

CONTEMPORARY KAZAKSTAN: ANALYSIS OF
POLITICAL OPPOSITION

By

KARLYGASH BALAPANOVA

Diploma of philosophy

Al Farabi Kazak State National University

Almaty, Kazakstan

1995

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
In partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF ART
May, 1998

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges the NAFSA: Association of International Educators and the Russian Eurasian Awards Program (REAP), whose financial support made possible the research and writing of this thesis.

The author also wishes to express her deep gratitude to her thesis advisor, Dr. David Nixon, for his generous advice, and careful reading and criticism of an earlier draft of this thesis. All of his thoughtful suggestions have been incorporated into the final text. The author would like to express her sincere gratitude to Dr. D. Nixon for his scholarly guidance, supervision and encouragement during this research.

The author's sincere appreciation extends to her thesis committee members, Dr. William Parle and Dr. Joel Jenswold, whose assistance, encouragement and friendship are also invaluable. The author is very thankful to Dr. Frederique Knottnerus and Richard J. Faillace for their support and friendship while studying at Oklahoma State University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
General.....	1
Background.....	2
Statement of the Problem.....	3
Purpose of the Study.....	4
Methodology.....	5
Significance of the Study.....	7
Limitations.....	8
Outline of the Reminder of the Thesis.....	8
II. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	10
Introduction.....	10
Dynamics of the Parties of Kazakstan.....	14
Parties and Electoral System.....	21
The Political Parties and the Parliament.....	24
Interest Groups and Social Movements.....	25
Summary.....	26
III. METHODOLOGY.....	30
Scope of the Study.....	30
Research Method.....	30
Data Collection and Its Limitations.....	31
Time Frame.....	31
Statement of the Problem.....	31
Statistics.....	32
The 1996 Russian Presidential Elections.....	40
The 1995/96 Russian Parliament Elections.....	42
Political Orientation of Kazakstan Regions (Oblasts).....	45
Tables.....	48
Limitations.....	48
IV. FINDINGS.....	51
General.....	51

The Opposition in Kazakstan and Russia: Similarities And Differences.....	52
Summary.....	54
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	57
General.....	57
Methodology.....	57
Discussion of Findings.....	57
Future Forecast and Recommendations.....	58
Summary.....	60
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	62

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. The Kazakstan Majilis.....	33
2. Results of the Elections.....	34
3. Distribution of Seats According To Political Group.....	35
4. Distribution of Seats According To Sex.....	35
5. Distribution of Seats According To Social Status and Profession.....	36
6. The Kazakstan Senate.....	37
7. Distribution of Seats According To Political Group.....	38
8. Distribution of Seats According To Sex.....	38
9. Distribution of Seats According To Social Status and Profession.....	39
10. The 1996 Russian Presidential Elections.....	42
11. The 1995 Gosudarstvennaya Duma: Distribution of Seats According to Political Party Members.....	43
11.1 Distribution of Seats According to Interest Groups and Movements Members.....	44
12. Ural'sk City.....	46
12.1 Northern Districts.....	46
12.2.Southern Districts.....	46

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

General

Kazakstan is a constitutional republic with a strong presidency. Throughout most of 1995, Kazakstan had no legislature; the country was governed through decree by the President and the Cabinet Ministers. President Nursultan Nazarbayev, initially elected in 1991 to a five year term as President, is the country's central political figure. In April 1995, his term was extended by referendum to the year 2000. A new constitution was adopted, also by referendum, in August 1995, that concentrates power in the presidency, permitting it to dominate the parliament, judiciary and local government. Parliamentary elections were held in December 1995.

The President is the head of state. He is also the commander-in-chief of the armed forces and may veto legislation that has been passed as Kazakstan's head of government. There are also several deputy prime ministers (the number is not fixed), 20 ministers, and 19 chairmen of state committees.¹

Kazakstan has a bicameral parliament, comprised of a lower house (the Majilis) and upper house (the Senate). Forty members of the Senate are indirectly elected by members of the regional assemblies; the remaining seven are appointed by the President. The 67-seat Majilis is popularly-elected. The December 1995 parliamentary elections were considered to have been an important, albeit flawed, step on Kazakstan's

road to democracy. Majilis deputies and the government both have the right of legislative initiative. In September 1996, Majilis deputies, for the first time, proposed several draft laws; prior to that time, all legislation considered by the parliament had been proposed by the government.²

Kazakstan is divided into 14 provinces (*oblasts*) and the territory of the capital, each of which is headed by a governor (*akim*) appointed by the Prime Minister. There are also city and village governments.

Background

General Kazakstan, a young Republic, declared its sovereignty in October 1991. International cooperation is playing an increasingly important role in the development of this new country. In 1991 Kazakstan became a member of the United Nations; it has since also joined numerous other economic, political, and cultural organizations. The human potential of Kazakstan is one of its greatest assets. The realization of this potential is a priority for a country striving for economic independence. The period of economic transition must be accomplished by radical social reforms.

Theoretical Framework Kazakstan became independent at a time when the country was undergoing a systemic crisis caused primarily by the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the ensuing transition from a centrally planned economy to a market economy. On the political front, a battle was waged against domination by the party bureaucracy, in the interest of achieving a basis for ideological and political pluralism.

Political implications in the short, medium and long term make up the substance of the current debate. An increasing number of politicians have become aware of the fact that the criteria for the success of a given program lies in the extent to which it can foster and safeguard opposition. This should, however, not be construed to mean that the existing realities in Kazakhstan are being ignored or that the relevant capacities of the emerging and the “old” democracies are taken as commensurate.

Statement of the Problem

Evaluation of government policies should include public response as an element. There was a discussion on “the relations of pressure groups, their influence on public opinion; their mutual relationship” during a round-table conference held by the International political Science Association at the University of Pittsburgh, September 9-13, 1957. Professor Blaisdel said that:

interest groups attempt to affect the climate of public opinion, using all means of public relations, and these have grown tremendously in the United States. It is within the normal activity of all major interest groups to have a highly organized public relations staff. However, the interest group does not primarily try to affect public opinion *per se*, but for another goal - to obtain favorable decision from the executive, legislative or judicial branch of government.

Professor Heckscher added that:

if a given pressure group is acting through a political party, public relations activities will be moderate, since, otherwise, the group would get little sympathy from an opposing political party, it will give increased attention to its public relations. Thus the structure of political parties may determine how important public relations are for interest groups.

A crucial issue of this study is whether or not much interaction can provide a meaningful basis for the stable development of opposition. Within a multi-ethnic society, the intent and implementation of such policies are important.

An overall analysis would require an assessment of domestic political structures (political parties, interest groups or social movements) and how well political pluralism is practiced. It offers possibilities for a comparative analysis of the opposition in Russia and Kazakstan.

A potentially significant direction for research would be the study of the evolving political system and opposition both in Russia and Kazakstan, and their correspondence to the provisions of the Constitution and other laws and statutes. Of similar importance would be the use of an internationally accepted methodology for use in the area of political parties and interest groups analysis that deals with the identification of current problems and the relevant political action taken by different groups toward their resolution.

Purpose of the Study

Under the conditions of acute social and economic crisis in which Kazakstan found itself in 1991, defining the directions for future development and reform of the country's political system is very important. A conceptual model was provided by President Nursultan Nazarbayev in his "Strategy for Growth and Development of Kazakstan as an Independent State" (1992): the creation of an open society and a democratic, peaceful, nuclear-free state. The major constituents of the new order are to

be a strong presidential republic, the upholding of human rights and civil liberties, a climate of political and ideological pluralism, and a state policy providing for stable civil peace and inter-ethnic harmony.³

This thesis is an attempt to understand how the opposition forces were being formed and to evaluate whether Kazakhstan today has a strong or weak opposition when comparing to those of Russia.

The data obtained under this research can be used to raise questions regarding the political parties, interest groups, or social movements, particularly the issues of their influence. The findings of the study may add to scholarly discussions on the objectivity in the politics as well.

Methodology

General The research method of this study is one of the techniques of comparative analysis. This technique provides a method of comparing according to a certain scale used in political science. "Statistics. A Tool For Social Research" by Joseph F. Healey suggests that the most basic and the only universal measurement procedure is to classify cases into the established categories of a variable. All measurement involves classification as a minimum. In nominal measurement, classification into categories is the only measurement procedure permitted. The categories themselves are not numerical and can be compared to each other only in terms of the number of cases classified in them.⁴ Variables measured at the ordinal level are more sophisticated than nominal-level variables because, in addition to continuing

the number of cases in a category, we rank the cases with respect to each other. Not only we can say that one case is different from another; we can also say that one case is higher or lower, more or less than another.⁵ The major limitation of the ordinal level of measurement is that a particular score represents only position with respect to some other score. We can distinguish between high and low scores, but the distance between the scores cannot be described in precise terms.⁶ Issues concerning the opposition forces of Kazakhstan and Russia will be examined using the strong – weak scale. Issues evaluating overall influence of political parties, interest groups, or social movements on Kazakhstan population will be examined using 5 point scale.

Research Hypotheses The research premise is that Kazakhstan is considered to be a new democratic-oriented country. From 1991 to 1994, the political system in Kazakhstan developed rapidly to accommodate a balance of power, a state ideology, and a development strategy, while the institutions needed for building a civil society were undergoing correspondingly radical transformations. This process was accompanied by the emergence and strengthening of the various political parties which were beginning to form a constructive opposition to the executive power.⁷

Research Framework Three major political structures namely political parties, interest groups, and social movements were selected for this project. The period covered in the study was December 23, 1991 (the formation of the Commonwealth of Independent States out of the wreckage of the old USSR) until the present. Countries selected for this research are Kazakhstan and Russia.

Research Objectives The goal of this study is to find out whether Kazakhstan received more democratic orientation, or obtained political pluralism with reference to

the issues of political opposition . In doing so, the study will attempt to attest to the accuracy of research hypothesis and to compare contemporary opposition forces of Kazakstan and Russia. This study will also focus on how strong or weak those forces are.

Significance of Study

The growth of social activity in the country and the availability of a structured political opposition provided a fresh impetus to the process of democratization in the area of the legislative and executive branches of the government. Radical institutional reforms of the government have taken place from the top to the very bottom. Significant authority has been extended to local administration heads as well as to managers of state enterprises. The development of the required legal framework, on the other hand, was hampered, by the basically low professional qualifications of a number of members of parliament, (which opted for self-dissolution in December 1993). In the context of the present study, this event marked the end of the one-party election system; a new Election Code was enacted soon afterwards, which provided for the possibility of holding elections on a multi-party basis.

This study will investigate if political parties, interest groups, or social movements were active during the election campaigns (the 1995 Parliament Elections in Kazakstan and the 1996 Presidential Election in Russia). It will give a clear picture of how the opposition may or may not influence the policy-making decisions. This study

will also investigate if the Kazakhstan opposition is strong or weak compare to those of Russia.

Limitations

This study will employ the comparative analysis method which is somewhat limited in regard to issues in the political science, for the investigator usually will not have detailed data on the interested issues.

Furthermore, one will find out that there was little primary data available to cover the material. Unfortunately, not all figures were available to present detailed information regarding certain tables such as number of seats held in oblasts, etc. However, the research is focused on identifying how strong or weak the emerging oppositions of Kazakhstan and Russia are, what are their differences and similarities.

Outline of the Remainder of the Thesis

In this thesis, Chapter II contains the comparative parties literature review that defines the criteria and gives the indicators of a strong opposition. Chapter III covers methodology to be used in the study (description of comparative analysis, data collection). Chapter IV discusses findings and gives the analysis of the data. Chapter V contains a summary and conclusions that were accumulated from the research.

ENDNOTES

¹ Country Commercial Guide: Kazakstan. February 1997
[http:// www. Itaiep.doc.gov/bisnis/country/kzcc3.htm](http://www.Itaiep.doc.gov/bisnis/country/kzcc3.htm)

² Ibid.,2.

³ Kazakstan Human Development Report
1997.undp.org/undp/rbec/nhdr/kazakstan/chapter5.htm#5.2

⁴ Statistics. A Tool For Social Research. Joseph F. Healey, Belmont, California, 1984,7.

⁵ Ibid., 8.

⁶ Ibid., 9.

⁷ Kazakstan Human Development Report
1997.undp.org/undp/rbec/nhdr/kazakstan/chapter5.htm#5.2., p.7.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Definition In “Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State” (1963) Maurice Duverger says that “a party is not a community but a collection of communities, a union of small groups dispersed throughout the country (branches, caucuses, local associations, etc.) and linked by coordinating institutions. The term “basic elements” is used for these component units of the party organization”.¹

Furthermore, M. Duverger says that “parties are distinguished by the nature of their organization (not by the doctrine, platform, social composition). A party is a community with a particular structure”².

According to Duverger, the strength of the party measures by

- 1) members
- 2) voters
- 3) parliamentary seats.³

Parties are influenced by their origins: the electoral and the parliamentary. There is a creation of parliamentary groups, then the appearance of electoral committees.

In words of Peter Mair, “Max Weber addressed himself to the question of ‘politics as a vocation’. His theme was the new professionalism of politics, within that theme he had particular emphasis on the emergence of the modern mass party.”⁴ For Weber, the contrast with past political organization was profound:

[T]he most modern forms of party organizations stand in sharp contrast to [the] idyllic state in which circles of notables and, above all, members of parliament rule. These modern forms are the children of democracy, of mass franchise, of the necessity to woo and organize the masses, and develop the utmost unity of direction and the strictest discipline.⁵

Furthermore, Peter Mair continues that “subsequent scholarship was to confirm the pervasiveness of this transformation and its inevitable association with the extension of democratic rights. Mass participation came to mean mass parties, and for many observers, including Schattschneider,⁶ it appeared that modern democracy itself was ‘unthinkable save in terms of parties’. A brief check-list of the functions normally associated with parties⁷ underlines their essential role: parties structure the popular vote, integrate and mobilize the mass of the citizenry; aggregate diverse interests; recruit leaders for public office; and formulate public policy.”⁸

The pervasiveness of mass party organization noted by Weber, was underlined in Duverger’s comparative study of parties and party systems. Like Weber, Duverger linked the development of the mass party to the extension of democratic rights, arguing that mass enfranchisement had led to the replacement of cadre parties by mass parties.⁹ Duverger associated this transformation primarily with the left, arguing that the need to secure financial resources made it particularly imperative for socialist parties to develop a mass organization. Parties of the right, on the other hand, which enjoyed the support of wealthy backers and clients, could still afford a more cadre-type organization.

Peter Mair says that “what was even more important, however, was the impact which this had on the stabilization of mass electorates: as Sartori has argued, ‘critical factor in altering the nature of a party system and bringing about its structural consolidation is the appearance of the mass party’.¹⁰ Through the encapsulation of

sections of the mass electorate, and through the inculcation of political identities which proved both solid and enduring, the mass party became the agency by which political behavior was structured, and by which partisan stability was ensured. Political choice developed into political identity as a result of political organization; in this fashion, the party systems themselves were consolidated.”¹¹

According to Graham K. Wilson, interest groups were part of the substance of real politics and the study of interest groups would bridge the gap between the study of politics and the study of society. Greater knowledge of interest group activity would contribute to debates whether power is concentrated or widely dispersed. His definition of an interest group “it is an organization which seeks or claims to represent people or organizations which share one or more common interests or ideals”.¹²

Henry W. Ehrman wrote that “the groups recruit feelings and opinions (even if they do not always “enlarge the heart”, as de Tocqueville hoped they would). Through them individual and organized behavior has its effect on governmental institutions just as the forms of authoritative decision-making determine group structure and strategy”.¹³

Classifying the factors which give interest groups effective access to the institutions of government, David Truman distinguishes (1) factors relating to a group’s strategic position in society, (2) factors associated with the internal characteristics of the group, and (3) factors peculiar to the governmental institutions themselves.¹⁴

It is suggested that such a classification, although formulated in regard to American politics, has its place in a cross-national or even cross-cultural consideration of group activities; it remains to be determined, it is true, whether (and which) other factors are particularly important in non-Western countries.¹⁵

Patterns of Opposition In "Party Systems and Patterns of Opposition" (1966)

Robert Dahl suggested that "opponents of a government may display varying degrees of organizational cohesion; they may all be concentrated in a single organization, for example, or they may be dispersed in a number of organizations operating independently of one another." (p.296).

Furthermore, he continues that "probably in no country, and certainly in no democratic country, are all the active opponents of government ever concentrated in one organization. If we concern ourselves with political parties, however, the situation is rather different." (p.296). According to Dahl, a political party is the most visible manifestation and one of the most effective forms of opposition in a democratic country. He wrote that the extent to which opposition is concentrated depends on the party system of a country. Dahl suggested that although genuine one-party systems probably cannot exist except where governments prohibit opposition parties, in a few countries where key civil liberties are by no means wholly impaired, as in Mexico, a single party has enjoyed a near monopoly of votes, or, as in India, of parliamentary seats. Dahl says that

in each of these countries, although some opposition is concentrated in small parties, a good deal of opposition operates as factions within the dominant party. The highest degree of concentration of opposition exists in two-party systems, where the out-party has a substantial monopoly of the opposition. In multiparty systems, opposition is likely to be dispersed among several parties.

Dahl thinks that

it might be reasonable to consider multiparty systems as the natural way of government and oppositions to manage their conflicts in democracies, while two-party systems, whether resembling the British pattern or the American, are the deviant cases. ...In addition to the number of important parties, concentration has yet another dimension. Parties themselves vary enormously in internal unity,

as measured, for example, by the way their members vote in parliament; what is formally a single opposition party may in fact disintegrate into a member of factions. ... How competitive an opposition is depends partly on how concentrated it is.

Dahl says in this case 'competitive' refers to the way in which the gains and losses of political opponents in elections and in parliament are related.

Dynamics of the Parties of Kazakstan

The political system of Kazakstan has quickly passed through the initial stages of its evolution. A whole range of political views on the country's social, political, and economic situation and ways out of this crisis have emerged. Thus, these concerns became the primary motivation for changes that have been made with respect to state structure and the direction chosen in developing the political system. The issue of economic reform has given way to social concerns because of their extreme urgency.

With the collapse of the totalitarian system in the USSR, there began to appear new political parties and social movements in Kazakstan. This marked the transition from a one-party system to a multi-party one.

According to the current literature (Babakumarov E., Buluktayev U., Kuserbayev K., "*Kazkastan Segodnya: Mir Politicheskikh Partii*" [Kazakstan Today: The World of Political Parties], Almaty, 1995, p.77), there are more than 500 social unions officially registered in Kazakstan as of 1995. But not all of them are the subjects of the political system. When one is to look at the definitions of political parties, it is necessary to distinguish between a political party and a political movement. A political movement does not have an organizational structure and a political program. A round-

table conference held by the International Political Science Association at the University of Pittsburgh, September 9-13, 1957 had a special discussion concerning these issues.

Professor Leiserson suggested to distinguish between the interest group system and the party system.

We must seek to specify the relationship of interest groups to other forms of political action as well as to the larger political system, and must develop adequate models for understanding the internal structure and function of interest groups as well as the relationship between interest groups, parties and government.

Professor Neumann suggested that

pressure groups are the representation of homogeneous interests seeking influence. The interest group is strong and effective when it has a directed, specific purpose. Political parties, on the other hand, seeking office and directed towards policy-decisions, combine heterogeneous groups. In fact it is one of their major themes to reconcile the diverse forces within a political society. There is an integrative function which is not in the domain of the interest groups.

Professor Neumann's definition seems to be that interest groups do not openly put up candidates for public office while parties do. When a party ceases to put up candidates, it ceases to be a political party. To Raymond Aron a political party is

“a regular and permanent organization or a certain number of people concerned with either conquering power or keeping it”.

Such a definition inspired by Max Weber's analysis of politics.

It is also important to distinguish from those one calls a pressure, or an interest group. An interest group is not eager to conquer a power, it wants to possess an influence over those who have power. A party is an organized group of adherents who represent an interest of social groups and has a goal to bring about through power conquest and corresponds to a long-term party criteria.¹⁶ Jean Meynaud described pressure groups as

association of various judicial forms which upon the basis of common goals or attitudes endeavor to impose a certain number of positions and demands by all means at their disposal, but especially by pressure on the public authorities.

Professor Finer has defined interest groups thus:

all groups or associations which seek to influence public policy in their own chosen direction, while declining direct responsibility for ruling the country.

The Origin and the Nature The origin and the functioning of political parties and social movements are stipulated by the social stratification of both Russian and Kazak societies. It is also explained by a presence of many social, class, and ethnic groups who have their own interests, and demands which they would like to fulfill.

A new model of the social structure formation process is going on now in Russia as well as in Kazakstan. It is stipulated by system changes in all spheres of social life. There was a transition from a one-party communist regime to "liberal communism" in 1985-1989.¹⁷ Furthermore, the republic of Kazakstan has announced its sovereignty.

The contemporary parties of Kazakstan are to be subdivided into political parties and organizations. They have become successors of previous institutions such as the Social Party of Kazakstan, the Communist Party of Kazakstan, and Alash. They all have a set of common features. When comparing them with the other parties, one finds strong centralization, party discipline, and solidarity.

A set of parties and political organizations, especially of national-democratic block were created. Some parties merged, and some parties split.

When analyzing a party structure, it is useful to look at its party statute (Ustav). Knowing the statutes of the Social Party of Kazakstan, the People's Congress of Kazakstan, the Communist Party of Kazakstan, Alash, and the Republic Party of

Kazakstan, it is possible to conclude that they are more stable hierarchic organizations. They work hard to achieve their goal, which is to come to power. Their internal structures are the following: a leader, a bureaucratic apparatus, the active members, the masses of the party, and the sympathizers. The Social Party of Kazakstan is the most organized party due to the experience of its members.

Typology When analyzing party typology, it is important to point out that the process of party development is not yet completed. There are complex processes that go on. Its dynamic constantly changes.

A “new” party that appeared after 1995, such as the Democratic Party of Kazakstan has a significant number of members. This party has an established structure all over the republic, and a significant influence among the social layers of society. It allows to impart this party with the features of mass parties. Simultaneously, the Democratic Party has a party cadre-like function features.¹⁸ Those are a presence of celebrities, a rest on professional politicians, an orientation toward election function execution, i.e. an organization of election campaign, and a creation of its ideological background.

All features of party institutions mentioned above are witnessing the complexity and contradictory of its qualitative indexes. Not all parties and organizations have determined its organizational structures. Yet, those are to be altered from time to time. Nevertheless, there are a few models that political parties might fit in to.

First of all, it is a communist model main principles of which were stated by Lenin in “*Chto Delat'?*” (“What Is To Be Done?”) (the Communist Party and the Social

Party). *What Is to Be Done?*, long regarded as the key manual of communist action, is containing Lenin's famous dissection of the Western idea of the political party along with his own concept of a monolithic party organization devoted to achieving the goal of dictatorship of proletariat. Henry M. Christman comments: "*What Is to Be Done?*, Lenin's major work on Bolshevist organization and discipline, was published in the spring of 1902. In this work, Lenin directs special attention to three issues, which he describes as "The character and the principal content of our political agitation, our organizational tasks, and the plan of setting up, simultaneously, and from all sides, a militant, all-Russian organization."¹⁹ In *What Is to Be Done?*, Lenin clearly defines his concepts of Bolshevist organization. As he specifies, the basic Bolshevist movement is not a movement of workers, or a movement of intellectuals, or a combination of the two; rather, it is an authoritarian organization of dedicated professional revolutionaries, individually recruited from among workers and intellectuals. According to Lenin, the only real role of the Bolshevist movement is to plan for, work for, and execute revolution. Lenin believed, that revolution must carefully and systematically planned and carried through; he scorned those who anticipated "spontaneous" revolution by the people themselves.

Second, an electoral parties. Its main task is to organize a pre-election campaign of candidates. As parties they exist during the elections (the Social Democratic Party of Kazakstan). Also the Democratic Party of Kazakstan is characterized as the party of reform. The other main goal is to guarantee stability in Kazastan. It demands the development of a market economy, and the privatization of industrial and agricultural enterprises.²⁰

Third, a parliament model party that adheres to parliament form of work (the People's Congress of Kazakstan, the Union of People's Unity of Kazakstan, the Republic Party of Kazakstan and "new" parties). The People's Unity Party is a large organization, consisting of 28, 000 members in 800 organizations found throughout the 14 regions of the republic. This party has declared its intention to create a political block with progressive democratic parties of Kazakstan such as the People's Congress, the Democratic Party, and the Agricultural party. The aim of the People's unity Party is to help with the development of a democratic society in Kazakstan and to address the economic crisis. This party aspires to the status of a governmental party. The People's Unity nominated 54 candidates to the *Majilis* (the lower house - House of Representatives) during the 1995 parliamentary elections, and only 38 of them were allowed to register by the government. The People's Congress has refrained from ethnic politics, proclaimed the priority of the individual, and supported the development of a market economy, business development, and the creation of Eurasian unity. Despite the party's opposition to the takeover of power by the State Committee on the Extraordinary Situation in Moscow during the putsch of 1991, the People's Congress has been criticized from its inception as being an artificial organization, created by the president in order to ensure safe opposition. However, in the fall of 1994 the party declared its opposition to the president. This party represented serious opposition, and the Chairman Olzhas Suleimenov was seen as a possible competitor for the presidency. The government has made Suleimenov ambassador to Italy. At its third congress on October 14, 1995, the People's Congress announced a new political course. It has shifted from a position of opposition to one constructive cooperation with state power.²¹

Fourth, a totalitarian model – strongly centralized, a vertical relations. The members of those parties conducted a very active political struggle, participated in the demonstrations, meetings, quarrels (Alash).²² The Kazak nationalist organizations (*Jeltoksan* and *Alash*) advocate removing Russians from the country's economic and political power structure. They demand the establishment of a democratic and legitimate state. Some supporters of these groups advocate economic growth that promotes development of small enterprises and control on the issues of foreign investment. *Jeltoksan* takes its name from the Kazak word for December, which evokes the riot that broke out in Almaty in December, 1986. *Jeltoksan's* members demanded the political rehabilitation of the participants in the 1986 December events. Both *Jeltoksan* and *Alash* are real opposition, regarded by some as “uncontrollable”.²³

The traditional western political science's scheme of party classification is loosely applied to Kazakstan. It is explained by a set of reasons. Kazakstan has never had a long historical tradition of political pluralism. A multi-party system is very weak and has more of a declarative feature of it. It is an artificial process of foundation of some political institutions. According to party quantities, a party system of Kazakstan is a multiparty system.²⁴ Most of these parties and organizations have not created a political impact within the broader community. However, some of them take an active part in the political life of the republic, especially during election periods.

Some opposition forces have appeared in the republic since the 1994 elections. Opposition parties developed in connection with social and economic crises, the decline in worker productivity, the decline in the standard of living, the rise in crime, migration, and a general moral crisis. In addition, the growth of opposition can be explained by the

government's unsuccessful reform program, the strengthening of the role of executive branch, and the controversial 1994 parliamentary election.²⁵

Parties and Electoral System.

Although a pluralistic tradition is very weak in the society, all parties pursue an idea of tolerance toward other parties, an adherence to multi-party system and parliament work. However, there is a dangerous trend among certain leaders. They believe that to be a democrat means to be in the opposition and compete with the ruling authorities.

It was necessary to create parties that have had an electoral and parliament origin in early 1994. There was a tendency to influence the elections and to provide an electoral support to its own candidates and their election campaign. A conference "For the Future of Kazakstan" took place in September 1994 in order to create a party of economic freedom and liberal orientation.

The republic did not have a designated authority in power until 1995. Throughout most of the time, Kazakstan had no legislature; the country was governed through decree by the President and the Cabinet Ministers. A new constitution was adopted by referendum, in August 1995, that concentrates power in the presidency, permitting it to dominate the parliament, judiciary, and local government. Although, many leaders of party organizations belonged to a higher state political elite. The state president agreed to be the leader of the Union of People's Unity of Kazakstan in 1993. There are other state leaders of high standing in charge of the party leadership. The

regime's desire to structure and control the political representation of interests was manifested during the 1994 parliamentary elections. This elections did not conform the requirements for democratic elections. There was a 'president's list' which included representatives of the government. This was an attempt to ensure a strong presidential coalition with the parliament. The members of the Democratic Party are mainly members of the political elite, directors of large enterprises, and representatives of ethnic cultural centers. Also the Democratic Party supports the president's strategy. It demands a strong presidential government. The Socialist Party is the successor to the former Communist Party. The Socialist party united more than 47, 000 members. It mainly represents the *nomenclatura* [Soviet-era elite]. The goal of this party is the creation of social justice, freedom, and the solidarity of people. Its program supports the democratization of society, pluralism, the development of political institutions, economic reform, and the preservation of ethnic harmony.²⁶

Political opposition forces arose in late 1993. In 1994 they were in a stage of political counterelite formation. In other words, an opposition was able to claim high state positions. An opposition still is lack of a strong influence. A weak means of communication, a weak organizational infrastructure, and an absence of finance support are the restrictive factors of its growth. For instance, there are different parties with different means of communications. If a large and influential parties such as the Union of People's Unity, the Party of People's Congress, the Socialist Party have their own newspapers and magazines such as "*Dayir*", "*Narodnyi Congress*" with 20, 000 circulation, and "*Respublika*" in both Russian and Kazak languages, and an established communication with their *oblasts'* organizations (branches), then other political

structures, for the most part, do not have their own means of mass media, transportation, etc.

At the same time, one cannot understate their influential capabilities. Temporarily opposition does not have a complex program of how to lead the country out from its social-economic crisis. Two election campaigns to the Supreme Soviet took place since 1985-1995. As it was stated earlier, some opposition forces have appeared in the republic since the 1994 election. The main opposition parties and movements are: *Alash*, the Communist Party, the Socialist Party, the Peoples' Congress, Federation of *Profsyous* [trade union], *Birlesu* [unification], and the Workers' Movement. The last election was the parliamentary election: to the Senate and to the Majilis. The significance of this election is that 75 deputies out of 176 were elected by the party lists including 30 deputies from the Union of People's unity of Kazakstan, 11 deputies from the Trade Union Federation, 9 deputies from the People's Congress, 8 from the Social Party, 4 from the Slavic movement "Lad", 4 from the Peasant's Union, etc. These figures tell us that the tradition of pluralism has started in the republic. Instead of one-party system, now there is a diverse representation according to different party affiliation. Distribution of seats in the parliament is characterized by many political structures.

In this transition period Kazakstan has a majority election system. A majority principle is the substance of western democracy. In this particular situation it stipulates party enlargement, and stimulates party leaders to coordinate their activity. It is witnessed by a trend before the 1994 parliament elections when a set of parties merged²⁷ in one.¹

The parties themselves, however, were largely mono-national. This posed a threat of a parliamentary split into different ethnic groups. In order to prevent this happening, the Law Concerning Elections provided that 135 members would be elected on a one-vote basis in constituencies, while the rest (42) were to be nominated for elections by the President. Although many objections were initially raised against the scheme, it eventually proved to live up to the expectations that would catalyze parliamentary procedures and invest in it a constructive spirit. Parliament was indeed taking a constructive turn in maintaining a dialogue between the three branches of power, pursuing the reform policies, and upholding the cause of human rights. The 1993 Parliament was dissolved. It can be argued that this event represents the first victory of law over expediency in the history of the Republic.²⁸

The Political Parties and the Parliament

Political parties play a main role in the formation of central and local authorities. However, not all parties take part in the formation of activities of parliament and government. Furthermore, only parties that acquired deputy mandates as a result of elections may participate in a parliament activities. Their number decreases when talking about a party quantity members of which have formulated a government. A participation of parties in government activity depends upon a party system that exists in the country. Under the multi-party system a parliament's representation is given to a several influential parties. Under the system that has one or two dominating parties, one or two dominating parties obtain a majority of deputy mandates. A government is

founded by more than two parties under the multi-party system, and a government authority is usually concentrated in the hands of one party under the system that has one or two dominant parties.

A struggle among the political parties reflects real political power distribution in the society. Same thing occurs in the parliament. Parliament deputies unite into a party groups, clubs, fractions, etc. This is the most important element of the parliament mechanism that makes a motion within a parliament.²⁹

Interest Groups and Social Movements

Social movements and organizations seek not power but influence.

A movement does not have an organizational structure unlike a party. There is no complex program of activity as well as defined political principles. It is often founded in order to fulfill a certain goal. These goals are determined by a common notions which are integrated with heterogeneous and contradictory social powers.³⁰

Social movements take on mass character, which makes them close to a social organizations. At the same time, they differ. First of all, a social movement may not have a structure. Second, a social organization is an organization of partisans. A social movement unites with groups and trends in order to fulfill a certain goal but they differ in their outlooks.

There are certain groups not included in government or party structure but are able to influence political decisions (lobbyists, for instance). Trade unions have steady but not main political functions.

Social movements and organizations are latent political forces. Gradually, they might transform in to an active political power.³¹

These movements and organizations (that are defined as pressure or interest groups) are joint individuals who express their demands under the common interest influence. A group of people dominating over a certain activity field might compete with governmental authorities to bring about politics.

How do they express demands and represent interests of people within a group? Let's pay attention to a social basis. It is very diverse. There are representatives of intelligence, clerks, students, women, and people of a certain professions. Consequently, the problems and the demands are stipulated by a variety of social basis.

Political pluralism characterized by a multi-party system and a presence of social movements and organizations began to form in Kazakstan. There is a positive trend in the republic for those groups to be united under "the Round Table". The Independent Trade Union Center of Kazakstan was an initiator of this idea.³²

Summary

Due to the novelty of subject, there was no comparative study of the political system of Russia and Kazakstan. Both republics have been created as a result of the dissolution of the former Soviet Union. Presumably, the basic political-economic shape of the two countries are similar for that matter, but to a certain extent they may differ from one another. However, those few materials sparked the researcher's interest to explore the situation under the conditions of new political order. That is the task of the next Chapter.

ENDNOTES

-
- ¹ M. Duverger, Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 17.
- ² Ibid., XV.
- ³ Ibid., 281.
- ⁴ Peter Mair: "Introduction. Political Parties and The Stabilization of Party Systems", The West European Party System, edited by Peter Mair. Oxford University Press, 1990, p. 1.
- ⁵ M. Weber, 'Politics as a Vocation', in H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds.), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (New York: Oxford Press, 1946), p. 102.
- ⁶ E. E. Schattschneider, *Party Government* (New York: Rinehart, 1942), p. 1.
- ⁷ e.g. Anthony King, 'Political Parties in Western Democracies: Some Skeptical Reflections', *Polity*, 2/2 (1969), p. 111-41.
- ⁸ Peter Mair: "Introduction. Political Parties and The Stabilization of Party Systems", The West European Party System, edited by Peter Mair. Oxford University Press, 1990, p. 1.
- ⁹ See M. Duverger, *Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Government in the Modern State* (London: Methuen, 1954).
- ¹⁰ Giovanni Sartori, 'Political Development and Political Engineering', *Public Policy*, 17 (1968), p. 292.

-
- ¹¹ Peter Mair: "Introduction. Political Parties and the Stabilization of Party Systems", The West European Party System, edited by Peter Mair, Oxford University Press, 1990. p. 3.
- ¹² Graham K. Wilson, Interest Groups in the United States, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1981, 4.
- ¹³ Interest Groups in Four Continents, edited for the International Political Science Association by Henry W. Ehrman, University Of Pittsburgh Press, 1964, 43.
- ¹⁴ David B. Truman, The Governmental Process, New York, 1951.
- ¹⁵ Henry W. Ehrman:" The Comparative Study of Interest Groups", Interest Groups in Four Continents , University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964, 2.
- ¹⁶ Babakumarov E., Buluktayev U., Kuserbayev K., Kazakhstan Segodnya: Mir Politicheskikh Partii, Almaty, 1995, 77.
- ¹⁷ Ibid., 49.
- ¹⁸ Ibid., 106.
- ¹⁹ Essential Works of Lenin, "What Is to Be Done?" and Other Writings, edited by Henry M. Christman, New York, 1987, p. 53.
- ²⁰ Ivatova L. Papers on Government and Politics in Kazkstan, The Development of a Party System in the Republic of Kazkstan, Center for Policy Studies, Oklahoma State University, Volume 2, Number 2, 3.
- ²¹ Ibid., 2-3.
- ²² Babakumarov E, Buluktayev U., Kuserbayev K., Kazakstan Segodnya: Mir Politicheskikh Partii, Almaty, 1995, 107.

-
- ²³ Ivatova L., Papers on Government and Politics in Kazakstan, The Development of a Party System in the Republic of Kazakstan, Center for Policy Studies, Oklahoma State University, Volume 2, Number 2, 6.
- ²⁴ Babakumarov E., Buluktayev U., Kuserbayev K., Kazakstan Segodnya: Mir Politicheskikh Partii, Almaty, 1995, 107.
- ²⁵ Ivatova L., Papers on Government and Politics in Kazakstan, The Development of a Party System in the Republik of Kazkastan, Center for Policy Studies, Oklahoma State University, Volume 2, Number 2, 2.
- ²⁶ Ibid., 4.
- ²⁷ Babakumarov E., Buluktayev U., Kuserbayev K., Kazakstan Segodnya: Mir Politicheskikh Partii, Almaty, 1995, 48.
- ²⁸ Kazakstan Human Development Report, 1997.
<http://www.undp.org/undp/rbec/nhdr/kazakstan/chapter5.htm#5.2>
- ²⁹ Babakumarov E., Buluktayev U., Kuserbayev K., Kazakstan Segodnya: Mir Politicheskikx Partii, Almaty, 1995, 38.
- ³⁰ Ivatova L., Obshestvennyie Dvizheniya, Organizatsii v Politicheskoi Sisteme Respubliki Kazakhstan, Almaty, 1994, 5.
- ³¹ Ibid., 5.
- ³² Ibid., 9.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Scope of the Study

This study will investigate the opposition forces forming in Russia and Kazakstan during the transition period. The main objective is to find out if they are formidable political institutions that may effect the political decision-making processes. The researcher also would like to know how the process of political participation is proceeding in different parts of Kazakstan.

Research Method

The research method of this study is to compare the political parties, and interest groups, or social movements of both Russia and Kazakstan. To do so, the researcher will employ the 1995 Kazakstan Parliament Election, the 1995/96 Russian Parliament Election, and the 1996 Russian Presidential Election events. The **strong – weak** scale of measurement will be used to assess the present issues.

To evaluate the level of political participation in Kazakstan, 5 point scale of measurement will be employed. Because variables measured at the ordinal level are more sophisticated than nominal-level variables because, in addition to continuing the number of cases in a category, we rank the cases with respect to each other. Not only can we say that one case is different from another; we can also say that one case is higher or lower, more or less, than another.¹ The major limitation of the ordinal level of

measurement is that a particular score represents only position with respect to some other score, and the distance between the scores cannot be described in precise terms.²

Data Collection and Its Limitations

The researcher obtained the data from different sources. It is important to underline that, unfortunately, very little primary data was available. However, some of the data that has been employed came from Internet sources, some from recent Human Development Report publications, some from western experts, some from Russian and Kazak publications. As will be seen, most of the data are the secondary data.

Time Frame

The period covered in this study was December 23, 1991, the formation of the Commonwealth of the Independent States out of the wreckage of the old USSR, until 1997.

Statement of the Problem

Any evaluation of government policies should include public response as an element. A crucial issue of this study is whether or not interaction can provide a meaningful basis for the stable development of opposition. Within a multi-ethnic society, the intent and implementation of such policies are important.

An overall analysis would require an assessment of domestic political structures (political parties, interest groups or social movements), and how well political pluralism

is practiced. It offers possibilities for a comparative analysis of the opposition in Russia and Kazakstan.

Statistics

The Report on Parliamentary Elections in Kazakstan (December 1995) says that "these were first parliamentary elections held in Kazakstan since the 1994 elections which was dissolved in March 1995 and the republic has been run by the executive rule since that time."³

Delegation members observed widespread practice of voters collecting and casting multiple ballots per person during the elections to the lower house (Majilis). Observers noted the process of signing for, and voting more than one ballot per individual, to be prevalent in the majority of polling stations.⁴

There appeared to be a general lack of information among voters regarding candidates. A lack of standardized procedures between polling stations was observed specifically relating to determining the validity of ballots, vote counts, etc.⁵

The adoption of a number of observer recommendations from the 1994 elections are believed to have somewhat improved the overall electoral process. Specifically, the simplification of the candidate registration process, the increased ability for opposition views to broadcast, more opportunities for candidates to obtain funds for their campaigns (along with established accounting criteria), and the inclusion of independent domestic observers groups.⁶

Given the long period of time that the Government of Kazakstan has been without a legislature, it would be an important achievement in building democracy in

Kazakstan for a subsequent round of elections to eventually produce a new Supreme Soviet.

Table 1. The Kazakstan Majilis

Members	67	Percentage of women	13%
Term	4 years	Last renewal	12-1995
Affiliation to IPU	Yes	Affiliation dates	1993
Constituencies	67 single-member		

Internet Source on *Kazakstan: General Information, Electoral System* comments the following:

Voting system Direct election with absolute (and later simple) majority. Elections are deemed valid if at least 50% of the registered electors in each constituency have voted. If no candidate obtains more than 50% of the votes of the participating electorate, a second round is held within two months between the two leading candidates. Simple majority then suffices for election, provided that this figure accounts for at least 40% of the total votes.⁷

Background and Outcome of Elections In March 1994, the first post-independence general elections for the former unicameral Parliament took place. A year later, Kazakstan's Constitutional Court invalidated this poll and declared the legislature

illegal. President of the Republic Nursultan Nazarbayev thereupon announced the dissolution of the Parliament and plans to rule by decree pending new elections. A majority of the 177 Deputies challenged the dissolution.

On August 30, 1995, a new Constitution providing, inter alia, for a smaller bicameral legislature was approved by popular referendum. On October 2, 1995, the President announced the December election dates. The overall conduct of the polling was overseen by the Central Election Commission. According to it, 2285 candidates (128 self-nominated, 157 registered to parties or public associations) ran for the 67 Majilis seats.⁸

Table 2. Results of the Elections

	First round	Second round
Number of registered electors	8,860,897	3,308,897
Voters	7,153,443 (80.73%)	2,519,733 (76.15%)
Blank or void ballot papers	101,701	16,248
Valid votes	7,051,742	2,503,485

Table 3. Distribution of Seats According to Political Group

Kazakstan National Unity Party	11
Democratic Party	7
Communist Party	2
Socialist Party	1
National Co-operative Party	1
National Congress Party of Kazakstan	1
	23

Table 4. Distribution of Seats According to Sex

Men	58
Women	9
	67

Table 5. Distribution of Seats According to Social Status and Profession

Heads of local administrations & maslikhats	19	Heads of enterprises, associations, funds & other structures	15
Scientists, university professors & teachers	10	President administration, Ministries & Committees staff	10
Temporarily out of occupation	5	Culture & Art	3
Justice Department	2	Engineers & Economists	2
Lawyer	1	Military	1
Pensioner	1		

Political parties have their main role in periods of elections, because they nominate candidates, support them, and spend a lot of money and effort on election campaigns.⁹

The regime's desire to structure and control the political representation interests was manifested during the parliamentary elections which were held in March, 1994. It is true that the 1994 elections did not conform to the requirements for democratic elections. In addition, there was a "president's list" which included representatives of

the government. This was an attempt to ensure a strong presidential coalition with the parliament.¹⁰

Political pluralism in Kazakhstan was limited and the government has controlled the process off the development of a multiparty system through the registration and election laws.

Tables 1-5 show the data concerning the 1995 elections for the lower house.

Shown below is the data for the Senate.

Table 6. The Kazakhstan Senate

Members	47	Percentage of women	8%
Term	4 years (half of the elected Senators' seats are renewed every 2 years)	Last renewal	12-1995
Affiliation to IPU	Yes	Affiliation dates	1993
Constituencies	20 multi-member (2 seats)		

Voting System Indirect election by the local assemblies of the 14 regions and the capital – two Senators from each. Majority and voter thresholds of 50% required for each election in each constituency.

Table 7. Distribution of Seats According to Political Group

Kazakstan National Unity Party	6
Democratic Party	5
Socialist Party	1
National Co-operative Party	1
	13

Table 8. Distribution of Seats According to Sex

Men	43
Women	4
	47

Table 9. Distribution of Seats According to Social Status and Profession

Heds of local administrations & maslikhats	16	President administration, Ministries, Committees & Constitutional Court staff	9
Heds of enterprises, associations, firms, funds & other structures	7	Scientists, university professors & teachers	4
Justice department	3	Culture & Art	2
Trade unions	2	Medical doctors	1
Temporarily unemployed	1		

On average, candidates for the Senate and the Majilis were between 40 and 60 year old. As it shown in the Tables 5 & 9 they represented different professions: doctors, journalists, economists, politicians, lawyers, industrial and agricultural workers, and so on. Generally speaking, the candidates for the senate are officials of maslikhats. Candidates represented 11 nationalities living in the republic. These include Kazaks, Russians, Ukranians, Tatars, Belorussians, Koreans, Uzbeks, Germans, Poles, Jewish, and Uighurs.¹¹

From the Tables 3 & 7 one sees that political parties and social movements took an active part in the nomination of their candidates. In sum 172 nominees were registered for the Majilis. The breakdown was: PNEK – 38, Democratic Party – 22, Federation of Profsoyuz – 21, People’s Cooperative Party of Kazakstan – 15, Krest’yanskii Soyuz (Peasant’s Union) – 13, Communist Party – 9, People’s Congress – 8, The Unity of Advocates – 5, Engineers’ Academy – 3, Lad – 3, The Party of Jurists – 2, “Nevada-Semei” Movement – 2, The Unity of Writers – 2, The Unity of Enterprisers – 2, Others – 1 from each party.¹²

The development of the party system is influenced by the presence of a strong government. However, the opposition forces have appeared and gained strength since the 1994 parliamentary elections. Opposition forces began to criticize the government and the policies of the president. Criticism by opposition elements was especially strong in 1995 after such events as the disbanding of parliament and the Constitutional Court and the referendum of April 1995. These actions strengthened the executive branch. However, the opposition parties did not offer any framework that could serve as an alternative to the political course of the government.¹³

The 1996 Russian Presidential Elections

The 1996 Russian presidential poll was the country’s second free presidential election since the fall of communism. The tension, both domestic and international, over who would win reached its zenith during the first round of the Russian presidential elections on June 16. Eleven candidates were on the ballot, but it was Yeltsin and

Zyuganov who grappled for the lead, coming in with 35 percent and 32 percent respectively. But because neither candidate pulled in more than half the vote, the elections went into overtime, and attention became riveted on former military General Aleksander Lebed, 49, who surprisingly stole almost 15 percent of the support. People began to speculate about which side he would root for, now that he was out of the game.¹⁴

But the suspense did not last very long. Within two days, he was among the many supporters that walked over the Yeltsin team after the incumbent president fired his defense secretary and other top officials. He gave Lebed the high-ranking posts of security advisor and Security Council secretary, and observers say the aggressive Lebed and his support almost certainly helped garner Yeltsin's win.

Supporters held their breath when Yeltsin rumored to be ill, disappeared from the public eye just days before the final ballot, but they had little cause to worry. The idea of returning to communism turned off more than half of the voters, who voted 54 percent to 40 percent for Yeltsin's status quo against Zyuganov's promises of communist tradition.

Despite the fact that the elections would dramatically impact the turn of the century, the government would take into the next century, fewer of the country's 106 million voters went to the polls than expected – 67 percent in the last round compared to about 69 percent in the first.¹⁵

Table 10. The 1996 Russian Presidential Elections

Boris Yeltsin	35.3%	53.8%
Gennady Zyuganov (KPRF)	32.0	40.2
Aleksandr Lebed (KRO)	14.5	-
Grigory Yavlinsky (Yabloko)	7.3	-
Vladimir Zhirinovskiy (LDPR)	5.7	-
Others	3.8	-

The 1995/96 Russian Parliament Elections

Altogether 43 political parties have submitted applications to run in parliamentary polls. The registration of 14 parties including prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin's centrist central block Our Home is Russia, and President Boris Yeltsin's key opponents – communists, agrarians and ultra-nationalists – have already been announced.

Besides Derzhava and Yabloko one other group has been barred from the election, the smaller Democratic Russia and Free Trade Union block of independent candidates. It is appealing. President Yeltsin has said he will campaign not to allow communists and ultra-nationalists to win a majority in the Duma, whose 450 seats will be contested. Russia's democrats and liberals are split into several groups and parties. But Yabloko was one of the few with a good chance of clearing the 5% barrier to winning seats in the Duma. Under the Russian electoral system half of the deputies are

elected on party lists and the other 225 in individual constituencies. That means Yabloko and Derzhava candidates still appear able to run without party affiliation in the individual constituencies.¹⁶

The Russian Parliament - The *Federal'noe Sobranie* (Federal Assembly) has two chambers. The *Gosudarstvennaya Duma* (State Duma) has 450 members, elected for four year term, 225 members elected in single-seat constituencies and 225 members by proportional representation. The *Sovet Federatsii* (Federation Council) has 178 members: 2 delegates for each region.

Table 11. The 1995 Gosudarstvennaya Duma: Distribution of Seats According to Political Party Members

December 16, 1995		%	450
Kommunisticheskaya Partiya Rossiiskoi Federatsii	KPRF	22.3	157
Liberal'no-Demokraticeskaya Patriya Rossii	LDPR	11.2	51
Nash Dom – Rossiya	NDR	10.1	51
Yabloko	Yabloko	6.9	45
Zhensh'iny Rossii	ZR	4.6	3
Partiya Samoupravleniya Trudyash'ikhsya	PST	4.0	1
Agrarnaya Partiya Rossii	APR	3.8	20
Partiya Rossiiskogo Edinstva I Soglasiya	PRES	0.4	1
Partiya Economicheskoi Svobody	PES	0.1	1
Partiya Lubitelei Piva	PLP	0.6	-

Table 11. 1 Distribution of Seats According to Interest Groups and Movements Members

Kongress Russkikh Obsh'in	KRO	4.3	5
Kommunisty SSSR – Trudovaya Rossiya za Sovetskii Sojuz	KTS	4.5	1
Demokraticeskii Vybor Rossii	DVR	3.9	9
Derzhava	Derzhava	2.6	-
Vpered, Rossiya	VR	1.9	3
Vlast' Narodu!	VN	1.6	9
Pamfilova-Gurov-Vladimir Lysenko	PGL	1.6	2
Profsojuzy I Promyshlenniki Rossii – Sojuz Truda	PPR-ST	1.6	1
Konstruktivno Ekologicheskoye Dvizhenie Rossii	Kedr	1.4	-
Blok Ivana Rybkina	BIR	1.1	3
Blok Stanislava Govorukhina	BSG	1.0	1
Moye Otechestvo	MO	0.7	1
Obsh'ee Delo	OD	0.7	1
Musul'manskoye Dvizhenie "Nur"	NUR	0.6	-
Preobrazhenie Otechestva	PO	0.5	1
Blok Nezavisimyykh	BN	0.1	1
89 (89 Regionov Rossii)	89	0.1	1
Against all parties	-	2.8	-
Invalid ballots	-	1.9	-
Non-affiliated	-	-	77

Political Orientation of Kazakstan Regions (Oblasts)

When the oblasts administrations were asked to provide the Kazakstan Institution for Development with the data on the local political situation, some sociological surveys were held in different oblasts.¹⁷ Since this research's interest is on the political parties, interest groups, or social movements, the researcher decided to pick that particular data. According to the sociological surveys taken place in Semipalatinsk oblast, it was discovered that there are 5 political parties: Social and Communist Parties, Party of People's Unity, Party of People's Congress, and People-Cooperative Party.

The Socialist Party is very popular in Aktubinsk oblast. Its oblast organization has 1100 members. Overall political activity is weak, especially in rural areas.

The Union of People's Unity of Kazakstan, the People's Congress, "Azat" Movement, and the National Democratic Party have an influence in Atyrau oblast. The oblasts' ethnic group representation is very diverse. That is why there are lots of German, Korean, Bolgarean cultural unions. Political parties and social movements' activity is weak.

Slavic social movements ("Lad", "Russkoye Zemlyachestvo", Ukranian cultural center) are active in Mangystau. There are 6 parties, 3 social-political movements, 11 national-cultural centers. The most influential political movement is "Parasat" consists of 5000 members, which is Kazak movement.

Overall political involvement measured in Western Kazakstan is not active, only 3-4%, in urban area – 7-9%. Population’s trust in different parties and groups were measured by 5 point scale. These are the results of the survey presented in Table 12.

Table 12. Urals’k City

“Lad”	2.7	Communist Party	2.67
Oblast’s Trade Union	2.65	Independent Trade Unions	2.54
Social Party	2.48	Union of People’s unity	2.35
Cossaks’ Movement	2.29	“Parasat”	2.28
“Azat”	2.23		

Table 12.1. Northern Districts

Communist Party	2.8	Social Party	2.63
Oblast’s Trade Unions	2.62	Independent Trade Unions	2.5
Union of People’s Unity	2.32	“Lad”	2.38
“Parasat”	2.2	Cossaks’ Movement	2.18
“Azat”	2.12		

Table 12.2. Southern District

“Azat”	3.46	Oblast’s Trade Union	3.31
“Parasat”	3.21	Union of People’s Unity	3.21
Independent Trade Unions	3.13	Communist Party	2.93
Social Party	2.63	“Lad”	2.44
Cossaks’ movement	2.18		

From Tables 12-12.2. it can be concluded that in party preferences ethnic breakdowns play a great role. The reason is that the northern part of Kazakstan consists of Russian speaking population, and the southern part of Kazakstan consists of Kazak speaking population.¹⁸ That is why social movements like “Azat” and “Parasat” have high ranking in the South - **3.46** and **3.21** respectively, and “Lad” and Cossaks’ Movement obtain the lowest rank – **2.44** and **2.18** respectively. “Lad” has the highest ranking – **2.7** in Ural’sk city and Communist Party – **2.8** and “Parasat” and “Azat” have the lowest – **2.2** and **2.12** in the North.

The Cossack movement is active in 9 (9 is out of old 19 districts, not from modified 14, because some districts were merged by the government’s decision). This organization advocates the creation of a military complex, which could be used to “protect” the Russian speaking population in case of socio-economic instability.¹¹⁹

There is a decrease in the political activity of Taldykurgan and Kyzyl Orda oblasts. As of June 1, 1995 there are 5 political parties and 89 interest and social groups and movements in Almaty oblast. Southern Kazakstan has 130 socio-political units, 9 of them are parties and movements, 11 cultural centers, 13 trade unions, and other social groups. The Socialist Party has 16,000 members. The Republican Party has more than 2,000 members, The Party of People’s Congress – 2,000, and The Communist Party - 2,000.

Northern Kazakstan experienced an increase in the political participation of population. This oblast has 4 parties: The People’s Congress, People’s Unity, Communist Party, and People’s Cooperative Party. There are also 3 movements – “Lad”, “Support for the Eurasian Union”, and “Zemlyachestvo”.

Torgai region has 85 political social unions. It includes 4 parties, 2 social movements, 15 different beneficial funds, 14 trade unions, etc. Akmola oblast has 6 parties, 9 national cultural centers. 25 political parties, interest groups, and social movements were registered in Pavlodar oblast. But the membership is not significant. The Communist party members' number ranges from 250 to 280, The Peoples' Congress – 400-450.

Tables

The tables given include a breakdown of the political party, interest group, or social movements. Percentages were tabulated for each party, group or movement of each country or region (oblast).

Limitations

This study strictly focused on the content of different elections and survey in different oblasts. Because not all districts provided the data this was not sufficient to cover every aspect in every region.

ENDNOTES

¹ Statistics. A Tool For Social Research. Joseph F. Healey, Belmont, California, 1984,8

² Ibid., 9.

³ *Report on Parliamentary Elections in Kazakistan*, December 1995,
[gopher://marvin.nc3a.nato.int:70/00...RLIAMENT/ELECTION/KAZH/osce-ka1.txt](http://marvin.nc3a.nato.int:70/00...RLIAMENT/ELECTION/KAZH/osce-ka1.txt)

⁴ Ibid.,1

⁵ Ibid., 1

⁶ Ibid.,1

⁷ Kazakistan. General Information, Electoral System,
<http://www.ipu.org:80/cgi/multigate...n=FT%5fTEXT%20HTML%200;ct=text/html>

⁸ Kazakistan. *General Information, Electoral System*,
<http://www.ipu.org:80/cgi/multigate...n=FT%5fTEXT%20HTML%200;ct=text/html>

⁹ Ivatova L., *Papers on Government and Politics in Kazakistan*, The Development of a Party System in the Republic of Kazakistan , Center for Policy Studies, Oklahoma State University, Volume 2, Number 2, 7.

¹⁰ Ibid., 7

¹¹ Ibid., 7

¹² Aukenov A., "Central Elections Committee Has Waited that The Electors will Say Something About The Election, but He Did not Wait", *Panorama*, no, November, 1995, 1. 46

¹³ Ivatova L. *Papers on Government and Politics in Kazakistan*, The Development of a Party System in the Republic of Kazakistan, Center for Policy Studies, Oklahoma Sate University, nolume 2, Number 2, 8.

¹⁴ Summary of the 1996 Russian Presidential Elections, *Russia Today* ,
<http://www.russia.net/politics/parties.html>

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Election Shock Over Party Bans, *Reuter* ,
<http://www.spb.su/sppress/130/election.html>

¹⁷ Obzor Obsh'estvenno-Politicheskoi Situatsii v Oblastyax Kazkakhstana, *Sayasat*.
Politika, April, 1995, 66.

¹⁸ Ibid., March , 1995, 51

¹⁹ See: "Political Infighting Reported in Cossack Community," *Khalyk kenesi*, February 10, 1995, 1.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

General

This thesis is an attempt to investigate the political organizations (political parties, interest groups, or social movements) of Kazakhstan. The main objective is to find out how strong or weak the opposition forces are. Specifically, the study was concerned whether or not those new forces may impact political decision-making under the current regime. To do so, the researcher has decided to make comparison between the political organizations of Kazakhstan and Russia.

The research method of this study was one of the technique of comparative analysis employing the **strong – weak** scale. In order to estimate how new opposition forces are popular within the entire territory of Kazakhstan, the **5** point scale has been used.

This chapter will discover the main findings based on the research done in the previous chapter. One will find the similarities, and the differences in the political oppositions of Kazakhstan and Russia. Also, the study will discover whether the Kazakhstan opposition is **strong** or **weak** and how popular (within the scale of **5**) those forces are among the population.

The opposition in Kazakistan and Russia: similarities and differences

Before any further discussion, a few issues are to be taken into consideration. The reason the researcher picked Russia for the purposes of this analyses is that both Russia and Kazakistan have the same ideological background, both occurred as the result of the former USSR wreckage. That is to say these republics have many things in common. It is their past experience under a centralized government, mono-party system and so on. At the same time, for these very reasons they differ. Russia then became a “successor” for the old USSR with all the consequences. Also there is a room to speculate that Russia would have had a political tradition, before the Bolshevics. This means the way two republics experience opposition is different. Russian opposition tends to be **stronger**, and Kazakistan opposition tends to be **weaker**. Kazakistan is not used to oppose. Only now, bit by bit, there is a tendency for Kazakistan opposition to show up. The researcher believes, it is explained by the upcoming 2000 Presidential Elections. Table10. shows how the 1996 Russian Presidential Election campaign went. First of all, there were many candidates. Second of all, it was so competitive that there was a need for the second round. Kazakistan has not ever had a presidential elections similar to this Russian election. Only this upcoming 2000 elections make one hope to see what kind of opposition Kazakistan has. To strengthen the point the researcher has employed the data on the 1996 Russian Presidential Elections (Table10) along with the 1995/96 Russian Parliament Elections (Table11) simply because there is nothing to show and compare with Kazakistan. That is why instead of comparing only the 1995

Kazakstan Parliament Elections (Tables 3 & 5) and the 1995/96 Russian Parliament Elections the researcher assumed it is relevant to include the data on the 1996 Russian Presidential Elections (Table 10).

There are lots of other different factors for the Kazakstan opposition to be **weaker**. Both republics ethnically are diverse. Both republics have vast territories, but they are not populated equally. Kazakstan has roughly 17 million people while Russia has 148,195,000 (1995) which means that Kazakstan population density is among the lowest in the world. That is why the correlation of political participation is different. According to the 1997 Human Development Report, Northern and Southern Kazakstan are the most populated areas (the population density is 7.4 and 9 persons per square kilometer respectively), but Southern Kazakstan is the least economically developed region.¹ Northern Kazakstan tends to be more Russian speaking region and Southern part tends to be more native language (Kazak) speaking region. These two factors (economic development and ethnicity) explain the level of political participation in the republic. In the scale of 5 point measurement Table 12.2 shows that parties and movements such as “Azat” and “Parasat” have the highest rank in the 5 point scale (**3.46** and **3.21** respectively) and “Lad” and Cossaks’ Movement have the lowest (**2.44** and **2.18** respectively) in Southern part. Tables 12 & 12.1 show that “Lad” has the highest rank – **2.7** in Urals’k city, and the Communist Party – **2.8**, and the lowest - **2.2** for “Parasat” and – **2.12** for “Azat” in Northern part.² Nevertheless, overall evaluation of Kazakstan opposition forces suggests it is **weak**. It is seen from the 5 point scale of measurement none of the parties, or groups, have reached neither **3.5** nor **4**.

Summary

The institutions of political parties and organizations and an electoral system play a great role in the new political systems of Russia and Kazakstan. However, one must not overstate that there is a completed party system in Russia as well in Kazakstan. That would have been an early assumption.

Russian and Kazakstani parties differ by program goals, a political orientations, an organizational structure, and methods (which were not the purpose of this study to investigate on). It is often impossible to classify them as the “rights-lefts”, the “conservatives-liberals”. Sometimes one cannot include a religious, an ethnical, a professional interests in to this scheme. Consequently, a set of parties might share common positions on many social-economic issues but might disagree on the issues of religion, state, national and other problems.³

Since the economic problem is the primary problem and it is necessary to lead the country out from its current crisis, one starts to classify political forces according to their social-economical and political reformation.⁴

A common feature for both Russia and Kazkastan is that political opposition can offer their own programs of reforms on how to lead the countries out from the crisis that differs from those of governments. For instance, the parliament’s opposition lead by the Russian “Progress” group have suggested an alternative reforms program in 1994. Its main distinctions are following:

- Not in agreement with the government on privatization methods;
- Strengthening a social bias of reforms;
- Slowing down the process of reformation of kolkhoz and sovkhos (collective and joint farms);
- A restoration of state control over state property;
- A different approaches in the quest for drastic measures on how to handle the inflation.

The most significant difference is to refuse the recommendations of the International Currency Fund. Because, according to the opposition, it might lead to a social burst and a catastrophe.⁵

The political opposition of Russia has a stronger position. For instance, the State Duma has a strong fractions of the Communist Party, the Agrarian Party, Yavlinsky block, "Democratic Russia", the Liberal_Democratic Party (the LDPR) (Tables 11 & 11.1).

The reason the LDPR obtained significant support from the population of Russia is simple, people were in favor of "simple" prescriptions to solve a complex social problems.⁶

Considering the election results within one mandate district it was revealed that the representatives of socialist trend were more influential in the State Duma: "Russia's Choice" (Vybor Rossii) had a bit less (103 against 111), the parties of liberal trend have gotten 130 seats ("PRES" – 29, "Yabloko" – 28, DPR – 17, LDPR 66).

ENDNOTES

¹ 1997 Kazkstan Human Development Report , Chapter 1.

<http://www.undp.org/undp/rbec/nhdr/kazakstan/chapter1.html>

² Obzor Obsh'estvenno-Politicheskoi Situatsii V Oblastyakh Kazakhstana, Sayasat. Politika ,April 1995, 71.

³ Karsakov I., Politicheskie Partii Rossii I Kazakhstana: Sravnitel'nyi Analiz, Sayasat. Politika , May 1995, 24.

⁴ Ibid., 27.

⁵ Ibid., 30.

⁶ Ibid., 30.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

General

This chapter is a summary of research methodology and findings. This chapter will also include the recommendations and forecast. It will also give an overall conclusion on the validity of the researcher's thesis. Is the Kazakstani opposition strong or it is weak when comparing to those of Russia? What are the limitations and what are the suggestions for the research?

Methodology

The problem of either support or opposition toward authorities in Kazakstan is closely connected to the activity of social-political movements and groups. In general, the republic's social-political movements adequately reflect those deep processes that are taking place in Kazakstan.¹ From the previous chapter's evaluation it is seen that population's politization level is not very high (within the scale of **5** the mean average for Northern and Southern parts of Kazakstan was **2.41** and **2.94** respectively).

Discussion of Findings

For the last 50 years, after the 1930's cruel government policies, resistance to the authorities did not acquire mass characteristics in Kazakstan. One might recall the 1979 events in Tselinograd (now Aqmola, which is now the new capital of the Republic in Northern Kazakstan), or the 1986 December events in Alma-Ata (now Almaty, the old

southern capital). The distinct peculiarities of those events are that the main mass of those who did protest against authorities consisted of both students' and workers' youth. Kazak and Kazakstani intellectuals kept silent, or were self-flagellant and were looking for scapegoats, or "the people's enemy".² The nomenclature was surprisingly quiet because of their subordination to Moscow.

Is there any opposition to the existing power, to the president's policy? If yes, how influential it is?

According to some scholars, there is opposition to the government, and to its policies. But there is no strong and wide opposition to the president's and government's policies on the issues of social welfare, even though the population experiences a very hard time right now. The parties and the movements critique the reform of the government.

It is early to discuss any very serious opposition in Kazakstan. One might seriously consider opposition as real power only when the questions of property will be solved and there will be a demand for pursuing interests of certain social strata. The governments of the former Soviet Union had to deal with the unsteady, impulsive masses who do not have a wide social basis and a strong support.³ That is to say the Kazakstan opposition is **weak**.

Future Forecast and Recommendations

According to different scholars, in the nearest future PNEK and DPK will be influential forces within and outside the parliament. These parties are closely connected

with the Kazakstan political elite. Both are parliamentary parties and both support the reforms undertaken by the president. They will probably be the most significant parties in Kazakstan.⁴

If one is to give a prognosis in perspective, one might see a huge likelihood for the “heterogeneous” rival institution to be established. Each party will obtain “its own” electorate and will have a program reflecting interests of its own social group, strata, class.⁵

For Russia, as well as for Kazakstan, a political parties standing on a centristic positions are more acceptable, because their policy would differ by their stability and predictability. However, an attempt to create mass centristic organizations from the top did not succeed in Kazakstan (the Union of People’s Unity, the Democratic Party, for example). Russia experienced an analogical situation. Perhaps, it is explained by the current crisis, and an ideology of centrism which is no longer popular among constituents, and leaders who pursue those ideals fail to win during the elections. Also it is worth mentioning that both Russia and Kazakstan do not have a stable social base for a centric political organizations today.⁶

A centrism’s social basis as a political trend in western democracy that stipulates its position durability is a strong and numerous middle class – a category that encompasses a wide range of small and middle enterprise owners, intellectuals, etc. In the West the middle class is numerous. That is why it influences the political process development and gives a steady centric orientation to it.⁷

Summary

- Political parties in Kazakhstan are generally small and nearly unknown outside major cities. There are six political parties officially represented in the Kazakstani Parliament. Three of these parties – the Party of People’s Unity, the Democratic Party, and the People’s Cooperative Party – are pro-presidential. Two small opposition parties, the separatist and the communist parties have seats in Parliament. Outside of parliament, small Kazak ethnic and Slavic ethnic parties are active in some cities. Party affiliation plays little role in local Kazakstani politics, where personal and family ties are more important.⁸
 - By the beginning of 1997, Kazakhstan had in place important elements of participatory democracy. Citizens enjoy basic rights to free speech, press and assembly; however, some rights are restricted by complicated bureaucratic requirements and an imperfect legal system. The government generally respects the human rights of its citizens.⁹

ENDNOTES

-
- ¹ Ayaganov B. "Gosudarstvo Kazakstan: Evolutsiya Obsh'estvennykh Sistem", Almaty 1993, 125.
- ² Ibid., 125.
- ³ Ibid., 127.
- ⁴ Iyatova L., *Papers on Government and Politics in Kazakstan*, The Development of a Party System in the Republic of Kazakstan, Center for Policy Studies, Oklahoma State University, Volume 2, Number 2, 8.
- ⁵ Babakumarov E., Buluktayev U., Kuserbayev K., "Kazakhstan Segodnya: Mir Politicheskikh Partii", Institut Razvitiya Kazakhstana, Almaty, 1995, 106.
- ⁶ Karsakov I., Politicheskie Partii Rossii I Kazakhstana: Sravnitel'nyi Analiz, *Sayosat. Politika*, April 1995, 31.
- ⁷ Ibid., 32.
- ⁸ *Country Commercial Guide: Kazakstan*, February 1997, 2
<http://www.itaiep.doc.gov/bisnis/country/kzccg3.htm>
- ⁹ Ibid., 2

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Almond, Gabriel A. "Comparative Study of Interest Groups and the Political Process" *American Political Science Review* 52 (1958);270-82.
2. Ayaganov B. *Gosudarstvo Kazakhstan: Evolutsiya Obsh'estvennykh Sistem*. Almaty, 1993.
3. Babakumarov E. *Dinamika Partinoy Sistemi Kazakhstana v 1985-1994 godakh*. Almaty, noyabr' 1994.
4. Babakumarov E., Bulekbayev U., Kuserbayev K. *Kazakhstan Segodnya: Mir Politicheskix Partii*. Almaty 1995.
5. Bakayev L. "Rossiiskii Factor." *Aziya. Mezhdunarodnaya Gazeta*. No 23 (113) Iyun 1994.
6. Country Commercial Guide: Kazakhstan. February 1997.
7. Dave Bhavna. "A New Opposition Movement is Launched in Kazakstan." *Analytical Brief*. 23 April 1996, Volume 1, No. 76 /AB.960423-076.htm
8. Duverger M. *Political Parties. Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State*. New York, 1963.
9. Ehrmann W. Henry. "The Comparative Study of Interest Groups." *Interest Groups in Four Continents* University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964.
10. "Elections In Russia"
11. "Electoral System. Kazakstan."
%20HTML5200;ct=text/html
12. Human Development Report. Kazakstan 1997.

13. Ivatova L. "Papers on Government and Politics in Kazakstan. The development of a Party System in the Republic of Kazakstan". *Center for Policy Studies*. Oklahoma State University. Volume 2, Number 2.
14. Ivatova L. *Obsh'estvennyie Dvizheniya I Organizatsii v Politicheskoi Sisteme Respubliki Kazakhstan: Sostoyanie I Perspektivi*. Almaty, 1994.
15. Karsakov I. "Politicheskie Partii Rossii I Kazakhstana: Sravnitel'nyi Analiz." *Sayasat. Politika*. Almaty, 1995 No. 5 (Oktyabr).
16. Report on Parliamentary Elections in Kazakstan. December 1995.
ELECTION/KAZ/osce-ka1.txt
17. "Summary of the 1996 Russian Presidential Elections". *Russia Today*. parties.html
18. *Sayasat. Politika*. Almaty, 1995 No.3 (Avgust).
19. *Sayasat. Politika*. Almaty, 1995 No.4
20. Truman David B. *The Governmental Process*. New York, 1951.
21. Wilson Graham K. *Interest Groups in the United States*. Clarendon Press. Oxford. 1981.

ADDITIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aukenov A. "Central Elections Committee Has Announced the Results of the Registration of Candidates for Parliament." *Panorama*, no.46, November, 1995.
- Comparative Politics. The Quest for Theory*. James Bill, Robert L. Hardgrave, Jr. University Press of America, 1981.
- Essential Works of Lenin. "What Is To Be Done?" and other Writings. Edited by Henry M. Christman. New York, 1987.
- Evraziiskoye Soobsh'estvo*. *Ekonomika. Politika. Bezopasnost'*. Almaty, 1995 No 3.
- Political Science. A Comparative Introduction*. Rod Hague, Martin Harrop and Shaun Breslin. New York, 1992.

Spravochnik. Politicheskie Partii I Dvizheniya. Vipusk 1-2. Almaty 1994.

Statistics. A Tool for Social Research. Joseph F. Healey, Belmont, California, 1984.

The West European Party System, edited by Peter Miar, Oxford University Press, 1990.

VITA

Karlygash Balapanova

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Art

Thesis: CONTEMPORARY KAZAKSTAN:
ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL OPPOSITION

Major Field: Political Science

Biographical:

Education: Graduated from High School #131, Almaty, Kazakstan in June 1990; received University Diploma in Philosophy from Al Farabi Kazak State National University, Almaty, Kazakstan in June 1995. Current postgraduate student at Al Farabi Kazak State University, Almaty, Kazakstan.

Completed the requirements for the Master of Art Degree with major in Political Science at Oklahoma State University in May 1998.

Experience: Program Coordinator - the USIA grant in Journalism Management July to August 1995. Research Assistant – Al Farabi Research Center, Almaty, Kazakstan, 1995. Teaching Assistant – Department of Political Science, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1996-1998.

Professional Membership: Pi Sigma Alpha – National Political Science Honor Society (Member, Association of College Honor Societies).

VITA

Karlygash Balapanova

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Art

Thesis: CONTEMPORARY KAZAKSTAN:
ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL OPPOSITION

Major Field: Political Science

Biographical:

Education: Graduated from High School #131, Almaty, Kazakstan in June 1990; received University Diploma in Philosophy from Al Farabi Kazak State National University, Almaty, Kazakstan in June 1995. Current postgraduate student at Al Farabi Kazak State University, Almaty, Kazakstan.

Completed the requirements for the Master of Art Degree with major in Political Science at Oklahoma State University in May 1998.

Experience: Program Coordinator - the USIA grant in Journalism Management July to August 1995. Research Assistant – Al Farabi Research Center, Almaty, Kazakstan, 1995. Teaching Assistant – Department of Political Science, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1996-1998.

Professional Membership: Pi Sigma Alpha – National Political Science Honor Society (Member, Association of College Honor Societies).