

Hereditary Succession Politicians in Japan: It is Time to Reconsider by Yukio Sakurai Speculations on Georgia's Status in the Light of Regional Changes by Gökhan Sırmalı An Overview of the India-Kyrgyzstan Relationships: Challenges and Opportunities *by Chitra Rajora*

Right-wing Populism in Germany and The "Reichsbürger" Movement

KC1

IZEI

by Ozgur Tuf



International Think-tank www.cesran.org

Consultancy **Research Institute**

CESRAN International is a member of the United Nations Academic Impact (UNAI)

CESRAN International is a think-tank specialising on international relations in general, and global peace, conflict and development related issues and challenges.

The main business objective/function is that we provide expertise at an international level to a wide range of policy making actors such as national governments and international organisations. CESRAN with its provisions of academic and semi-academic publications, journals and a fully-functioning website has already become a focal point of expertise on strategic research and analysis with regards to global security and peace. The Centre is particularly unique in being able to bring together wide variety of expertise from different countries and academic disciplines.

The main activities that CESRAN undertakes are providing consultancy services and advice to public and private enterprises, organising international conferences and publishing academic material.

Some of CESRAN's current publications are:

- The Rest: Journal of Politics and Development (biannual, peer reviewed) www.therestiournal.com
- Journal of Conflict Transformation and Security (biannual, peer reviewed)
- Political Reflection Magazine (quarterly) www.politicalreflectionmagazine.com
- CESRAN Paper Series
- CESRAN Policy Brief
- Turkey Focus Policy Brief

CESRAN International also organises an annual international conference since 2014, called International Conference on Eurasian Politics and Society (IEPAS) www.eurasianpoliticsandsociety.org



Established in 2010

Chairman: Dr Ozgur Tufekci Executive Editors: Dr Rahman Dag Dr Emrah Atar

South Asian Studies | Editor: Dr Sharifullah Dorani American Foreign Policy | Editor: Dr Mark Meirowitz Applied Economics | Editor: Dr Hakan Uslu Middle Eastern Studies | Editor: Dr Rahman Dag Interview Editor: Ebru Birinci Assistant Editor: Ruhullah Afshar Assistant Editor: Oguzhan Cakir Assistant Editor: Rukiye Patan

Submissions:

To submit articles or opinion, please email:

Rahman.dag@cesran.org

or

editors@cesran.org

Note:

The ideal **PR** article length is from **1000** to **2000** words.

©2023 By

the Centre for Strategic Research and Analysis.

All rights reserved. Political Reflection and its logo are trademarks of the Centre for Strategic Research and Analysis, which bears no responsibility for the editorial content; the views expressed in the articles are those of the authors. No part of this publication may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher.



VOL. 9 - NO. 2

APRIL MAY JUNE 2023

POLITICAL REFLECTION e-ISSN: 2042-888X

"ADVANCING DIVERSITY"

Contents

World News 05 - 09 by Ahmed Yesevi Taşçı

> 11-16 Right-wing Populism in Germany and The "Reichsbürger" Movement by Ozgur Tufekci

Hereditary Succession 18-22 Politicians in Japan: It is time to reconsider *by Yukio Sakurai*

> 24 - 28 Speculations on Georgia's Status in the Light of Regional Changes by Gökhan Sırmalı

An Overview of the India- 30 - 36 Kyrgyzstan Relationships: Challenges and Opportunities *by Chitra Rajora*

Speculations on Georgia's Status in the Light of Regional Changes

Gökhan Sırmalı gokhan.sirmali@erdogan.edu.tr

rom a free-wheeling kleptocracy to "a Western country"

Although Georgia had not explicitly progressed towards a democratic ruling system due to the ethnic problems under Zviad Gamsakhurdia's presidency at the beginning of the 1990s, it commenced taking democratic steps in Eduard Shevardnadze's term due to the credibility of Shevardnadze

as a reformist in the eyes of western politicians. He was known as the 'gatekeeper' of Western funds (Christophe, 2004, p. 10). However, as mentioned by Lazarus (2010, p. 5), this age can be explained by three concepts: feckless pluralism (Carothers, 2002, pp. 10-14); chaotic pluralism; and a mafia-dominated state which corresponded to Georgian political atmosphere under Shevardnadze with his authoritarian power. The late years of Shevardnadze rule is even identified with the notion of 'free-wheeling kleptocracies' by Mitchell and Philips (2008, p. 164).

According to Mitchell, (2012, pp. 101-102), three features explain and provide clues as to why the post-Soviet Central Asia, and the South Caucasus countries have authoritarian and semi-authoritarian regimes. The first feature is that these regimes are not dominated by strong parties. Throughout the regions, individuals are stronger than the formal party mechanisms. The second is that the leadership of those countries is highly centralised. As a common result of this, all governors, majors, and leaders of other sub-national policies are almost entirely appointed by the president rather than directly elected. Thirdly, the legislative bodies of those post-Soviet countries are powerless. Mitchell claims that many parliamentary members see the parliament as a way to make business networks and gain access to corruption rather than a place of decision-making (Mitchell, 2012, p. 102).

Democracy promotion played a key role in the political transformation of Georgia from 1995 to 2003. Looking at the volume of external aids, from 1992 to 2007, the US provided \$778 million to Georgia in order to flourish and strengthen democracy in this country (Jakopovich, 2007, p. 213). As for the EU, the financial contribution was £420 million between 1992 and 2004, and this amount excluded individual aid from separate member states (Tudoroiu, 2007, p. 323).

Gökhan SIRMALI is a lecturer in the International **Relations** department of Recep Tayyip Erdogan University and a PhD Candidate, **Political Science** and International Relations, at Istanbul University. He holds a master's degree in Russian, East European & Eurasian Studies from Glasgow University.

24

The leading role of the US in the democratisation process of Georgia clearly affected the destiny of Georgia. The demonstrators of the RR waved American flags while protesting against Shevardnadze for his resignation. After Shevardnadze was removed from power, a billboard located in downtown Tbilisi had the words 'Thank you, USA' written on it (Mitchell, 2006, p. 671). Having succeeded in Georgia's RR, the US president, George Bush, held an open-air meeting with the young western-educated Georgian president Mikheil Saakashvili, at Freedom Square, Tbilisi, on 10 May 2005. Bush hailed Georgian democracy and stated in his speech that Georgia was a beacon of liberty¹ (The Guardian, 2005; Muskhelishvili & Jorjoliani, 2009, p. 684; Jones, 2015, p. 139). The RR was a milestone in the democratic transition of Georgian history that was mainly encouraged by the US. Furthermore, the revolution of Georgia in 2003 was called a `short-lived fourth wave of democratization that spread over the countries such as Kyrgyzstan, Ukraine, and Lebanon (Mitchell, 2009, p. 2).

According to Wertsch (2005, pp. 520-521), a couple of basic forces at work prior to the RR provide insight into why it took place. These are civil society; a vibrant free press; a lack of state authority; and lastly Georgian national identity and unity. However, this democratic enrichment in Georgia lost its speed due to political issues that range from the centralisation of power to intolerant, and aggressive political discourse towards political opponents (Muskhelishvili & Jorjoliani, 2009, p. 693). Nevertheless, the interest of donors has maintained in some various degrees over a quarter century.

The democratic transition in Georgia reached another peak point. A new political protest wave flourished in Georgia between 2007 and 2008 though foreign actors did not play the same role as they had done in the RR (Muskhelishvili & Jorjoliani, 2009, p. 682).

The regional disputes and the enlargement policies of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the EU have been the top issues that have affected the interactions of the Western countries with Georgia in the context of democratic reforms (Mitchell, 2012, p. 104). At that point, the August 2008 War between Georgia and Russia in the region played a vital role which concluded with Russia recognising two regions of Georgia, Abkhazia, and South Ossetia, as an independent country. This catastrophic war was also supposed to be a milestone in terms of the relationships between regional and international powers with Georgia and Russia.

Dance of Georgia and European Union Together

According to Kopstein (2006, p. 86), the US and EU differ from each other through their interpretations of 1989's lessons. European statespersons encouraged the elites to build stable and democratic states on their periphery where the Yugoslav tragedy occurred. To achieve these aims, the postcommunist elites were supported in order to strengthen their enthusiasm for joining the EU as a grant project of reconstruction since democracy promotion was principally a top-down project in the eyes of Western Europe

¹ Although the original saying of Bush was 'beacon of liberty', Muskhelishvili and Jorjoliani used the term beacon of democracy, possibly to emphasise its influence on democracy.

(Kopstein, 2006, p. 90). Moreover, according to Youngs (2009, p. 895), while promoting democratic norms in third-world countries, the EU uses networks more than hierarchical approaches to governance.

Looking at the European Union, it can be seen that programmes such as PHARE²) were carried out firstly in Poland and Hungary and then in some other countries. Technical Aid to the Commonwealth of Independent States (TACIS) and the Freedom of Support Act were launched with a broad democracy assistance perspective by the EU (Bishku, 2015, p. 45). It should not be forgotten that the EU also implemented a Partnership and Cooperation Agreement with Georgia in 1999. In the following years, as mentioned by Bishku, new instruments of the EU, the ENP and its specific dimension the EaP, were enacted. At this stage, as emphasised by Nilsson and Silander (2016, p. 44), the EU's policies to promote democracy, and sustain peace and security were embedded into its foreign and security policies, development aid, international treaties with third states, and all potential member states. The EU-Georgia Association Agreement entered into force in July 2016 and is occupied with doing political association and economic integration between the EU and Georgia. Indeed, economic indicators show the European Union as Georgia's largest trading partner. Georgian citizens have benefitted from visa-free travel to the Schengen area since 2017.

The Caucasus Research Resource Centers (CRRC) is a network of research, resource and training centres established in 2003 in the capital cities of South Caucasus to strengthen social science research and public policy analysis. Having looked at CRRC's datasets (2014-2020) regarding the most important national issues of Georgia, such as territorial-related issues, Eu membership, NATO membership and democracy-related problems are not listed but jobs, poverty, and rising prices/high inflations are on the agenda of Georgia.

Instead of a Conclusion, Some Speculations: from "a Western country" to uncertainty

Georgia, which is the more western state of the South Caucasus, is open to various crises due to the recent regional-global events. Firstly, in the face of the ever-increasing tension between the EU and Russia, the failure to find a solution regarding Georgia's use of its sovereignty rights based on Abkhazia and South Ossetia may damage relations of trust in the medium term. Because the EU has not been successful in this issue for more than a quarter of a century. Secondly, Although Georgia, which has not found a solution to the problems of Abkhazia and Ossetia due to sovereignty, is eager for the EU and NATO, it has not been given the green light due to the reservations of its interlocutors. Thirdly, the progress of the Azerbaijan-Armenia conflict, which has not been resolved in the region for many years, with moves that strengthen the territorial sovereignty of Azerbaijan, will potentially open new avenues to various economic, political, and military changes in the region. Fourthly, the development of relations between Iran and Saudi Arabia under

² Poland and Hungary Assistance for the Restructuring of the Economy.

the mediation of China will also bring about regional changes. Lastly, when we add the rising populist politics and the influence of regional autocratic regimes to all regional developments, it is hardly possible to think that this atmosphere will not affect Georgia's domestic politics.

References

- Bishku, M. B. (2015). The South Caucasus Republics: Relations with The U.S. and the EU. Middle East Policy, 12(2), 40-57.
- Carothers, T. (2002). The End of the Transition Paradigm. Journal of Democracy, 5-21.
- Caucasus Research Resource Centers. (2014-2020) "Caucasus Barometer". [NDI time-series dataset Georgia] Retrieved from http://www.crrccenters.org/caucasusbarometer/
- Christophe, B. (2004). Understanding Politics in Georgia. (O. Nørgaard, & L. Johannsen, Eds.)
- Jakopovich, D. (2007). The 2003 "Rose Revolution" in Georgia: A Case Study in High Politics and Rank-and-File Execution. Journal of Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe, 211-220.
- Jones, S. (2015). Georgia: A Political History Since Independence. London: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd.
- Kopstein, J. (2006). The Transatlantic Divide over Democracy Promotion. The Washington Quarterly, 29(2), 85-98.
- Lazarus, J. (2010). Neo-liberal State Building and Western 'Democracy Promotion': the case of Georgia. Stockholm, Sweden: SGIR 7th Pan-European Conference. Retrieved from http://georgica.tsu.edu.ge/files/01-Politics/State-Building/Lazarus-2010.pdf.
- Mitchell, L. (2012). Georgia: The Issue is Not Democracy. Global Politics and Strategy, 54(2), 97-112. doi:10.1080/00396338.2012.672753
- Mitchell, L. (2012). Georgia: The Issue is Not Democracy. Global Politics and Strategy, 54(2), 97-112. doi:10.1080/00396338.2012.672753
- Mitchell, L. A. (2006). Democracy in Georgia Since the Rose Revolution. Orbis, 50(4), 669-676.
- Mitchell, L. A. (2009). Uncertain Democracy: U.S. foreign policy and Georgia`s Rose Revolution. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Mitchell, L. A., & Phillips, D. (2008). Enhancing Democracy Assistance. American Foreign Policy Interests, 156–175. doi:10.1080/10803920802171188
- Muskhelishvili, M., & Jorjoliani, G. (2009). Georgia's ongoing struggle for a better future continued: democracy promotion through civil society development. Democratization, 16(4), 682-708. doi:10.1080/13510340903083000

- Silander, D., & Nilsson, M. (2016). Democracy and Security in the EU's Eastern Neighborhood? Assessing the ENP in Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine. Democracy and Security, 12(1), 44-61. doi:10.1080/17419166.2015.1135744
- The Guardian. (2005, 05 10). https://www.theguardian.com/uk. Retrieved 06 21, 2017, from The Guardian: https://www.theguardian.com/world/2005/may/10/georgia.usa.
- Tudoroiu, T. (2007). Rose, Orange, and Tulip: The failed post-Soviet revolutions. Communist and Post-Communist Studies, 315-342.
- Wertsch, J. V. (2005). Georgia as a laboratory for democracy. Demokratizatsiya, 13(4), 519 - 535. doi:10.3200/DEMO.13.4.519-536
- Youngs, R. (2009). Democracy promotion as external governance? Journal of European Public Policy, 16(6), 895–915. doi:10.1080/13501760903088272



www.cesran.org

Tower Court, Oakdale Road, York YO30 4XL, UK

Leadership

Honorary President Ken Booth



Director-General Ozgur Tufekci



Deputy Director-General Rahman Dag





think-tank consultancy research-instute

www.cesran.org

