and other state officials.

Table 1. Government effectiveness index

Country	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2000	1998
Georgia	.22	.25	.14	-.19	-.37	-.41	-.72	-.81	-.67	-.67
Kyrgyzstan	-.98	-.81	-.88	-.91	-.94	-.78	-.71	-.74	-.49	-.31

Source: World Bank, World Development Indicator

Table 2. Voice of Accountability index

Country	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003	2002	2000	1998
Georgia	-.18	-.24	-.22	-.16	-.16	-.19	-.45	-.50	-.26	-.41
Kyrgyzstan	-.96	-.80	-.67	-.73	-.80	-.99	-1.08	-1.00	-1.17	-.73

Source: World Bank, World Development Indicator

Table 3. Corruption perception index

Country	2009	2008	2007	2006	2005	2004	2003
Georgia	4.1	3.9	3.4	2.8	2.3	2	1.8
Kyrgyzstan	1.9	1.8	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.2	2.1

Source: Transparency International.

Conclusion

On the assumption of above given comparison can be concluded that such indexes as Government effectiveness, Voice of accountability and Corruption can dramatically influence on the political instability in the country. On the face of it, the relationship between political instability and these indexes cannot be followed, but the data shows that there is a close relationship between them. In fact, existence of these indexes in the state forms the concept of political stability. The absence of one of the indexes can lead to political instability; if one of them is lack it can fetch the country to revolution or other hard times. Not only the lack but even the low percentage of fulfillment can badly influence on economic situation and may inhibit the normal elaboration of the country.

By the way, the low fulfillment of the above mentioned indexes led both of these countries to revolution in 2004-2005, however, in Georgia these negative experience was taken into consideration and the government which came to the power after the revolution decided not to make this

Political Instability, Revolution: Comparison between Kyrgyzstan and Georgia mistake again. The indexes were raised up by the effective and adequate policy, reforms were hold and they carry positive changes in the economic and political situation in Georgia. As to Kyrgyzstan, the oppositionists who came after the revolution did not take into account the experience of former president and made the same fault, as a result no positive changes were made, the policy of president brought only poor changes in the economy of the country.

Finally, the decreasing indicators of above mentioned indexes may be accepted as a reason for second revolution of Kyrgyzstan in April 2010. Where President Bakiev was forced to resign and leaved Kyrgyzstan.

Above mentioned discussions and comparison is only based on the figures obtained from Transparency international and World Bank. For better understanding and analysis of these indexes requires additional studies which will analyze the relationship between indexes is necessary.

References

Apter, David Ernest, 1973, Political changes: Collected essays.

Constitution of Kyrgyz Republic, 2010.

Grem, Maxim, 2010, Kyrgyzstan: UK voyage of Maxim Bakiev, Komsomolskaja Pravda.

Krennerich M., 2003, Elections in Georgia: comments on the election code and the electoral administration, by the European Commission for Democracy through Law (VENICE COMMISSION), Strasbourg, the Council of Europe.

Nesinov V., 2007, Omnipotent son of the president of Kyrgyzstan, "Prince" Maxim Bakiev.

Urmat RYSKULOV

Parsons T., 1996, On the concept of influence, Concept of stability and social structure, N.Y. Free Press.

Postnikova L., 1996, Politics: A Look at the Present, Political stability, Vol. 9, Moscow.

Sariev, Mars, 2010, Kyrgyzstan: Clan or tribe.

Usmanov, Farukh, 2007, The President of Kyrgyzstan strengthens vertical power, Journal "Vlast" №42 (746).

Zedgenidze G., 2009, MIA was completely destroyed and created again in Georgia.

Zedgenidze G., 2010, Fridman and my law: Saakashvili proposed the number of laws which will make Georgia more liberal than USA and UK.