

*S t u d i a i A n a l i z y*  
*S t u d i e s & A n a l y s e s*

---

*Centrum Analiz  
Społeczno-Ekonomicznych*



*Center for Social  
and Economic Research*

**2 4 2**

---

**Marek Dąbrowski and Radziława Gortat**

**Political Determinants of Economic Reforms  
in Former Communist Countries**

*W a r s a w , 2 0 0 2*

Materials published here have a working paper character. They can be subject to further publication. The views and opinions expressed here reflect Authors' point of view and not necessarily those of the CASE.

The paper was prepared thanks to support given by the Human Development Report 2002 project of the United Nations Development Programme.

The publication was financed by Rabobank Polska S.A.

Key words: **transition, political systems, democratization, electoral systems, institutional reforms.**

© CASE – Center for Social and Economic Research, Warsaw 2002

Graphic Design: Agnieszka Natalia Bury

DTP: CeDeWu Sp. z o.o.

ISSN 1506-1701, ISBN 83-7178-290-X

Publisher:

CASE – Center for Social and Economic Research  
ul. Sienkiewicza 12, 00-944 Warsaw, Poland  
tel.: (4822) 622 66 27, 828 61 33, fax (4822) 828 60 69  
e-mail: [case@case.com.pl](mailto:case@case.com.pl)

# Contents

Abstract	5
1. Introduction	6
2. Ten Years of Transition: Winners and Losers	7
3. Politics Behind Economics: How Political Factors Determine Economic Performance?	12
4. Scenarios of Political Changes and Their Outcomes	15
4.1. The CEB Model: Towards a Consolidated Democracy and Broad Participation	16
4.1.1. Electoral Law	17
4.1.2. Political Parties	18
4.1.3. Dynamics of Constitutional Changes	19
4.1.4. Consequences for the Political and Economic Reform	19
4.2. The European CIS Model: Transitional Regimes and Limited Participation	20
4.2.1. Evolution of the Constitutional Order Towards the Presidential-parliamentary Regimes	21
4.2.2. Weak Political Parties and Shortcomings of the Election Law	22
4.2.3. Consequences for Political and Economic Reform	24
4.3. The Central Asia's Eodel: Consolidated Autocracies and Restricted Participation	25
4.3.1. Towards the Pure Presidential Regime	26
4.3.2. Manipulated Election Process, Restricted Party System and Further Strengthening the Presidential Power	27
4.3.3. Consequences for Political and Economic Reform	30
5. How the Flawed Institutions Impede the Economic Development?	30
6. General Conclusions	33
References	35
Figures	38

### **Marek Dąbrowski**

*Marek Dąbrowski is a professor of economics, one of the founders of the Center for Social and Economic Research (CASE), Warsaw, and chairman of the CASE Foundation Council. Since 1991 he has been a policy advisor to governments and central banks in Bulgaria, Georgia, Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan, Macedonia, Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, Russia, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, and Yugoslavia. In 1989–1990 he was first deputy minister of finance of Poland. From 1991 to 1993 he was a deputy in the Sejm (the lower house of the Polish Parliament). From 1991 to 1996 he was the chairman of the Council of Ownership Changes, an advisory body to the Prime Minister of Poland. In 1994–1995, he was a visiting consultant to the World Bank's Policy Research Department. Since 1998 he has been a member of the Monetary Policy Council of the National Bank of Poland. His recent research interests concentrate on macroeconomic policy problems and the political economy of transition.*

### **Radzisawa Gortat**

*Radzisława Gortat has a Ph.D. degree in political science. She is the Senior Lecturer at the Institute of Political Science of the Warsaw University, the Lecturer at the Higher School of Humanities in Pułtusk, Poland, and the Senior Research Fellow at the CASE – Center for Social and Economic Research (CASE) in Warsaw. She participated in a number of CASE research and technical assistance projects in countries of the former USSR. She is the author of several publications related to political and constitutional reforms, elections and democratization process in former communist countries.*

## **Abstract**

The results of the first decade of economic transition are very uneven and are distributed according to a sub-regional pattern. The group of "leading reformers" consists of middle-income countries of democratic capitalism of the Central Europe and Baltic region (CEB). The second group of less advanced reformers includes mainly lower- and lower-middle-income countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) where both capitalism and democracy are still immature and sometimes heavily distorted.

This differentiation can be explained mainly by the adopted transition strategies and political factors determining them. Also the perspective of the European integration has played an important leveraging role. Fast reforms allowed for shortening the period of a temporary system vacuum, breaking down the inertia of the old system, and exploiting maximally the initial political window of opportunity.

The ability of individual countries to follow the effective (i.e. fast) reform strategy was determined by the scale of the initial political changes and further developments in the sphere of institutional and political reform. Generally, a very strong correlation between the progress in political and economic reforms could be observed.

Looking at the role of specific institutional solutions one must underline the advantage of the parliamentary or parliamentary-presidential regime over the presidential or presidential-parliamentary system. The former helped to build the transparent and relatively stable system of the political parties while the latter contributed to political fragmentation, irresponsible legislature and oligarchic capitalism.

## **I. Introduction**

The role of good governance, transparency and accountability of governments in supporting economic growth is widely and increasingly recognized by the world community in recent years (see e.g. WDR, 2002). Experience of the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union brought additional evidence in favor of a hypothesis that good political and economic institutions do matter a lot. These countries had to overcome the heritage of communist ideology, authoritarian regimes and centrally planned economy in the relatively short time.

The achieved results of transition process are uneven. Simplifying somewhat, we can distinguish two broad groups of transition countries, according to their progress in economic and political reforms. The first one, which may be called as the 'leading reformers' group consists of middle-income countries of democratic capitalism of the Central Europe and Baltic region (CEB). The second group of less advanced reformers includes mainly lower- and lower-middle-income countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) where both capitalism and democracy are still immature and sometimes heavily distorted.

During the first decade of transition, the first group represented a much better economic and social record in any respect than the second one. Trying to find causes of such differentiation one must inevitably come, sooner or later, to the role of political and economic institutions such as constitutional division of power, electoral systems, political parties, free mass-media, civil society organizations, rule of law, independent and efficient judiciary, central bank independence and others. Some of these institutional factors will be analyzed in this paper, taking into consideration their impact on economic and social performance of transition countries<sup>1</sup>.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 presents the brief characteristics of the overall transition results in the economic and social sphere. These results give a ground for categorization of transition countries according to the above mentioned lines. Section 3 shows interdependence between economic and political reforms and role of political factors in determining the results of economic transition. Section 4 contains a more in-

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a shortened and revised version of the larger paper titled "Political and Economic Institutions, Growth and Poverty – Experience of Transition Countries" prepared for the UNDP Human Development Report 2002. Authors want to thank Grzegorz Klima and Wojciech Mazurkiewicz for assistance in collecting background materials and statistical data. The paper, however, reflects only the personal opinions of the authors. They should not be attributed to the UNDP, CASE and other institutions, authors may be associated with. The authors accept the sole responsibility for the quality of this paper.

depth analysis of the political models dominating in countries of the analyzed region and discusses the role of individual political institutions such as constitutional division of power, electoral law, and political parties. Section 5 describes the transmission mechanism through which flawed political and economic institutions influence the economic and social performance. We try to show how people can be deprived of effects of economic growth, possibility to control their government, and participate in the globalization processes. Section 6 presents general conclusions.

## **2. Ten Years of Transition: Winners and Losers**

Most of countries of Central and Eastern Europe started their transition to democratic capitalism in 1989–1990 while the beginning of the similar process in the former Soviet Union happened at least two years later. Major packages of macroeconomic stabilization and complex liberalization of the economy was launched at the end of 1989 and beginning of 1990 in Poland and former Yugoslavia, at the beginning of 1991 by former Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, at the end of 1991 by Slovenia (one of successors of the former Yugoslavia), in 1992 by Albania, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Russia, at the end of 1993 by Croatia, Macedonia, Moldova, and Kyrgyzstan, in 1994–1995 by Kazakhstan, Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan. Hungary being more advanced in building market mechanism in 1980s and having moderate level of inflation followed policies of more gradual changes. The same strategy was followed by Romania but with much worse results. Some countries such as Belarus, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan never started a serious full-scale transition to market economy.

The results of the first decade of economic transition are very uneven and are distributed according to a sub-regional pattern. Generally, one can distinguish two basic sub-regional groups of countries: (i) Central Europe and Baltic (CEB) region, and (ii) CIS countries. In addition, few Balkan countries can be classified as an intermediate category. However, the latter has a tendency to disappear as more and more countries from the Balkan region enter the pace of fast reforms and European integration.

The CEB group can be characterized as the 'leading reformers' or as middle-income countries of democratic capitalism being close to the EU membership. They manage to achieve:

- Sustainable growth after relatively short period of transformation output decline.

Figure 2.1 shows the growth record of individual transition economies and Figure 2.2 compares growth performance of two analyzed sub-regions. This discrepancy was

slightly diminished in years 2000–2001 when economic growth resumed (see below) in most CIS countries and, on the contrary, some CEB countries experience a certain slowdown of their growth rates.

- Low and stable inflation level. Figure 2.3 demonstrates that all CEB countries apart from Romania are already below or very close to 10% annual inflation threshold considered as the low-inflation zone (see Dąbrowski et al., 1999).

- Moderate or high monetization level: in most cases in the range of 25 to 45%, with Czech Republic and Slovakia representing level exceeding 70%.

- Low-to-moderate level of fiscal deficit, which could be financed, in most cases, on a sustainable basis. However, CEB countries represent a very high level of fiscal redistribution (premature post-communist 'welfare state') well exceeding 40% of GDP.

- Serious progress in building the basic market institutions. Figure 2.4 present a more detail picture of this sphere.

- Liberal entrepreneurial climate (particularly for small and medium size private firms – see Figure 2.5) and significant inflow of foreign investments (see Figure 2.6).

- Relatively well-developed, healthy and modern financial sector.

- Trade/economic integration with the EU and clear perspectives of the EU membership.

As we said above, Balkan countries are less advanced in transition process than the CEB group but the perspective of the EU integration (Bulgaria and Romania are already on the candidate list, Croatia and Macedonia may join this list in not so distant future) and acceleration of reform process during last few years make them more and more close to 'transition leaders' than to the CIS group.

The latter may be labeled as the 'less advanced reformers'. Their members can be characterized as mainly lower- and lower-middle-income countries representing distorted capitalist model and generally highly imperfect democracy. Their progress in economic and institutional transition can be characterized by:

- Long lasting and deep GDP decline and late take off. However, years 2000 and 2001 changed somewhat this picture (see Figure 2.7 for 2000) but one must remember about the role played by high oil and other commodities prices, at least in the case of Turkmenistan, Russia, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan and Uzbekistan.

- Moderate or low inflation level. This does not look, however, as sustainable achievement in most cases what was confirmed by the series of 1998–1999 financial crises. In addition, not all countries of this group managed to achieve even this moderate result. The latter relates to Belarus, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Tadjikistan.

- Low or very low monetization level what additionally confirms a hypothesis about fragility of achieved low inflation.



– Chronic fiscal crisis caused mainly by excessive government commitment in a social sphere, continuation of direct and indirect subsidization of enterprises, low level of tax collection and other similar factors. Although in 2000–2001 current fiscal balances of Russia, Kazakhstan and Ukraine improved but the key question is how much this positive outcome was influenced by high oil and other commodities prices, and to what extent can be attributed to real improvement in structural policies and fiscal management. In addition, Russia and Ukraine did not yet overcome the negative consequences of 1998–1999 debt crises and continue to have a closed access to the international financial markets.

– Weakness and immaturity of basic market institutions what is illustrated by Figure 2.4.

– Serious impediments to business activity (the so-called 'red tape') effecting in underdevelopment of officially registered small and medium size enterprises (see Figure 2.5) and minimal inflow of foreign investments (see Figure 2.6). On the contrary, many CIS countries (particularly those being commodity exporters) suffer a substantial capital outflow.

– Underdeveloped and fragile financial sectors suffering numerous irregularities and pathologies such as stripping and looting bank and enterprise assets, abusing minority shareholders rights, connected lending, excessively risky speculations on a foreign exchange market and corruption.

– Dominance of trade and economic relations inside the CIS what not necessarily should be considered as a negative phenomenon under condition that trade regime is open, transparent and fully market-based. Unfortunately, this is not always the case in CIS countries, which continue to have many tariff and non-tariff barriers. Their trade regulations are unstable and non-transparent. Many trade transactions have a non-market character, i.e. either result from government decisions, or are conducted on barter basis (reflecting soft-budget constraints in the enterprise sector). Trade and economic relation with the EU have rather marginal character (apart from Russia) (see Aslund and Warner, 2002) and the European integration process did not go beyond the initial stage of implementation of the Partnership and Cooperation Agreements (PCA).

The CIS group, in spite of having some common historical and contemporary characteristics, remains heterogeneous. At least three countries – Belarus, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan – can be considered as very little advanced in transition process and, in fact, trying to preserve significant components of the command system.

The reported differentiation involves not only the economic but also the social dimension. As Figure 2.8 demonstrates, Gini coefficient increased in all post-communist countries during transition what should be considered as a 'normal' effect of departing from communist egalitarianism (*'uravnilovka'*) towards a market determined income

structure. However, this increase was, on average, much higher, among less advanced reformers than among the transition leaders.

Why the results of transition process are so uneven? One of the possible answers refers to history and resulting differences in starting conditions of the transition process.

Certainly, the history and starting point to democratic and market transformation were much more complicated in the former Soviet Union than in the rest of the former communist block, particularly in countries earlier experimenting with some kind of 'socialist market' economy such as the former Yugoslavia, Hungary and Poland. Shorter period of communist regime in the latter, their greater openness to the West, greater enterprise autonomy and some enclaves of the private sector tolerated under communism did matter. On the other hand, 'socialist industrialization' in the former USSR lasted much longer, was more intensive and more subordinated to the military needs, creating greater structural distortions, particularly in Russia, Ukraine and Belarus. However, the experience of Baltic republics, being a part of the USSR and considered now as the most successful reformers (particularly Estonia)<sup>2</sup> puts the hypothesis about the key importance of the starting conditions under a serious question. Obviously, the latter influenced the size of initial output decline and overall costs of the first stage of transition but the transition results depended rather on the ability to carry out the comprehensive and consistent reform package in fast and consequent way (see WEO, 2000, p. 159–164; World Bank, 2002, p. 11–20).

Thus, the importance of the initial economic conditions has been limited and decreasing over time. The same cannot be necessarily told about importance of the initial political conditions. As we show below they played a quite important role in determining the successful or unsuccessful course of reforms.

Another possible explanation relates to geography – proximity to biggest markets, access to seashore, distance from Brussels, etc. While the role of this factor seems to be obvious as it determines, at least to some extent, geographic structure of trade, and chances for participation in the European integration process (see next section) it should not be overestimated. Even a very superficial look into the above-referred transition effects show many cases do not fit well with this stereotype, particularly inside the less advanced reformers group. This relates, for example, to Belarus, excellently located on the East-West transition routes (similarly to Baltic countries) but being one of the transition outsiders comparing to much worse located Kyrgyzstan, Kazakhstan or

---

<sup>2</sup> One must remember, however, that Baltic countries lived under communist regime only 45 years (as in the case of Central and Eastern Europe and Moldova) and not 70 years as the rest of the USSR. Besides, the pain connected with initial phase of transition (measured by the scale of output decline) occurred to be greater in Baltic countries than in Poland, Hungary or Slovenia.

Caucasus countries performing much better in terms of reform progress.

The above said means that such factors as the pace of reform, its comprehensiveness, consistency, proper sequencing, and consequence in implementation do matter a lot. The very hot, and sometimes emotional, intellectual and political debate on shock therapy versus gradualism erupted several times in the previous decade<sup>3</sup>, most recently provoked by two Stiglitz (1999a, 1999 b) papers<sup>4</sup>. In spite of this controversy, there is very little doubts that fast, radical and comprehensive reforms in economic and institutional sphere helped to achieve better transition results than gradual and compromise ones (for deeper empirical evidence see WEO, 2000; EBRD, 1999; EBRD, 2000; World Bank, 2002).

Generally speaking, fast reforms shorten the period of transitory vacuum when the previous administrative mobilization and controlling mechanisms do not work any longer (in most cases they spontaneously collapsed in the last stage of a communist regime) and market discipline does not influence enough an enterprise behavior yet. In fact, this argument relates to both macroeconomic and microeconomic sphere.

The speed and consistency of transition also influence the expectations. Their role in monetary policy and fighting inflation is obvious but cannot be ignored on the microeconomic level too. Very often, economic agents (particularly state owned or newly privatized firms) do not believe in the reform success and real change in rules of game in the near perspective. This may be well rooted in the past experience of partial and unsuccessful reform attempts. Hence, the radical package gives chance to influence microeconomic behavior and break up accumulated inertia much faster than in the case of gradual changes.

In addition, there are important arguments related to the complicated political economy of transition. Obviously, most of necessary reform steps in the economic sphere are considered as socially painful, at least in a short term. This relates to fighting inflation/ hyperinflation, liberalizing domestic prices, exchange rate and foreign trade, cutting widespread subsidies, imposing hard budget constraints vis a vis state enterprises and privatization of the latter. Usually, in 'normal' circumstances, these kinds of steps are highly unpopular and meet the strong resistance of various groups of special interests. But in the onset of transition when the old regime collapsed many of these groups were in

---

<sup>3</sup> For the early and mid-decade debate on the speed of transition and importance of the early stabilization and liberalization see, among others, Fischer and Gelb (1991); Nuti and Portes (1993); Aslund (1994); Balcerowicz (1994); Balcerowicz and Gelb (1995); de Melo, Denizer and Gelb (1996); Dąbrowski (1996); Aslund, Boone, and Johnson (1996).

<sup>4</sup> Stiglitz (1999a; 1999b) papers questioning the rationale of fast transition, particularly in the context of Russian and Chinese experience were challenged, among others, by Dąbrowski, Gomułka and Rostowski (2001) and Mau (2000).

disarray, not able to resist changes, and new lobbyist groups did not manage to emerge so quickly. On the other hand, political enthusiasm coming from the collapse of communism, gaining the political freedom and independence (full independence in the case of former Soviet satellites) made societies more patient and ready to bear the costs of changes, even if they did not understand fully their nature.

This special window of opportunity in the beginning of transition called by Leszek Balcerowicz as the 'period of extraordinary politics' (Balcerowicz, 1994) could not last indefinitely. Thus, the crucial problem was how the individual countries used this chance. They could decide either on fast reform track and try to carry out the critical mass of market reforms (in order to make them irreversible when political situation will deteriorate), or they could move slower but the latter usually involved the necessity to build some palliative solutions helping to avoid the above mentioned systemic vacuum. So the significant part of political energy should have been spent on arranging the prolonged transition period instead of just trying to concentrate on a final model. Moreover, considered as temporary the compromise/palliative regimes became long living as the newly formed groups of interests started to defend them. This kind of additional political economy costs of gradual liberalization (reform) has been also observed in developing countries.

### **3. Politics Behind Economics: How Political Factors Determine Economic Performance?**

The above referred observations and arguments on superiority of fast reforms in comparison with the slow ones leads us to another important question. Why did some countries manage to choose fast, comprehensive and consequent reform track (even being handicapped with bad starting conditions as in the case of Baltic states) and some others could not do this? In order to answer this question we must come back to the concept of a 'period of extraordinary politics' and answer two additional questions: did all the post-communist countries enjoy such a political window of opportunity and could they use them effectively?

Analyzing political developments in very general terms (a more in-depth analysis of political systems is presented in the next section) it is easy to find that this special political window of opportunity was not observed in all the countries under consideration in the initial stage of transition. It was virtually absent in the Central Asia, Belarus, and Serbia, and rather weak in Romania, Ukraine and Russia.

The absence or shortness and weakness of the 'period of extraordinary politics' in a significant part of the former Soviet Union can be explained by a number of factors. First, anti-communist and pro-democratic tendencies in the former USSR were less popular than in some Central European countries such as Poland or Hungary, despite all the achievements of the *glasnost*' (openness) and *perestroika* (reconstruction) period. They could be observed mainly in the biggest cities and inside the intellectual elite.

Second, the 'independence' factor so powerful in many former communist countries, including some republics of the former USSR (Baltic and Caucasus ones, Moldova) was virtually non-existent in Russia, Belarus and most of the Central Asia, and not strong enough in Ukraine. On the contrary, many people and significant part of political elite in Russia (but partly also in some other Soviet republics) were upset by the loss of the Soviet empire (in the wide sense, including the former satellite countries of Central and Eastern Europe) and attributed this unfortunate (in their minds) event to democratic and market reforms<sup>5</sup> initiated by Mikhail Gorbachev and continued by Boris Yeltsin and 'young reformers' in Russia from the end of 1991.

So the 'patriotism' in Russian politics of the last decade was strongly associated with the opposition to market oriented reforms. Only very recently, advocates of strong Russian state and its continuing super-power status start to understand that modernization of the economy based on some market principles constitutes one of the preconditions of building the international position of their country.

Third, the absence of the 'European factor' in CIS countries must be also taken into account. Unlike their Central European, Baltic or even Balkan neighbors, societies and political elite of the CIS countries were not strongly interested in a political and economic integration with the Western Europe what politically helped the former in conducting market oriented reforms<sup>6</sup>. Neither this kind of geopolitical perspective was ever offered to CIS countries by the EU.

In order to use effectively the initial political window of opportunity political elites of individual countries had to define the right priorities, to find a good professional team to carry out economic reforms (what was not easy at that time) and provide this team with the necessary political backing. Unfortunately some countries, which enjoyed the period of 'extra-ordinary' politics (usually having the form of 'independence enthusiasm'), waste the energy either for ethnic conflicts (examples of Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Moldova, and Croatia) or for populist policies (Ukraine; Slovakia after gaining

---

<sup>5</sup> A somewhat similar situation could be observed in Serbia.

<sup>6</sup> This relates particularly to the later stage of transition when the first 'revolutionary' enthusiasm was over and the perspective of the EU accession played a role of powerful factor stimulating further reforms, especially in the institutional and legal sphere.

independence). Among countries where political environment was much more difficult, Russia built in the end of 1991 the strong economic team (with Yegor Gaidar as its leader) and tried to carry out a quite ambitious reform program. However, the political window of opportunity was too limited to enable this country to join the group of leading reformers at that time.

The history of transition did not finish with the period immediately following the collapse of communism. Countries, which lost the first chance (or did not experience this chance to sufficient extent) had to wait for the next windows of opportunity in order to catch up frontrunners. And the latter had to continue structural and institutional changes, as the transition agenda was too difficult and complicated to be completed in few years even by the most radical reformers. However, each time the same questions came back: which factors could create the political window for conducting difficult reforms and the ability of political elite to use this window in effective way?

This leads us to the issue of political reform and its interrelation with the economic transition.

Comparing the EBRD transition indicators (see Figure 2.4) with the Freedom House political and civil liberties index (see Figure 3.1) we can establish a very strong correlation between them as illustrated in Figure 3.2. The first conclusion, which can be drawn, is the almost complete lack of empirical evidence in favor of the 'pinochetism' (i.e. authoritarian regime implementing radical market reforms), the idea being quite popular, for example, in the part of a Russian liberal elite. In fact, we can find only one example of such a (rather temporary) phenomenon, i.e., Kazakhstan in 1995–1996 (what is partly reflected in Figure 3.2, where Kazakhstan is located well below 45-degree axis)<sup>7</sup>.

Figure 3.2 does not explain, however, how democracy and economic reforms are mutually related (in terms of causality). According to EBRD (1999, Box 5.3, p.113) the influence is going in both directions, i.e. democracy and the market economy are mutually reinforcing. On the one hand, democracy increases transparency of government actions, constraints opportunity of rent-seeking and capturing the state institutions, and give chance for long-term guarantee and stability of property rights. On the other hand, market system helps to develop civil society institutions, a broad middle class, and culture of cooperation based on self-interest what reinforce democracy.

The above EBRD observations are correct but do not fully capture the specifics of transition process, particularly of its initial stage. As we mentioned earlier, economic transition was a quite complicated exercise with far-going changes in all the basic rules of an economic and social life. The old rules were defended by the old communist elite unless this elite came to conclusion that its own interest called for changes in status quo

---

<sup>7</sup> The similar conclusions have been driven from an econometric analysis of Dethier, Ghanem and Zoli (1999).

(but even in such a case changes had a limited and rather inconsequent character). Thus, starting real transition and its consequent and efficient continuation required far-going political changes (see Aslund, 2002). The above-discussed concept of the period of 'extraordinary' politics also corresponds to this finding. So, we think that these are political developments and political reforms, which seriously influence the course of economic transition in individual countries although we do not reject the importance of opposite relation (i.e. success of economic reforms helps to consolidate democracy).

#### **4. Scenarios of Political Changes and Their Outcomes**

Post-communist countries, apart from conducting market reforms, have to build reliable institutions and procedures of modern politics. These institutions should be able to cope with enormous cost of transition and, as we have showed earlier, progress in this sphere has an enormous importance for the course of economic reforms and their social effects. An important part of this objective is to create proper relationships between society and institutions of state power through building the effective channels of representation and balancing various interests.

After the old system had fallen, almost all the post-communist countries declared their intention to build democracy and market economy. After ten years, however, only a part of them can be perceived as consolidated democracies (see Figure 3.1). What factors determine the success or failure of democratization processes?

Any comparative analysis of emerging political system is not an easy undertaking because countries in transition differ in their size, level of economic and social development, and historical background. To simplify this task, we can concentrate on the institutional choices made by political actors just after collapse of communism, in order to show their implications (in terms of promoting democracy, rule of law, market economy, and civic society institutions) on the further stages of a transition process. Institutional choices are depicted as the strategies, by which some actors seek to gain access to the power resources of the state or to deny access to the others (Easter 1999, p. 188)<sup>8</sup>. We are convinced that the origin and nature of the political elite as it emerged from the breakdown phase of communism are the best factors explaining its preferences in the constitutional sphere.

---

<sup>8</sup> This section of the report has drawn from the following studies: Ester (1999), Karatnycky et al. (2000; 2001), and Kitchelt et al (1999).

Making elite the culprit of the analysis, we should underline that the outcome cannot be perceived as a result of wise or wrong policy choices *per se*. The opposite is true. Institutional choices made by political actors reflect, among others, a historical heritage, legacies of communist rule, and a degree of elite's own integrity (totalitarian, patrimonial, national-accommodative, bureaucratic-authoritative), intensity of political and social conflicts during that period and the scale of economic reform undertaken in the end of the old regime. All these factors shaped the nature of the elite. On the other hand, institutional choices became, to a high degree, a result of spontaneous political process reflecting competition of the old elite and strength of the new actors as well as the results of elections and other contextual factors.

On the eve on transition three different structures of the political elite can be identified – dispersed, reformed and consolidated. Stemming from this typology three different trajectories of development can be conceptualized respectively: pathway towards consolidated democracies, transitional regimes or consolidated autocracies (Karatnycky et al., 2000; 2001). Within these framework a special attention will be put on such crucial factors as participation, constitutional models, electoral law, and building a system of political parties.

Three components of institutional design of post-communist countries, reinforcing each other, have had a great impact on the ultimate outcome of the process: electoral law, regulations regarding formation and activity of political parties and constitutional model of the state.

#### **4.1. The CEB Model: Towards a Consolidated Democracy and Broad Participation**

If the communist elite experienced internal fragmentation and the new non-totalitarian actors were (relatively) strong, all actors agreed to follow equal rules of political game. In few cases the new rules of competition were formalized in result of intensive negotiation between representatives of both elites. The experience of the Round Table Talks in Poland, which was followed by Hungary and Bulgaria, can serve as the best example here. In many other East European countries mass demonstrations, elections, boycotts and other forms of activity of a civil society brought the momentum of change during the last period of communism. These actions dislodged old regime elite from the position in power (Czechoslovakia, Romania, Baltic republics, and Slovenia) and dispersed them in different political directions. It provided an opportunity for the new



political actors to influence the process of institutional change, to a greater extent than in the rest of the former Soviet Union or the former Yugoslavia<sup>9</sup>.

#### **4.1.1. Electoral Law**

Electoral law adopted by most CEB countries tends to promote the idea of representation rather than of creating a stable political power. First non-communist elections were predominantly held under the proportional systems of voting without any legal thresholds (Poland, Bulgaria) and accompanied by rather proportional method of distribution of the parliamentary seats (the Hare-Nemeyer or Saint-Lague methods). Only a few countries (Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Lithuania) introduced moderate thresholds (3%–4%) for the party lists. Two of them (Hungary and Lithuania) adopted mixed electoral system for the first elections. In many countries the requirements concerning the minimal turnout were eliminated and attempts were made to formalize equal access to the media.

New arrangements contained many other innovations such as observation of democratic standards in the organization of elections, vote counting and publication of the results, restrictions concerning interventions of state officials in the process, fixed campaign expenditures etc. In consequence, elections were fair and free and nearly all the mandates were distributed among the candidates running from party and quasi-party lists. Thus, almost all significant political actors gained representation in the parliaments. Only Baltic countries introduced some restrictions to limit participation of Russian minority in the first elections.

Large fragmentation of the legislatures occurred to be a price of their highly representative character although situation differed thorough the region (six parties in the Hungary in 1990, versus 29 parties and election committees represented in the Polish Sejm elected in 1991). The latest case made difficult to form any stable ruling coalition and contributed to instability of the governments.

Further development of electoral systems was determined by two simultaneous processes: crystallization of political parties and increasing the minimal thresholds for the party lists (predominantly 5%, except Bulgaria – 4%), and sometimes higher for coalitions (8% in Poland) as well as D'Hondt method of allocation of seats. It took time,

---

<sup>9</sup> A similar spontaneous process of change that had begun in some other Soviet republics was marred by open confrontation between old and new elite (Georgia and Azerbaijan 1991–1992, Armenia in 1998), civil wars (Tajikistan in 1992–1997) or ethnic and territorial disputes (Moldova 1992, Croatia and Yugoslavia for the long period). The change of power, which was not the effect of normal political process but of instability and conflicts pull these countries out of the first trajectory toward the second or third model.

however, until parties adjusted to the new regulations and started merging into broader entities. Subsequent elections decreased significantly the number of parties represented in the national legislatures and limited fluidity of the political landscape. Electoral coalitions still exhibit a tendency to disperse and re-emerge in the new configurations (Polish AWS). Perhaps, the most radical measure to stop this trend was a decision of the Estonian parliament to abolish a right to form electoral coalitions just few months before the March 1999 elections. Only single parties could run in parliamentary elections. This resulted in smaller number of political parties in the new legislature.

#### **4.1.2. Political Parties**

Most CEB countries introduced a set of incentives to accelerate a process of emergence of political parties and crystallization of the party systems. The first condition relied on relatively low requirements concerning membership (a support of 15 adults was enough in Poland for a political party to be registered) and simple procedures of registration. Beside it, some schemes of financial support were also launched such as the direct state subsidies to political parties (Hungary since 1993, Poland since 1997) or refunding costs of parliamentary elections' campaigns, proportionately to the number of seats gained in both chambers of parliament (Poland since 1993<sup>10</sup>). Political parties have been also allowed to run some business activities free of taxation.

The above favorable legal conditions helped to form a large number of political parties defining themselves along the historic and symbolic references, economic and social programs, and sometimes also religious or ethnic identities. Many of them occurred to be very small, politically insignificant and short-lived. After 2–3 rounds of parliamentary elections the political landscape has been clarified in the course of process of a natural selection. Forming the government and government coalitions contributed significantly to the party discipline and accountability.

As a result, political systems in CEB sub-region are institutionalized relatively well with a small number of parties and clear left-right division, although their stability differs in individual countries. Parties monopolize the process of nomination of candidates to parliament making independent MPs rare and marginal case. Many features of the systems of political parties in CEB resemble the attributes of Western democracies. The quality of post-communist democracy in this sub-region is generally positive although less so in the case of Romania and some post-Yugoslav countries.

---

<sup>10</sup> From 1997 election, proportionally to the number of votes obtained over the threshold of 3%.

### **4.1.3. Dynamics of Constitutional Changes**

A dynamic competition between dispersed elite of old regime and new political actors experiencing ideological fragmentation influenced the choice of constitution model. Generally speaking, on the eve of political change the old communist elite preferred presidential regime perceived as an instrument useful in preserving its dominant position, whereas the opposition opposed it. Parliamentary regime was considered as better serving the latter's political interest than the presidential one.

The situation changed when the new actors came to power. This related, for example, both to Vaclav Havel in Czechoslovakia (and later in the Czech Republic) and Lech Walesa in Poland as well as representatives of some nationalist or right-wing parties. However, none of these players was able to reach its goal fully in the competitive environment (Elster, 1993–1994). Czechoslovak parliament refused to amend constitution in favor of stronger presidential power. The same happened with referendums in Albania, Hungary and Lithuania. In Poland, the constitutional National Assembly in 1997 even decreased President's prerogatives. As a consequence, parliamentary or rationalized parliamentary system prevails in the CEB region.

Executive power is vested mainly in hands of government backed by parliamentary majority. The presidents play mostly representative role (with some exceptions related, for example, to the right to impose veto on laws adopted by parliament like in Poland, Romania or Bulgaria). In some countries indirect elections of the president by parliament have been replaced by popular elections (Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia and Serbia), which case be interpreted as a sign of the mixed (parliamentary-presidential) system.

### **4.1.4. Consequences for the Political and Economic Reform**

A combination of broad participation in political process, open and free elections and rationalized parliamentary system resulted in a sharp political break with the ancient regime. Fish (1998) showed that the deeper changes in elite had happened as the outcome of the first elections, the quicker and deeper economic reforms were undertaken in the aftermath. The enormous social cost of those reforms led, in turn, to the change of parliamentary majority and government after the next elections. The mechanism of electoral pendulum had positive effect for maintaining democracy, as the losing parties were interested in keeping democratic rules of the game, which should make them possible to fight for regaining power in the subsequent elections.

The debate on economic reforms and distributing their social costs did not only shape the party systems but also produced other mechanisms of representing group interests and their mediation (tripartite commissions, consulting opinion of the interested groups on particular laws, different forms of social bargaining).

The third result of the initial elite change was the transformation of former communist parties into social-democratic parties or social-liberal parties. When these parties came back to power (usually after the second round of free election) the continued the process of economic and political reforms.

The pace of political and economic reforms was slower in countries where – as a result of the first elections – the forces of old regime (Bulgaria, Romania) or nationalistic parties (Slovakia, Croatia, Serbia and Montenegro) came to power. Subsequently, these countries were knocked out of the development trajectory followed by transformation leaders (the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Baltic countries). Yet, in the late nineties those countries managed to speed up their development thanks to maintaining the mechanism of democratic elections and desire to join the EU.

#### **4.2. The European CIS Model: Transitional Regimes and Limited Participation**

The course of political developments was different in the former Soviet Union. Apart from the Baltic republics, the rest of the new independent states had neither significant experience in democratic governance, nor even independent statehood in the twentieth century (except Russia). In many cases old communist elite persisted – although not intact – until the breakdown phase. Their self-destruction did not happen, despite political cleavages along generation, ideological, ethnic or regional lines, and removal of some parts of the old elite from power. Anticomunist opposition was generally too weak to force the old elite to alter the means of acquiring power. Apart from the Baltic republics, noncommunist movement took power in Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan, for the short period of time only. In other republics (Russia, Ukraine, Belarus) either the former high-rank members of the former Communist Party alone or the coalition of former communists and reformers took the highest government positions during the early transition phase. Therefore, the new constitutional solutions were determined by the intense intra-elite game rather than by the result of parliamentary elections.

#### **4.2.1. Evolution of the Constitutional Order Towards the Presidential-parliamentary Regimes**

The course of events was determined mostly by the fact that presidential elections were held prior to free parliamentary elections. In such circumstances, newly elected presidents with strong electoral legitimacy could broaden the scope of their power. Almost all post-Soviet states started with the constitutional order blending Western European type of parliamentary system on the one hand, and US-style presidential power on the other. This had to lead to open conflicts between old legislatures and new presidents and contributed, in one way or another, to forming the presidential-parliamentary systems, in which most power is concentrated in the hands of the chief executive. The concrete solutions vary across the region. While strong presidential power was imposed in Russia after bloody conflict of 1993 and subsequent referendum, the Ukrainian President has been fighting for a substantial extension of his power until now. Alexander Lukashenko converted the presidential-parliamentary system of Belarus into personal dictatorship through referendum (1996) whereas similar leaning of President Luchinski in Moldova proved to be unsuccessful and resulted in introduction of a parliamentary system in Moldova (1999–2000).

The President is usually directly elected for fixed term (4 or 5 years) with a maximal two-term limit. President nominates all ministers. Only candidature of the Prime Minister is a subject of parliamentary approval. In Russia, if the State Duma rejects presidential candidate for the Prime Minister position three subsequent times it may be dissolved by President and new elections are called. Parliament has the power to take resolution on non-confidence to a government, which can be rejected by President. If parliament repeats a second non-confidence vote within 3 months, the President must respond either by sacking the cabinet or dissolving the parliament. It must be added that the Russian president must propose a new Prime Minister for the State Duma approval only after the presidential elections. It means that election of the new parliament does not require formation of the new government (the same concerns Ukraine).

The legislation initiative belongs to President, the government and parliament. President can veto all laws adopted by two-chamber Federal Assembly (Russia) or one-chamber Supreme Council (Ukraine). The veto can be overridden only by two-third majority of the parliament (both chambers of parliament in the case of Russia). In Russia, President can also issue decrees being equal to laws, which are not the subject of parliamentary review. In Ukraine, Presidential decrees relate to issues not regulated by laws only and may be subject of parliamentary veto.

In both countries, however, functioning of political system has depended much more on the personality of the President than on the pure constitutional regulations. Indeed, presidents have frequently resorted to decrees, appeals, voluntary interpretation of the constitution, and referendums what should be considered as a clear violation of the principle of separation of powers. The President Administration, which should play a purely technical role according to constitution, has become a kind of very influential super-government not bearing, however, any constitutional responsibility for their actions. This creates association with the role of the Central Committee of the Communist Party under the old regime strengthened symbolically by the fact the most of the President Administrations in countries of the former Soviet Union is physically located in former communist parties headquarters.

The lack of effective institutional framework that might have bound President and parliament to a single set of policies, normally approved in national elections tends to produce a system of 'court politics' involving struggle for influence and various favors between official advisers, cronies, and intimates (Taras, 1997).

Legislative and judiciary branches of government have little control over the executive. President appoints senior members of the judicial and executive branches. In Ukraine and Belarus President nominates the heads of regional administration (governors) while in Russia all of them are elected since 1996.

#### **4.2.2. Weak Political Parties and Shortcomings of the Election Law**

In most European CIS countries the entry barriers for the new political parties occurred to be much more complex than in the CEB countries. As a rule, they had to meet much more stringent membership requirements for registration (5000 in Russia, 3000 in Ukraine) and faced competition from non-political organizations in the course of electoral process (the right of working collectives and other non-political organizations to nominate candidates). Neither the electoral law encouraged the stability of parties and party system.

The majority of European CIS countries with the exception of Moldova introduced the electoral system based on single-member constituencies, 'first past the post' principle or the mixed system (containing both proportional and 'first past the post' components), and a high 50% turnout requirement. These arrangements appeared to be much less favorable for institutionalization of fragile parties and emergence of the stable party system than proportional elections of party lists. Electoral studies showed that the Duverger's well-known observation (single-member districts tend to produce two-party system, whereas multimember districts and proportional representation produce multi-

party system) does not apply to reality of the Eastern Europe (Gebethner, 1997; Moser, 1999; and Rose et al., 2001).

In the CIS countries the opposite tends to be true. In Ukraine and Belarus the 'first past the post' system produced a very dispersed representation, and independent candidates won a pretty large number of seats. For example, in parliamentary elections in Ukraine in 1994 independents won 56% seats, whereas the two largest political parties – communists and national democrats won 22% and 5% seats respectively. Turnout provision resulted in numerous runs-off.

In these circumstances a composition of the Ukrainian parliament (until the 2002 elections) was very unclear and unpredictable. It was characterized by the strong left block and broad fluid center, with a tiny margin of political parties on the right side of the spectrum. Neither president, nor his opponents were able to collect majority of supporters. In such circumstances, the reform policy was slowed down. Political parties did not participated officially in the government, but some their representatives did on the individual basis. In 1998, electoral system was changed into a mixed system (with the 4% threshold in proportional voting on the party lists) following similar scheme in Russia.

In the latter this system was introduced in 1993 with half of the seats of the State Duma elected according to the 'first past the post' principle and half – on the proportional basis from the party lists (with the 5% threshold). Turnout threshold was reduced to 25%.

However, the mixed system also tends to produce a very fragmented composition of the parliament. In Russia where only few parties were able to meet 5% threshold and obtain seats from the party lists (9 parties in 1993, 4 parties in 1995 and 6 parties in 1999), fragmentation stems predominantly from single-member districts where majority of candidates runs for the seats without a party label.

The weakness of Russian parties meant that they often failed to nominate candidates in all the districts. The biggest parties – Communists and liberal Yabloko – were able to nominate candidates for half of single-mandate constituencies only in 1999 (Rose et al. 2001) Electorate prefers voting for independents rather than for party representatives. In result, independent deputies won 61% of seats in 1993, 33% in 1995 and 51% in 1999 (in Lithuania 3% only in 1996). Majority of them was either former government officials or managers of enterprises who benefited in their election campaign from organizational and financial assets of regional authorities or enterprises (Thames, 2001).

On the other hand, proportional elections to the 'party halve' of the State Duma did not produce the proportional representation. The single-member constituencies stimulated enormous mushrooming of a number of federal parties and federal electoral lists (registering a federal list gave access to federal mass media and increased the chance to win a seat in the single-member constituency). Such big fragmentation – a number of parties running for seats from proportional list increased from 13 in 1993 to 43 in 1995

and to 26 in 1999 – led to failure of most of them to meet the 5% threshold. As result, 49,5% of votes were lost in 1995 and 18.7% in 1999. The similar phenomenon could be observed in Ukraine during 1998 parliamentary elections (Gortat 1998).

The above situation makes the stability and accountability of a party system illusory. In Russia, only three parties managed to participate in all three parliamentary elections. The remaining used to appear before and disappear after the ballot. It prevents voters being loyal to a particular party and vote strategically.

The extreme instability of the party structure is manifested, among others, by the permanent changes in party affiliation by the already elected MPs. Both in the Russian Duma and Ukrainian Supreme Council independents join existing party factions, form new ones, stay unaffiliated or float between different groupings. As result, the actual political structure of parliament differs sometimes significantly from the proportion of votes endorsing each party list during election. Secondly, high fragmentation of parliament, in which none party has more than one fourth of mandates, provokes new divisions. The new political coalitions tend to be formed 'without regard to party labels, ideology or the accountability to the electorate, being dictated instead by opportunities for enrichment and access to power' (Rose et al. 2001, p. 440).

In sum, in the mixed systems used both in Russia and Ukraine produced skewed vote-to-seat ratios and, therefore, contributed to creating a disproportional legislature, which does not mirror the real preferences of electorate. Politics is highly personalized and many political parties are formed around a single individual or group of individuals. Decision-making process is more like undercover fight than a public debate. Political patronage and protection of business are important characteristics of both Russian and Ukrainian reality. Parliamentary and local elections increasingly serve as the arena for the big business supported by the subordinated media, on which it competes for big money, rather than the field of citizens' activity.

#### **4.2.3. Consequences for Political and Economic Reform**

The almost permanent conflict between executive and legislature and the far-going fragmentation of the latter have complicated a lot the process of economic reforms. Presidents and governments could not rely on a stable parliamentary support in carrying out uneasy institutional and structural changes, or at least in conducting the responsible fiscal policy. They have had to gather support in the case of each individual law or decision what usually has involved substantial compromises, concessions in other fields, and corruption practices. On the other hand, they have become practically out of control of the parliament.



Highly fragmented and not being responsible for forming government, parliaments have behaved in highly irresponsible and populist way. They have also become easy targets of lobbying pressure of various interest groups. This has led to the creation of an oligarchic system characterized by a lack of transparency and accountability (see the next section).

The 'first past the post' election scheme has not helped in building the modern and stable party system articulating various political interests and helping to exercise the popular control over the executive power. Mixed electoral systems helped in producing a bit better results in this sphere, particularly in the countries where political parties were more developed or, at least, one party dominated the political scene (Georgia until very recently). However, development of the political party system in the European CIS countries is lagging behind what could be observed in CEB countries.

The constitutionally strong presidents are not usually interested in building the stable political party system. On the contrary, their actions usually support fragmentation and instability of the political scene what could be observed on several occasions in Russia, under Boris Yeltsin, in Ukraine, both under Leonid Kravchuk and Leonid Kuchma, in Moldova, under Petro Luchinsky, and recently in Georgia, under Eduard Shevardnadze. Consequently, they favored 'first past the post' and single-member constituency electoral system and oppose the proportional principle of voting for the party lists. One can give here the example of Boris Yeltsin attempt to reverse the mixed election scheme before 1999 Duma elections or vetoing by Leonid Kuchma the new election law in 2001, increasing the share of proportional component.

Generally speaking, political systems in the Western part of the CIS represent a great dose of instability and seem to have still a transitory character. They are subjects of various kinds of pressures, which probably will cause their further evolution. On the one hand, this is a temptation of the presidents to strengthen further their power what would mean a danger of evolution towards the Belarus or Central Asia type authoritarian model (see below). On the other hand, still weak but gradually developing institutions of a civil society, increasing pluralism of interests inside the political elite (and oligarchs), and the membership in the Council of Europe push these countries in the opposite (European) direction.

### **4.3. The Central Asia's Model: Consolidated Autocracies and Restricted Participation**

The collapse of the Soviet Union brought the different political effects in Central Asia republics than in the rest of the CIS. The old communist elite came through the breakdown phase structurally intact and retained all power resources in their disposal. In

the new circumstances they preferred a pure presidential regime, which – as a matter of fact – transformed first secretaries of the republican communist parties into the autocratic presidents<sup>11</sup>.

In 1992, the former first secretaries of the republican communist parties were elected as the presidents of independent republics of Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and Kazakhstan in a popular vote. The only exception was the President of Kyrgyzstan, professor of physics who did not belong to the typical party 'nomenclature' earlier. In Tajikistan, the conflict between the old nomenclature and the new political forces led to outburst of a long-lasting civil war.

### **4.3.1. Towards the Pure Presidential Regime**

Constitutional choices were made immediately after getting independence. New constitutions were adopted in 1992–1993 by parliaments inherited from the Soviet period to which new actors, even if they appeared, had no access.

Turkmenistan introduced a very strong presidential system at once, making President the Chairman of the Council of Ministers. A similar model was established in Uzbekistan although a position of the Prime Minister has been formally retained<sup>12</sup>. Imposition of a pure presidential regime became somewhat constrained in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, experiencing deeper political liberalization at the beginning of their independence. Heated parliamentary debates concentrated around such key issues as the prerogatives of President, right to nominate the heads of local administrations and judiciary, role of religion in the state, official language, etc. As a result, the mixed presidential-parliamentary model was adopted in both countries. More power to President was given by the Tajikistan constitution adopted in 1994 by the winners of a civil war.

Formally, all constitutions were based on the principles of division of power, declared free elections and guaranteed freedom of expression, assembly, association and religion. However, implementation of these provisions has differed, sometimes substantially, from the declared ones although the scale of abuses has varied across the region.

---

<sup>11</sup> For the political development of Central Asia countries see, among others, Gleason (1997), Bremmer & Taras (1997), and Anderson (2000).

<sup>12</sup> The very similar model was introduced by President Lukashenko in Belarus (in spite of their geographical location close to Central Europe) after the constitutional coup d'etat in 1996 (through referendum).

#### **4.3.2. Manipulated Election Process, Restricted Party System and Further Strengthening the Presidential Power**

The first parliamentary elections after getting independence were held in Central Asia relatively late – in 1994 or 1995 – and were conducted exclusively under the 'first past the post' system and 50% turnout requirement. Electoral law maintained many provisions from the Soviet times and there were not real guaranties for equal competition (limited access to media, myriad of electoral abuses). It would be risky, however, to repeat in this context the thesis that 'first past the post' electoral scheme became the main obstacle to development of the modern and democratic system of political parties in these countries. Reality has been much more complicated.

In Turkmenistan, for example, there was no room for any political pluralism or competitive elections. The communist party was simply renamed into the Democratic Party of Turkmenistan and retained all its previous prerogatives and structures. Although the Peasant Justice Party was created in 1992 at the wish of President Saparmurat Niyazov (in order to play the role of an alternative party) it ceased to exist in 1995. Since then no new party has been registered or permitted to operate. The government forbids the formation of any organization with even a slight suggestion of political agenda. Few political opponents were banned or arrested many years ago.

President leads the party and the state personally in the old indigenous style. Elections to the 50-member legislature, held in 1994 and 1999, had strictly ceremonial character as the President selected all the candidates and maintained tight control over the parliament. Most frequently, however, he bypasses its formal prerogatives ruling by decrees. President controls all government and public institutions and is enshrined in Stalin-style personal cult (Turkmenbasha). The first term of his power was extended until 2000 by plebiscite and then the Peoples' Council declared him 'President for the lifetime'. According to President Niyazov, the parliament will be granted more power in 2006 and political parties will be allowed to appear in 2008.

President Islam Karimov in Uzbekistan acted in a similar way – renamed the Communist Party of Uzbekistan into the Democratic Party of Uzbekistan and let the Progress of Fatherland Party be formed to make impression of pluralism. However, real opposition parties that emerged under *perestroika* time (Birlik, Islamic Renaissance Party, Adolat) were declared illegal and their leaders were arrested or banned.

During the first parliamentary elections in December 1995 even a very moderate party Erk and some famous individuals were not allowed to run. As a consequence, only two pro-presidential parties obtained seats in 250-members legislature (*Olli Medzhlis*). Elections were not free and fair under the OSCE standards. The same refers to the

January 9, 2000 elections, in which four other parties participated. All of them declared loyalty to the President Karimov regime. Legislature has minimal influence on government and its policy, playing a role of the rubber stamp for President's decisions. The Parliament's speaker is the member of President's cabinet.

Presidential elections in 1995 were not held because President chose to extend his term until year 2000 by referendum. In January 2000 election only one candidate opposed Karimov but he did not make any visible effort to challenge the incumbent.

Policy of repression in relation to opposition activists, religious and ethnic groups was sharpened after the terrorist attack in Tashkent in February 1999. Since then, Karimov's regime started to face a growing popular support to the Islamic Radical Movement (IMU). The lack of political will to soften the authoritarian regime may produce an adverse effect for the future stability of the country.

Kazakhstan and especially Kyrgyzstan have been perceived as more democratically advanced republics with respect to civil rights and freedoms. However, even in this case several legal restrictions and unfair political practices impede the development of political parties and independent media.

In Kazakhstan regular elections are still far from being the routine. The first parliament elected in 1994 was dissolved a year later by the President Nursultan Nazarbaev who then ruled by decree until the end of 1995. In the meantime, he called referendum twice to amend the constitution and extend his term until 2000. The new constitution broadened the prerogatives of the President, at expense of the parliament. Legislature was reduced in terms of the number of MPs and divided into two houses. Since then, only deputies of the Lower House have been elected by popular vote. The opposition has considered the new structure of parliament as a vehicle to legitimize authoritarian rule of the President.

Irregularities and manipulations marred both parliamentary elections of 1995 and 1999, as well as the unexpected presidential elections of 1999. Some parties and candidates (like the former Prime Minister Akezhan Kazhegeldin) were excluded from the competition. Controversial constitutional amendments of October 1998 extended the term of office for the President from 5 to 7 years, and removed the age limit and the limit of two terms in office for the same person. On the other hand, the requirement of the 50-percent turnout for valid elections was removed and 10 percent of parliamentary seats were left for the party list in proportional voting. Six political parties have their representatives in the parliament, three of which are pro-presidential. The impact of pluralistic representation on the decision-making process is minor in the context of consolidation of power in President's hands.

The similar drive to consolidate power around the President, which results in narrowing citizens' participation in politics, is visible in Kyrgyzstan, the most liberal

country of the region. The Constitution of the Kyrgyz Republic was revised twice in referendum and, subsequently, the structure of parliament was also changed twice. Despite the relatively favorable conditions to act in the first half of the nineties, opposition parties tend to be very weak. Under the 'first past the post' electoral system all political parties managed to win only about 10% of seats in the legislature in 1995. During presidential elections of 1995 and 2000 several key candidates (such as the former Vice-President and Mayor of Bishkek Felix Kulov) were excluded from competition prior to the vote.

The second parliamentary elections were held in February 2000 under the new election law, which, for the first time, included one quarter (15 mandates) awarded on the proportional basis from the national party lists. At the same time authorities barred four parties, including the three most popular opposition ones from participating in the election process. Some opposition candidates were also de-registered from single-mandate constituencies before the second round of elections. Unequal coverage by media, harassment of individual opposition figures, restriction on NGO-monitoring efforts and the lack of transparency in counting votes forced OSCE observers to conclude that elections failed to comply with democratic standards.

It is hard to imagine that Tajikistan could escape from the typical authoritarian drive of the Central Asia. The only contribution to the political pluralism and stability of the country was inclusion of the Islamic opposition (the United Tajik Opposition, or UTO) to the electoral process in 1999–2000, which should have ended five years of a civil war. In the presidential elections of November 1999 five candidates were denied to be registered as they failed to obtain 145 thousand signatures each, required by the law and the only representative of the opposition received 2.1% votes.

President Ali Rakhmonov used the election victory to strengthen his personal control over the country by amending constitution and extending his presidency to a seven-year term. Before parliamentary elections of February–March 2000, unicameral parliament was split into the lower and upper houses. Then the first one – the House of Representatives – became subject of the first Tajikistan multiparty elections. One third of deputies was elected from the party lists (7 percent threshold) and the remaining two-thirds from the single-mandate districts. Rakhmonov's Democratic Party of Tajikistan won nearly 65%, Communists obtained 22% and The Islamic Renaissance Party – 7% of seats.

Both elections failed to meet the minimal democratic standards of transparency, fairness and accountability. Nevertheless, they were approved by an international community, which had perceived the elections as a way to avoid the new round of a civil war. Readiness of President Rakhmonov to abide the power-sharing arrangement with the opposition should be proven in the future. Nevertheless, Tajikistan is the only country of a post-Soviet Central Asia where the Islamic party is allowed to participate in a political life.

### **4.3.3. Consequences for Political and Economic Reform**

The presidential regimes in Central Asia while consolidating the political power and providing a certain political stability in individual countries and the region as a whole significantly impede the process of democratization, development of civil society, and market reform. In respect to the latter one can observe differentiation of adopted transition strategies and achieved results. The most politically liberal countries of the region – the Kyrgyz Republic and Kazakhstan – chose the trajectory of relatively fast market reforms not differing (or even outpacing in some periods) the European CIS countries. However, even in the case of these two countries a visible authoritarian drift in the political sphere has damaged, through the increasing impact of clan politics and the rampant corruption, the speed and effectiveness of economic transition.

Other, much more authoritarian and politically oppressive regimes (Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, and Belarus in the European part of the former USSR) helped to preserve the economic positions and interests of the former communist oligarchy what resulted in a very limited economic changes as we analyzed in section 2.

Although one may argue that the authoritarian but secular regimes in the Central Asia region are better than the danger of religious fundamentalism or uncontrolled ethnic clashes, economic populism, widespread corruption and nepotism, increasing income inequality, and high level of political repression in some of these countries can create a very good ground for political extremism in future.

## **5. How the Flawed Institutions Impede the Economic Development?**

The analyzed institutional developments, economic policy and politics of transition have had a mutually reinforcing character. Below we will try to demonstrate, using the stylized facts' method, how this mechanism works.

Countries, which experienced the initial political momentum in favor of radical reforms (the 'period of extraordinary politics' – see section 3) and managed to use it in the effective way achieved a serious progress in forming the new political and economic system in a relatively short period of time. The accomplished 'critical mass of changes' made them irreversible. The new economic actors engaged in building capitalism emerged and were strong enough to oppose effectively attempts to go back to a command economy or try the populist experiments of searching the 'third way'. The

new political institutions with significant components of checks and balances were established and they became the effective barriers against temptations to restore authoritarian regime or numerous social and political pathologies. This concerns, for example, a free mass media and civil society organizations actively fighting corruption, nepotism, political clientism, and power abuse. The new elite provided the new economic and political perspective. Also the old elite (or their political successors) went through a serious transformation and started to accept the new rules of game, and the new economic and political system. Finally, the orientation towards European integration and transatlantic security cooperation (membership in NATO) declared in a relatively early stage of transition became the important external anchor strengthening the process of both political and economic reforms.

The early and radical macroeconomic stabilization and liberalization as well as early start of the privatization process helped to limit the scale of transformation 'recession' and widespread pauperization connected with a long period of high inflation or hyperinflation. These policies also brought earlier output recovery on a sustainable basis. They created broader and more equal access to the new entrepreneurial and employment opportunities – the fast development of the new private firms occurred to be the most effective factor of cushioning the social costs of transition. The relative macroeconomic stability, institutional progress, political predictability and prospects of the EU integration attracted a significant inflow of foreign investments. All these factors helped to increase income per capita in the second half of the last decade, start the process of catching up the more developed countries, and strengthen constituency in favor of democracy and market system. This, in turn, helped in continuing economic and political reforms, further converging this group of countries to developed-countries standards.

On the other hand, countries, which did not experience the 'period of extraordinary politics' or lost this window of opportunity, found themselves in a slow reform equilibrium (or trap). The prolonged period of macroeconomic instability, high inflation or hyperinflation not only hurt seriously the economy and damaged its growth perspective but also caused a widespread devastation of state institutions and pauperization of the mayor part of society. Slow progress in the sphere of liberalization, privatization and institution building helped to preserve significant remnants of the command economy and create the new distortions.

This hybrid economic regime helped to grow the new powerful group of interests – oligarchs – extracting various kinds of rent opportunities coming from a high inflation, multiple exchange rate, direct and indirect subsidies, tax exemptions, selective trade barriers, widespread licensing, export and import quotas, restricted and non-transparent privatization process (see Gelb, Hillman, and Ursprung, 1995). Oligarchs captured most of the basic public institutions – executive, legislative and judicial power, regional and local

self-government, political parties, and mass media. They have been interested in weak and fragmented parliaments, which can be easily manipulated and, hence, they have opposed to proportional electoral systems and other institutional measures strengthening political parties (other than their own 'pocket' creatures). They have also supported the presidential or presidential-parliamentary regimes because in the environment of the permanent conflict between president and parliament and the complex and non-transparent executive it has been easier to conduct the 'court' politics.

Oligarchic capitalism has deprived the rest of society equal access to business activity because of the bureaucratic 'red tape' connected with a widespread corruption. Distorted political institutions caused that society has lacked in many instruments of controlling a government, which exist in democratic countries, such as the stable political parties accountable before electorate, fair election process, independent and impartial judiciary, free mass media, and civil society organizations. Apart from purely economic pauperization caused by the prolonged output decline and high inflation there have been frustration and political apathy coming from the above described deprivation.

This has created a very good ground for political manipulation and populism, which have made situation even worse. Oligarchic elite and politicians seeking for an authoritarian power (the example of Alexander Lukashenko in Belarus) can play cynically social slogans, promise to fight corruption, and help the poor. But the actual results are always opposite to these demagogic promises. Thus, poverty, inequality and lack of elementary social justice have very often a self-reinforcing character. They contribute to bad political choices, which, in turn, impede chances to reform flawed institutions and policies.

The similar 'vicious circle' can be observed in the sphere of external relations. Because of the initial delay in economic and political reforms, and poor economic and institutional record slower reformers were not considered as the serious candidates to join the EU and NATO, and were completely excluded from an enlargement process of these institutions. The potential foreign investors also did not consider these countries as the prosperous markets. As a result, they lost both economic and political benefits coming from participation in the globalization process.

There were some cases where such a negative 'vicious circle' was overcome in some point as a result of internal mobilization of society and political elite usually caused by economic or political shock. In Slovakia it was, for example, realization that the country lost certain important historic opportunities, after not being admitting to NATO and the first round of EU accession negotiations. In Bulgaria it was 1996–1997 severe financial crisis, which pushed this country towards the policy of radical economic reforms. In the case of some post-Yugoslav countries (Croatia, and recently Serbia) there were consequences of a series of tragic ethnic conflicts and the NATO/EU intervention



combined with a perspective of participation in the EU integration process. Possibly the same EU accession perspective will push finally Romania towards faster and more consequent reforms. And maybe Russia is just at the beginning of the way towards more consistent and consequent process of reforming both economic and political institutions in order to rebuild its international economic and political position.

Never is too late to start fighting distortions and reform its ineffective institutions. However, later this process will start more chances and opportunities will be lost and bigger development gap will have to be closed in future.

## **6. General Conclusions**

In this paper we did analyze the interrelations between economic and political reforms. In both spheres, transition countries should pass the long and difficult way from the communist dictatorship and command economy to the democratic and competitive capitalism. This process is not finished yet in none single transition country in any of the analyzed aspect. As we said earlier there is a group of countries (the advanced EU candidates), which can be considered of being relatively close to this final destination of transition process<sup>13</sup>. But other countries, mainly CIS members and part of the Balkan region managed to build so far only the distorted capitalism and very immature and fragile democracy. Few among them (part of the Central Asia and Belarus) cannot claim even these limited achievements. They continue authoritarian regime and try to keep as much of the command economy mechanism as possible.

We are ready to confirm the opinion that fast and complex reforms bring, on average, better economic and social results than slower and more gradual changes. This is determined by both the nature of an economic transition itself (shortening the period of a temporary system vacuum and breaking down the inertia of the old system) and the political economy of the reform process (exploiting maximally the initial political window of opportunity and making changes irreversible).

The ability of individual countries to follow this kind of reform strategy was determined, to a large extent, by the scale of the initial political changes and further developments in the sphere of institutional and political reform. If the old communist elite

---

<sup>13</sup> In fact, transition is a never-ending story, as all the countries, even those most developed, must continuously reform their policies and institutions. However, we analyzed in this paper the fundamental transition from communism to capitalism, and this process will finish in some point of time.

was replaced by the new one convinced in building a new democratic order and market economy (and being able to do it) it gave a country the chance of having a longer period of 'extra-ordinary politics' and exploiting this window of opportunity in a proper way. The early success of economic transition helped to strengthen the constituency in favor of further reforms, both political and economic ones. Also the perspective of the European integration has played an important leveraging role in both spheres.

Generally, a very strong correlation between the progress in political and economic reforms can be observed. Looking at the role of specific institutional solutions one must underline the advantage of the parliamentary or parliamentary-presidential regime over the presidential or presidential-parliamentary system. The former helps to build the transparent and relatively stable system of the political parties while the latter contributes to political fragmentation, irresponsible legislature and oligarchic capitalism. In extreme cases presidential model may represent an authoritarian drift as it happened in the part of the former Soviet Union. The same can be said about the electoral systems. In the emerging democracies the proportional scheme with a minimum threshold helps better in building a stable and consolidated system of political parties than a 'first past the post' principle.

## References

Anderson, J. (2000), "Kyrgyzstan: Central Asia's Island of Democracy?", Harwood Academic Publishers.

Aslund, A. (1994), "Lessons of the First Four Years of Systemic Change in Eastern Europe", *Journal of Comparative Economics*, Vol. 19, No. 1.

Aslund, A. (2002), "Building Capitalism: The Transformation of the Former Soviet Bloc", Cambridge University Press.

Aslund, A., P. Boone, S. Johnson (1996), "How to Stabilize: Lessons from Post-communist Countries", *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, Vol. 1, pp. 217–313.

Aslund, A., A. Warner (2002), "The EU Enlargement: Consequences for the CIS Countries", paper prepared for the CASE International Conference on "Beyond Transition. Development Perspectives and Dilemmas", Falenty, Poland, April 12–13.

Balcerowicz, L. (1994), "Understanding Postcommunist Transitions", *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 5, No. 4, October.

Balcerowicz, L., A. Gelb (1995), "Macropolicies in Transition to a Market Economy: A Three-Year Perspective", CASE – Center for Social and Economic Research, Warsaw, *Studies and Analyses*, No. 33.

Bremmer, I., R. Taras, eds. (1997), "New States, New Politics: Building the Post-Soviet Nations", Cambridge University Press.

Dąbrowski, M. (1996), "Different Strategies of Transition to a Market Economy: How do They Work in Practice?", The World Bank, Policy Research Working Paper, No. 1579, March.

Dąbrowski, M. et al. (1999), "Disinflation, Monetary Policy and Fiscal Constraints, Experience of the Economies in Transition", CASE – Center for Social and Economic Research, Warsaw, *Reports*, No. 16, March.

Dąbrowski, M., S. Gomulka, J. Rostowski (2001), "Whence Reform? A Critique of the Stiglitz Perspective", *The Journal of Economic Policy Reform*, Vol. 4, issue 4, pp. 291–324.

De Melo, M., C. Denizer, A. Gelb (1996), "From Plan to Market: The Patterns of Transition", The World Bank, Policy Research Working Paper, No. 1564, January.

Dethier, J.-J., H. Ghanem, E. Zoli (1999), "Does Democracy Facilitate the Economic Transition? An Empirical Study of Central and Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union", mimeo, World Bank, June.

EBRD (1999), "Transition Report 1999", European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

EBRD (2000), "Transition Report 2000", European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Easter, G. M. (1997), "Preference for Presidentialism: Postcommunist Regime Change in Russia and the NIS, *World Politics*", Vol. 49, January.

Elster, J. (1993–1994), "Bargaining over Presidency", *East European Constitutional Review*, Vol. 3, No. 4.

Fischer, S., A. Gelb (1991), "The Process of Economic Transformation", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 5, No. 1.

Fish, S. M. (1998), "The Determinants of Economic Reform in the Post-Communist World", *East European Politics and Societies*, Vol. 12, No. 1.

Gelb, A. A. L. Hillman, H. W. Ursprung (1995), "Rents and Transition, background paper prepared for the World Development Report 1996", World Bank, August 15.

Gebethner, S. (1997), "Elections and Parliaments in Post-Communist East Central Europe", *International Political Science Review*, Vol. 18, No. 4.

Gortat, R. (1998), "Ukraińskie wybory (Ukrainian elections)", *Fundacja Polska Praca* (Foundation 'Polish Labor'), Warsaw.

Gleason, G. (1997), "The Central Asia States: Discovering Independence", Westview Press, Boulder, CO and Oxford.

Karatnycky, A., A. Motyl, A. Piano, eds. (2000), "Nations in Transit 1999–2000", Freedom House.

Karatnycky, A., A. Motyl, and A. Schnetzer, eds. (2001), "Nations in Transit 2001", Freedom House.

Kitchelt H., Z. Mansfeldova, R. Markovski, T. Gabor (1999), "Post-Communist Party Systems. Competition, Representation, and Interparty Cooperation", Cambridge University Press.

Mau, V. (2000), "Russian Economic Reforms as Seen by an Insider: Success or Failure?", Royal Institute of International Affairs, London, UK.

Moser, R. G. (1999), "Electoral Systems and the Number of Parties in Postcommunist States", *World Politics*, Vol. 51, No. 1.

Nuti, D. M., R. Portes (1993), "Central Europe: the Way Forward", in: R. Portes (ed.), *Economic Transformation in Central Europe. A Progress Report*, CEPR and European Communities.

Rose, R. N. Munro, W., Stephen (2001), "Voting in a Floating Party System: the 1999 Duma Election, *Europe-Asia Studies*", Vol. 53, No. 3.

Stiglitz, J. (1999a), "Whither Reform?", paper for 1999 ABCDE Conference, Washington DC: World Bank. <http://www.worldbank.org/knowledge/chiefecon>.

Stiglitz, J. (1999b), "Quis Custodiet Ipsos Custodes? (Who is to Guard the Guardians themselves?)", *Challenge*, 42 (6), November/December, pp. 26–67.

Taras R., ed.(1997), "Postcommunist Presidents", Cambridge University Press.

Thames Jr, C. Frank (2001). "Voting Behaviour in the Russian Duma: Understanding the Effect of Mandate", *Europe-Asia Studies*, Vol. 53, No. 6.

WDR (2002), "World Development Report 2002: Building Institutions for Market", The World Bank.

WEO (2000), *World Economic Outlook*, Advance Copy, International Monetary Fund, September.

WEO (2001), *World Economic Outlook*, Advance Copy, International Monetary Fund, April.

World Bank (2002), "Transition. The First Ten Years. Analysis and Lessons for Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union", The World Bank.


## Figures

Figure 2.1. Growth in real GDP in transition economies, 1989–2000 (in percent y/y)

Country	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	1999 1989= =100
Albania	9.8	-10.0	-28.0	-7.2	9.6	8.3	13.3	9.1	-7.0	8.0	7.3	7.0	95
Bulgaria	0.5	-9.1	-11.7	-7.3	-1.5	1.8	2.1	-10.9	-6.9	3.5	2.4	4.0	67
Croatia	-1.6	-7.1	-21.1	-11.7	-8.0	5.9	6.8	6.0	6.5	2.5	-0.3	3.5	78
Czech Republic	1.4	-1.2	-11.6	-0.5	0.1	2.2	5.9	4.8	-1.0	-2.2	-0.2	2.0	95
Estonia	8.1	-6.5	-13.6	-14.2	-9.0	-2.0	4.3	3.9	10.6	4.7	-1.1	5.0	77
Hungary	0.7	-3.5	-11.9	-3.1	-0.6	2.9	1.5	1.3	4.6	4.9	4.5	6.0	99
Latvia	6.8	2.9	-10.4	-34.9	-14.9	0.6	-0.8	3.3	8.6	3.9	0.1	4.5	60
Lithuania	1.5	-5.0	-5.7	-21.3	-16.2	-9.8	3.3	4.7	7.3	5.1	-4.2	2.2	62
Macedonia	0.9	-9.9	-7.0	-8.0	-9.1	-1.8	-1.2	1.2	1.4	2.9	2.7	5.0	74
Poland	0.2	-11.6	-7.0	2.6	3.8	5.2	7.0	6.1	6.9	4.8	4.1	5.0	122
Romania	-5.8	-5.6	-12.9	-8.8	1.5	3.9	7.1	3.9	-6.1	-5.4	-3.2	1.5	76
Slovakia	1.4	-2.5	-14.6	-6.5	-3.7	4.9	6.7	6.2	6.2	4.1	1.9	2.0	100
Slovenia	-1.8	-4.7	-8.9	-5.5	2.8	5.3	4.1	3.5	4.6	3.8	4.9	5.1	109
<b>CEB/Balkan group</b>	-0.1	-6.6	-10.7	-3.2	0.3	3.7	5.4	4.1	3.6	2.6	2.1	4.1	97
Armenia	14.2	-7.4	-11.7	-41.8	-8.8	5.4	6.9	5.9	3.3	7.2	3.3	3.5	42
Azerbaijan	-4.4	-11.7	-0.7	-22.6	-23.1	-19.7	-11.8	1.3	5.8	10.0	7.4	7.5	47
Belarus	8.0	-3.0	-1.2	-9.6	-7.6	-12.6	-10.4	2.8	11.4	8.3	3.4	2.0	80
Georgia	-4.8	-12.4	-20.6	-44.8	-25.4	-11.4	2.4	10.5	10.8	2.9	3.0	3.0	34
Kazakhstan	-0.4	-0.4	-13.0	-2.9	-9.2	-12.6	-8.2	0.5	1.7	-1.9	1.7	8.2	63
Kyrgyzstan	8.0	3.0	-5.0	-19.0	-16.0	-20.1	-5.4	7.1	9.9	2.1	3.6	5.0	63
Moldova	8.5	-2.4	-17.5	-29.1	-1.2	-31.2	-1.4	-7.8	1.3	-8.6	-4.4	-3.0	31
Russia	0.0	-4.0	-5.0	-14.5	-8.7	-12.7	-4.1	-3.5	0.8	-4.6	3.2	6.5	57
Tadjikistan	-2.9	-1.6	-7.1	-29.0	-11.0	-18.9	-12.5	-4.4	1.7	5.3	3.7	5.0	44
Turkmenistan	-6.9	2.0	-4.7	-5.3	-10.0	-17.3	-7.2	-6.7	-11.3	5.0	16.0	20.0	64
Ukraine	4.0	-3.4	-11.6	-13.7	-14.2	-23.0	-12.2	-10.0	-3.0	-1.9	-0.4	3.0	36
Uzbekistan	3.7	1.6	-0.5	-11.1	-2.3	-4.2	-0.9	1.6	2.5	4.4	4.1	1.0	94
<b>CIS group</b>	0.6	-3.7	-6.0	-14.1	-9.3	-13.8	-5.2	-3.5	0.9	-3.5	2.8	5.9	55
<b>ALL REGION</b>	0.3	-5.0	-8.1	-9.3	-5.1	-6.0	-0.5	-0.2	2.0	-1.1	2.5	4.8	68

Source: EBRD (2000), Table A.3.1, p. 65.

Figure 2.2 Cumulative changes of GDP in sub-regions, 1990–2000 (1999 = 100)



Source: World Bank (2002).

**Figure 2.3. End-of-year inflation in transition economies 1991–2001**

Country	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
<b>CEB and Balkan countries</b>											
Albania	104.0	236.6	30.9	15.8	6.0	17.4	42.1	8.7	-1.0	4.2	2.8 <sup>a</sup>
Bulgaria	338.7	79.4	63.8	121.9	32.9	310.8	578.6	0.9	7.0	11.2	4.8
Croatia	-	937.0	1120.5	2.4	4.6	3.7	3.8	5.6	3.8	6.9	2.4
Czech Republic	52.0	12.6	18.8	9.7	7.9	8.6	10.1	6.8	2.6	4.0	4.1
Estonia	-	942.2	35.7	41.6	28.8	15.0	12.5	4.5	3.8	5.0	4.2
Hungary	32.0	24.7	21.1	21.2	28.3	19.8	18.4	10.3	11.2	10.0	6.7
Latvia	-	958.2	34.8	26.2	23.3	13.2	7.0	2.8	3.2	1.8	3.1
Lithuania	-	1162.5	188.8	45.0	35.5	13.1	8.5	2.4	0.3	1.4	2.0
Macedonia	115.0	1935.0	241.8	55.0	9.0	-0.6	3.2	-3.1	2.5	6.1	3.7
Poland	60.3	44.5	37.7	29.5	21.6	18.5	13.2	8.6	9.8	8.6	3.7
Romania	223.0	199.2	295.5	61.7	27.8	56.9	151.6	43.8	54.8	40.7	30.3
Slovakia	58.3	9.1	25.0	11.7	7.2	5.4	6.4	5.6	14.2	8.4	6.6
Slovenia	247.0	88.2	22.9	18.3	8.6	8.8	9.4	5.7	8.8	10.6	7.0
<b>CIS countries</b>											
Armenia	-	1241.2	10896.1	1884.5	32.1	5.8	22.0	-1.1	2.1	0.3	3.0
Azerbaijan	-	-	1293.8	1788.0	84.5	6.7	0.4	-7.6	-0.5	2.2	1.5
Belarus	-	1557.8	1994.0	1957.0	244.2	39.1	63.4	181.7	251.3	108.0	46.2
Georgia	-	1178.5	7484.1	6473.0	57.4	13.7	7.2	10.6	10.8	4.6	3.4
Kazakhstan	-	2962.8	2169.1	1160.3	60.4	28.6	11.3	1.9	17.8	9.8	6.4
Kyrgyzstan	-	1257.0	766.9	95.7	32.0	34.9	14.7	18.3	39.8	9.5	3.7
Moldova	-	2198.4	836.0	116.0	23.8	15.1	11.1	18.4	82.7	18.5	6.4
Russia	-	2321.6	841.6	202.7	131.4	21.8	11.0	84.5	36.6	20.1	18.6
Tajikistan	-	-	7343.7	1.1	2133.3	40.5	163.6	2.7	30.1	60.6	12.7
Turkmenistan	-	-	-	1328.5	1261.5	445.9	21.8	19.8	16.4	7.4	12.2 <sup>a</sup>
Ukraine	-	2001.0	10155.0	401.1	181.4	39.7	10.1	20.0	20.2	23.9	6.1
Uzbekistan	-	910.0	884.8	1281.4	116.9	64.4	50.0	26.0	26.0	28.2	26.4

Source: IMF, EBRD and PlanEcon data.




Figure 2.4. Institutional progress in transition, 2000

Country	Private sector share of GDP in %	Large-scale privatization	Small-scale privatization	Governance and enterprise restructuring	Price liberalization	Trade & foreign exchange system	Competition policy	Banking reform & interest rate liberaliz.	Security market & non-bank financial institutions
<b>CEB and Balkan countries</b>									
Albania	75	2	4	2	3	4+	2-	2+	2-
Bosnia & Herz.	35	2	2+	2-	3	3	1	2+	1
Bulgaria	70	4-	4-	2+	3	4+	2+	3	2
Croatia	60	3	4+	3-	3	4+	2+	3+	2+
Czech Republic	80	4	4+	3+	3	4+	3	3+	3
Estonia	75	4	4+	3	3	4+	3-	4-	3
Hungary	80	4	4+	3+	3+	4+	3	4	4-
Latvia	65	3	4+	3-	3	4+	2+	3	2+
Lithuania	70	3	4+	3-	3	4	3-	3	3
Macedonia	55	3	4	2+	3	4	2	3	2-
Poland	70	3+	4+	3	3+	4+	3	3+	4-
Romania	60	3	4-	2	3	4	2+	3-	2
Slovakia	75	4	4+	3	3	4+	3	3	2+
Slovenia	55	3	4+	3-	3+	4+	3-	3+	3-
<b>CIS countries</b>									
Armenia	60	3	3+	2	3	4	1	2+	2-
Azerbaijan	45	2-	3+	2	3	3+	2	2	2-
Belarus	20	1	2	1	2-	2-	2	1	2
Georgia	60	3+	4	2	3+	4+	2	2+	2-
Kazakhstan	60	3	4	2	3	3+	2	2+	2+
Kyrgyzstan	60	3	4	2	3	4	2	2+	2
Moldova	50	3	3+	2	3+	4	2	2+	2
Russia	70	3+	4	2	3	2+	2+	2-	2-
Tadjikistan	40	2+	3+	2-	3	3+	2-	1	1
Turkmenistan	25	2-	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
Ukraine	60	3-	3+	2	3	3	2+	2	2
Uzbekistan	45	3-	3	2-	2	1	2	2-	2

Source: EBRD (2000), Table 2.1.

**Figure 2.5. Share of employment in small firms, 1990–1998**



Source: World Bank (2002).


**Figure 2.6. Main recipients of foreign direct investment**

Country	1992–95		1996–99	
	US\$ Millions	% of GDP	US\$ Millions	% of GDP
<b>Central and SE Europe and Baltic States */</b>	<b>21,091</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>50,558</b>	<b>3.3</b>
Czech Republic	4,821	2.9	10,104	4.6
Estonia	647	3.9	1,050	5.2
Hungary	9,399	5.7	6,979	3.8
Poland	2,540	0.6	17,096	2.9
<b>Community of Independent States */</b>	<b>8,272</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>22,001</b>	<b>2.5</b>
Azerbaijan	237	4.2	3,222	20.9
Kazakhstan	2,357	2.7	4,971	6.4
Russia	3,965	0.3	8,412	0.7
Turkmenistan	427	3.5	334	3.0

Notes: \*/ Shares of GDP are period average of medians for the group.

Source: World Bank (2002).

Figure 2.7. GDP growth rate in transition countries, 2000



Source: WEO (2001).

**Figure 2.8. Changes in inequality during the transition: gini coefficient for income per capita**

Country	1987–90	1993–94	1996–98
<b>CEB countries */</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>0.29</b>	<b>0.33</b>
Czech Republic	0.19	0.23	0.25
Hungary	0.21	0.23	0.25
Slovenia	0.22	0.25	0.30
Poland	0.28	0.28	0.33
Bulgaria	0.23	0.38	0.41
Croatia	0.36		0.35
Romania	0.23	0.29	0.30
Lithuania	0.23	0.37	0.34
Latvia	0.24	0.31	0.32
Estonia	0.24	0.35	0.37
<b>CIS countries */</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>0.46</b>
Russia	0.26	0.48	0.47
Ukraine	0.24		0.47
Moldova	0.27		0.42
Belarus	0.23	0.28	0.26
Armenia	0.27		0.61
Georgia	0.29		0.43
Kyrgyz Republic	0.31	0.55	0.47
Kazakhstan	0.30	0.33	0.35
Tadjikistan	0.28		0.47
Turkmenistan	0.28	0.36	0.45

Note:\*/ Median of countries with data.

Source: World Bank (2002).


**Figure 3.1. Freedom House democratization index, 2001**

Country	Political progress	Civil society	Independent media	Governance & Public Administration	Democratization index <sup>a</sup>
<b>CEB and Balkan countries</b>					
Albania	4.00	4.00	4.25	4.25	<b>4.13</b>
Bosnia & Herzegovina	4.75	4.50	4.50	6.00	<b>4.94</b>
Bulgaria	2.00	3.50	3.25	3.50	<b>3.06</b>
Croatia	3.25	2.75	3.50	3.50	<b>3.25</b>
Czech Republic	1.75	1.50	2.00	2.00	<b>1.81</b>
Estonia	1.75	2.25	1.75	2.25	<b>2.00</b>
Hungary	1.25	1.25	2.25	3.00	<b>1.94</b>
Latvia	1.75	2.00	1.75	2.25	<b>1.94</b>
Lithuania	1.75	1.75	1.75	2.50	<b>1.94</b>
Macedonia	3.75	3.75	3.75	3.75	<b>3.75</b>
Poland	1.25	1.25	1.50	1.75	<b>1.44</b>
Romania	3.00	3.00	3.50	3.75	<b>3.31</b>
Slovakia	2.25	2.00	2.00	2.75	<b>2.25</b>
Slovenia	1.75	1.75	1.75	2.50	<b>1.94</b>
Yugoslavia	4.75	4.00	4.50	5.25	<b>4.63</b>
<b>CIS countries</b>					
Armenia	5.50	3.50	4.75	4.50	<b>4.56</b>
Azerbaijan	5.75	4.50	5.75	6.25	<b>5.56</b>
Belarus	6.75	6.50	6.75	6.25	<b>6.56</b>
Georgia	4.50	4.00	3.50	4.75	<b>4.19</b>
Kazakhstan	6.25	5.00	6.00	5.00	<b>5.56</b>
Kyrgyzstan	5.75	4.50	5.00	5.25	<b>5.13</b>
Moldova	3.25	3.75	4.25	4.50	<b>3.94</b>
Russia	4.25	4.00	5.25	5.00	<b>4.63</b>
Tadjikistan	5.25	5.00	5.50	6.00	<b>5.44</b>
Turkmenistan	7.00	7.00	7.00	6.75	<b>6.94</b>
Ukraine	4.00	3.75	5.25	4.75	<b>4.44</b>
Uzbekistan	6.75	6.50	6.75	6.00	<b>6.50</b>

Note: <sup>a</sup> average of PP, CS, IM and GPA ratings; scale 1–7 (1 – the highest level; 7 – the lowest level).

Source: Karatnycky et al. (2001), Table A.

**Figure 3.2. Correlation between economic and political transition, 1998**



Source: EBRD (2000).