

UDC 327

IRSTI 11.25.15

<https://doi.org/10.48371/ISMO.2026.63.1.024>

TRANSFORMATION OF SOCIO-POLITICAL PROCESSES IN CENTRAL ASIA AND THEIR IMPACT ON KAZAKHSTAN

Seitakhmetova N.L.¹, Zhandossova Sh.M.², *Nurov M.M.³

^{1,2} Institute of Philosophy, Political Science and Religious Studies CS MSHE
RK, Almaty, Kazakhstan

^{*3} Kazakhstan Center for Humanitarian and Political Trends, Turan University,
Almaty, Kazakhstan

Abstract. This article offers a comprehensive analysis of the evolution of socio-political processes in Central Asia and their implications for Kazakhstan's developmental trajectory over four decades (1980–2020). The study spans the period from late-Soviet transformations to the end of the second decade of the twenty-first century. Drawing on comparative-historical and systems-based approaches, the author identifies key drivers of regional dynamics, mechanisms of mutual influence among Central Asian states, and the distinctive features of Kazakhstan's pathway of political modernization. Particular attention is devoted to the "color revolutions" in Kyrgyzstan, patterns of authoritarian consolidation in Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan, and Tajikistan's post-conflict development, assessing how these experiences shaped Kazakhstan's model of managed transformation.

The article further argues that regional interdependence operates through several channels – demonstration effects, security spillovers, migration, and water–energy disputes – thereby linking domestic governance choices in Kazakhstan to shifts in the wider regional environment. It also considers the role of external actors and changing geopolitical configurations in structuring reform incentives and constraints across the region. The findings contribute to scholarship on post-Soviet state-building and Central Asian regionalism by specifying how regional-level shocks and policy experimentation translate into national trajectories of stability, institutional adaptation, and selective modernization.

Keywords: Central Asia, Kazakhstan, political transformation, regionalism, post-Soviet space, authoritarianism, political stability, geopolitics

Funding: This research has been funded by the Committee of Science of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Grant No. BR27195711 «Socio-political processes in Kazakhstan (1980-2020): the experience of democratization and the formation of a Fair state»).

Introduction

Central Asia constitutes a distinctive region in which historical traditions, the Soviet legacy, and the pressures of globalization intersect. From the 1980s through 2020, the states of the region moved from the status of union republics within the USSR to sovereign polities with their own models of political and economic development. Kazakhstan – Central Asia’s largest republic by territory and among its most economically advanced – has consistently occupied a special position within the region’s geopolitical and institutional landscape.

The relevance of this study is determined by several factors. First, political processes in Central Asia exhibit a wide range of post-Soviet transformation trajectories – from comparatively stable authoritarian regimes to recurrent episodes of political crisis. Second, regional developments have exerted a direct influence on Kazakhstan’s domestic political environment. Third, understanding the mechanisms of regional interaction is critical for anticipating future trajectories under conditions of a transforming global order [1].

The research problem lies in the limited theoretical elaboration of how regional socio-political processes shape national development in individual Central Asian states, Kazakhstan in particular. Existing scholarship tends to concentrate either on country-specific analyses or on region-wide trends, while devoting insufficient attention to patterns of interdependence, cross-case linkages, and mutual influence.

The aim of the study is to identify and analyze the key socio-political processes in Central Asia during 1980–2020 and to specify the mechanisms through which they have influenced Kazakhstan’s political development.

The study addresses the following objectives:

1. To conduct a comprehensive analysis of socio-political transformations in the Central Asian states between 1980 and 2020, identifying the principal stages of regional development, the characteristics of political regimes, and their evolution over time.

2. To determine the mechanisms and channels through which regional processes affect Kazakhstan’s political development, taking into account the role of external actors in shaping regional dynamics.

Literature Review

Studies of political processes in Central Asia can be conventionally grouped into several strands. The first strand comprises works that examine the region’s post-Soviet transformation as a whole. A foundational contribution to understanding Central Asian specificity is associated with M. Olcott [2], who emphasizes the significance of clan-based structures and informal institutions. B. Kumarov [3] and A. Junusova [4] analyze key features of political-system formation in the context of nation-building.

The second strand focuses on authoritarianism and democratization. Classic works on authoritarian-regime theory by S. Levitsky and L. Way [5] (Levitsky & Way, 2010) are applicable to the analysis of Central Asian cases. Kazakhstani scholars D. Satpayev [6] and R. Zhangozha [7] (2020) explore the distinctive characteristics of Kazakhstan's "managed authoritarianism" and the mechanisms through which it adapts to changing conditions. N. Masanov [8] proposed the concept of a "nomadic civilization" as an important factor shaping political culture.

The third strand addresses regional security and geopolitics. Studies by A. Kortunov [9] and K. Bogatyrev [10] examine the role of external actors – Russia, China, and the United States – in Central Asian politics. The Kazakhstani researcher M. Laumulin [11] treats Central Asia as a space of geopolitical competition. S. Zhusupov [12] investigates issues of water and energy security as sources of regional tension.

The fourth strand consists of country-specific case studies. The "color revolutions" in Kyrgyzstan are analyzed in the works of K. Collins [13] and E. Schatz [14]. Uzbekistan's transformation in the post-Karimov period is examined by Heideman [15]. Tajikistan's post-conflict trajectory is discussed in the research of I. Olimova [16].

The fifth strand encompasses scholarship on economic integration and regionalism. R. Pomfret [17] analyzes economic linkages in the region and the role of China's Belt and Road Initiative. K. Sultanov [18] explores contradictions between national interests and regional cooperation.

Despite the breadth of the existing literature, the mechanisms through which regional processes are translated into the national-level dynamics of individual states remain insufficiently examined. Most studies concentrate either on region-wide trends or on domestic developments, without systematically identifying the linkages between them. The present study seeks to address this gap by offering a comprehensive analysis of regional influence on Kazakhstan's socio-political processes over a forty-year period.

Materials and methods

The methodological foundation of this study is a comprehensive approach that integrates several research strategies and methods. The principal theoretical framework is the comparative-historical method, which makes it possible to trace the trajectories of political development across the five Central Asian states over time and to identify both shared patterns and distinctive features [19]. This approach is particularly productive for the analysis of post-Soviet transformations, given their common point of departure.

Systems analysis is employed to conceptualize Central Asia as a regional system in which changes in one component affect others [20]. This perspective

helps to identify mechanisms of regional interaction and channels through which influence is transmitted. Neo-institutionalism is used to examine the role of formal and informal institutions in political processes [21, 22], which is especially important for Central Asia in light of the salience of informal practices—clan-based networks, patronage, and personalized ties. The theory of authoritarian regimes is applied to develop a typology of the region's political systems and to analyze the mechanisms underpinning their durability and transformation [23]. A geopolitical perspective helps to clarify the influence of external actors on regional dynamics and the role of geographic factors [24, 25].

With regard to data collection and analysis, the study relies on document analysis, including official texts (constitutions, laws, development strategies), speeches by political leaders, and programmatic documents produced by political parties and civil society movements. Media content analysis is used to identify discursive practices and representations of regional events within Kazakhstan's information environment.

Statistical data from international organizations (the United Nations, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund), along with national statistical agencies, are analyzed to assess key socio-economic indicators. Comparative analysis of political regimes draws on democracy indices (Freedom House, V-Dem, the Economist Intelligence Unit) and governance measures (Worldwide Governance Indicators).

Results

Analysis of Socio-Political Processes in Central Asia: Periodization and Key Trends

The onset of transformational processes in Central Asia is commonly associated with the *perestroika* reforms initiated by M. S. Gorbachev in 1985. The response of the Central Asian republics to liberalization, however, differed markedly from that of the European part of the USSR. As Olcott observes [2], regional elites tended to perceive *perestroika* less as an opportunity for modernization than as a challenge to the established order.

A pivotal episode that revealed the region's specificity was the December 1986 events in Alma-Ata (Zheltoksan). The replacement of the First Secretary of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan's Central Committee, D. Kunayev, with an ethnic Russian, G. Kolbin, triggered mass protests by Kazakhstani youth [8]. Although the demonstrations were suppressed, they became an early signal of rising national self-awareness and of the growing political salience of ethnicity. In Junusova's assessment [4], the Zheltoksan events laid important foundations for Kazakhstan's national movement and demonstrated the potential for mass mobilization.

In Uzbekistan, the late 1980s were marked by rising interethnic tensions. The Fergana events of 1989, linked to clashes between Uzbeks and Meskhetian Turks, highlighted the fragility of interethnic accommodation [3]. In Tajikistan, contradictions among regional groupings intensified, foreshadowing the civil war that would follow.

Kyrgyzstan experienced the Osh events of 1990—a major conflict between Kyrgyz and Uzbeks that resulted in hundreds of casualties and exposed the limited capacity of Soviet institutions to manage ethnic tensions [13]. Turkmenistan remained the most stable republic, a condition often attributed to the republic leadership's stringent political control and to a lower degree of ethnic heterogeneity.

A crucial feature of the late-Soviet period was the formation of national elites who subsequently led the newly independent states. In Kazakhstan, N. A. Nazarbayev, after becoming First Secretary of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan in 1989, began a gradual “Kazakhization” of the republican nomenklatura [1]. In Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan, I. Karimov and S. Niyazov consolidated authority in a broadly similar manner while still within the Soviet system.

The dissolution of the USSR in December 1991 found the Central Asian republics relatively unprepared for independence. As Pomfret notes [17], unlike the Baltic states or the South Caucasus – where national movements actively pursued statehood – in Central Asia sovereignty emerged less as a deliberate political choice than as a consequence of the center's disintegration. This circumstance substantially shaped subsequent trajectories across the region.

The first decade of independence became a period of state-building and of selecting models of political and economic development. All five states confronted shared challenges: the creation of national institutions, economic crisis, identity formation, and the construction of foreign-policy relations [9].

Under N. A. Nazarbayev, Kazakhstan pursued gradual economic reforms while prioritizing political stability. The 1995 Constitution institutionalized a presidential system with extensive executive powers [6]. Economic policy emphasized attracting foreign investment, particularly in the oil and gas sector. The relocation of the capital to Astana in 1997 served as a symbol of a new state project. Ethnic policy was articulated through the concept of a “Kazakhstani nation,” intended to integrate a multiethnic society [8].

Uzbekistan, under I. Karimov, adopted the most autarkic development model in the region. Economic policy was characterized by gradual reform and the preservation of a substantial state sector [3]. The political regime was rigidly authoritarian and did not tolerate opposition. A defining feature of Uzbek politics was the campaign against Islamic radicalism, which intensified after the emergence of the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU) in the Fergana Valley in the mid-1990s.

Kyrgyzstan, under President A. Akayev, initially positioned itself as the region's most democratic state – an “island of democracy” [13]. The 1993 Constitution envisaged a degree of separation of powers. By the late 1990s, however, the regime was becoming increasingly authoritarian, shaped by economic hardship and by presidential efforts to retain power. Kyrgyzstan nevertheless remained the most open Central Asian state to Western influence.

Tajikistan underwent the most dramatic experience of the 1990s: a civil war (1992–1997) that, according to various estimates, claimed between 50,000 and 100,000 lives [16]. The conflict was multidimensional, encompassing regional, ideological, and clan-based cleavages. The rise of E. Rahmon and the signing of the General Peace Agreement in 1997 ended open warfare, yet the consequences of the conflict continued to shape the country's development. A significant share of the population was forced into migration, predominantly to Russia.

Turkmenistan, under S. Niyazov (Turkmenbashi), moved toward a personality cult and a rigid authoritarian system with elements of totalitarianism [10]. The economy – supported by substantial natural gas reserves – remained fully subordinated to the state. Foreign policy was defined by neutrality, formalized in a 1995 UN resolution.

For Kazakhstan, the experiences of neighboring states carried particular significance. Tajikistan's civil war underscored the risks associated with weak state institutions and uncontrolled political competition, reinforcing elite preferences for “managed stability” [7]. Kyrgyzstan's trajectory suggested that formal democratization without economic development and robust institutions can generate political instability. Uzbekistan's closed model was likewise not viewed as desirable, insofar as it constrained economic development.

Consolidation of Authoritarianism and Regional Crises

The early twenty-first century marked a period of authoritarian consolidation across the region, while also bringing severe political crises – most notably in Kyrgyzstan. The September 11 attacks in 2001 and the subsequent operation in Afghanistan intensified the U.S. presence in Central Asia, reshaping the region's strategic environment and influencing its political dynamics [11].

The “color revolutions” in Kyrgyzstan became one of the defining regional developments of this period. The 2005 “Tulip Revolution” led to the ousting of President A. Akayev and the rise of K. Bakiyev [13]. Yet the new leadership quickly reproduced many of the predecessor regime's authoritarian practices, precipitating another crisis and Bakiyev's removal in April 2010. The interethnic violence that followed in Osh and Jalal-Abad in June 2010 exposed the depth of Kyrgyzstan's social and ethnic cleavages [14].

For Kazakhstan, these Kyrgyz events carried strong demonstrative effects. They showed that mass protest could dislodge even an entrenched president and reinforced the Kazakhstani elite's determination to prevent comparable сценарии

at home. As Satpayev notes [6], after 2005 Kazakhstan tightened controls over opposition forces and civil society and imposed additional constraints on media freedom.

The Andijan events of 2005 in Uzbekistan constituted another pivotal moment. The violent suppression of protests in Andijan resulted in hundreds of casualties and sharply worsened Uzbekistan's relations with the West [3]. The Karimov regime used these events to further harden political control and to intensify repression against any forms of unauthorized political activity.

Kazakhstan's leadership closely monitored the Uzbek experience. On the one hand, the harshness of Karimov's approach was viewed as excessive and potentially counterproductive. On the other, the Andijan episode underscored the perceived necessity of preventive control over radical movements [7].

In this period, Tajikistan was engaged in post-conflict recovery. President E. Rahmon gradually consolidated power, moving away from key provisions of the 1997 peace agreement. By the late 2000s, Tajikistan had evolved into a personalist autocracy with elements of family-clan rule, while its economy became increasingly dependent on remittances from labor migrants working in Russia [16].

Turkmenistan, following S. Niyazov's death in 2006, experienced a transfer of power to G. Berdymukhamedov. The new president introduced limited, largely cosmetic liberalizing reforms, slightly opening the country to the outside world while preserving the core features of an authoritarian system [10].

This period was also characterized by the intensification of water–energy disputes among the region's states. A persistent tension emerged between Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan, which prioritized hydropower development, and Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan, which depended heavily on water resources for agriculture [12]. The construction of the Rogun hydropower plant in Tajikistan provoked particularly sharp objections from Uzbekistan.

For Kazakhstan, these years coincided with rapid economic growth driven by high oil prices. This enabled the regime to pursue an active social policy and to reinforce legitimacy through the distribution of resources [1]. At the same time, regional developments served as a reminder of the fragility of stability and of the importance of preventing social and political crises.

New Challenges and Shifts

The 2011–2020 period was shaped by new regional and global challenges. Although the 2011 Arab Spring did not directly affect Central Asia, it exerted a psychological impact on regional elites by heightening fears of mass protest and regime instability [9].

In Kazakhstan, December 2011 was marked by the tragic events in Zhanaozen, where clashes between oil workers and police resulted in fatalities. These events served as a serious сигнал that social grievances could surface

even in a comparatively prosperous Kazakhstan [6]. After 2014, falling oil prices contributed to the devaluation of the tenge and broader economic difficulties, which in turn intensified social tensions.

A major turning point of the period was the leadership transition in Uzbekistan following I. Karimov's death in 2016. Sh. Mirziyoyev's rise to power signaled the start of wide-ranging reforms – economic liberalization, greater openness to the outside world, and the improvement of relations with neighboring states [15]. Uzbekistan's transformation became an important example of the possibility of reform within authoritarian systems and shaped regional debates about the need for modernization.

Following the 2010 constitutional changes, Kyrgyzstan shifted to a parliamentary form of government, becoming the only state in the region to adopt such a system. However, frequent changes of government and parliamentary volatility highlighted the constraints posed by underdeveloped political institutions [13]. Nevertheless, by the end of the second decade of the twenty-first century, Kyrgyzstan remained the most politically pluralistic state in Central Asia.

Tajikistan continued along a path of personalist consolidation. The 2016 constitutional amendments effectively established lifelong presidential rule for E. Rahmon and opened the possibility of a succession transfer to his son [16]. Economic conditions remained difficult, and dependence on remittances from labor migrants persisted.

Turkmenistan, under G. Berdymukhamedov, remained the region's most closed state. A personality cult—less extravagant than under Niyazov but still evident—continued to structure political life. The gas sector remained the backbone of the economy [10].

Another significant feature of the period was the expansion of Chinese influence through the Belt and Road Initiative, launched in 2013. China became the largest trading partner and investor across the region, reshaping the balance of external influence [17]. For Kazakhstan, which shares the region's longest border with China, this generated opportunities for economic development while also raising concerns related to sovereignty and national security.

These years were also marked by preparations for leadership succession in Kazakhstan. Having governed for nearly three decades, N. A. Nazarbayev was approaching the age of 80, making questions of succession increasingly salient [7]. Uzbekistan's post-Karimov transition offered certain reference points while also underscoring the potential unpredictability of such processes. In March 2019, presidential authority was transferred from N. A. Nazarbayev to K.-Zh. Tokayev, inaugurating a new phase in Kazakhstan's political development. Yet through the end of 2020, Nazarbayev retained significant influence as Leader of the Nation and Chair of the Security Council.

By the end of the period under review, the Central Asian states presented a heterogeneous landscape of political regimes. Kazakhstan maintained the profile of a relatively stable authoritarian state with elements of political modernization. Uzbekistan was undergoing large-scale reforms. Kyrgyzstan illustrated the difficulties of parliamentary governance under conditions of weak institutions. Tajikistan and Turkmenistan remained hard autocracies characterized by personalism and, to varying degrees, dynastic tendencies.

Discussion

Events in neighboring states generate an “example effect” – either positive or negative. Kyrgyzstan’s “color revolutions” demonstrated to Kazakhstan’s elite the risks associated with weakening control and liberalizing the political system [6]. After each Kyrgyz crisis, Kazakhstan tended to strengthen measures of oversight over the opposition, NGOs, and the media. The 2005 and 2010 crises in Kyrgyzstan were followed by revisions to Kazakhstan’s legislation on public assemblies, political parties, and mass media. By contrast, Uzbekistan’s post-2016 reforms created a more positive example of modernization without an immediate loss of political control, which may have informed debates within Kazakhstan’s elite about the scope and necessity of reform. Tajikistan’s civil war in the 1990s served as a cautionary illustration of how political instability and weak state institutions can escalate, reinforcing an elite consensus in Kazakhstan that stability should take precedence over political liberalization.

Tajikistan’s civil war and the subsequent economic underdevelopment of Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan contributed to significant migration flows into Kazakhstan [12]. By various estimates, between 500,000 and one million labor migrants from neighboring states were present in Kazakhstan by the late 2010s. This generated social tensions—especially in the country’s south—affected labor markets, and required adjustments in migration policy. The presence of large migrant communities also created the potential for the cross-border diffusion of radical ideas. Consequently, the Kazakhstani government had to develop mechanisms for regulating migration while balancing economic needs against social risks. Migration also influenced the ethnic composition of Kazakhstan’s southern regions, making careful ethnic policy and community-level governance particularly salient.

Despite aspirations for autonomy, the region’s states remain economically interconnected. Water–energy disputes—especially the controversy surrounding the Rogun hydropower plant—directly affect Kazakhstan’s interests [12]. As a major agricultural producer, Kazakhstan depends on transboundary water resources, particularly in its southern regions. Hydropower projects in the upstream areas of Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan may pose risks to the water supply of Kazakhstani regions. Trade relations, transit routes, and labor migration create

channels of economic interdependence, and crises in one country can generate spillover effects for neighbors. For example, Uzbekistan's economic difficulties in the 1990s and 2000s affected cross-border trade and the economies of southern Kazakhstan's border regions. The development of transport corridors through Central Asia requires sustained regional cooperation, which makes Kazakhstan partially dependent on the policy choices of its neighbors.

Islamist radicalism, which became visible in the 1990s in Uzbekistan and Tajikistan, has consistently been viewed by Kazakhstan's leadership as a serious threat [9]. The emergence of the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan (IMU) in the Fergana Valley and its attempts to penetrate Kyrgyz territory created risks for Kazakhstan's southern regions. The participation of citizens from Central Asian states in conflicts in Afghanistan, Syria, and Iraq raised concerns about the return of radicalized fighters. These dynamics encouraged security cooperation through organizations such as the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation (SCO) and the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), but also contributed to restrictions on civil liberties under the banner of counterterrorism. Kazakhstan developed cooperation with neighboring security services through information-sharing on suspected persons and groups, which in turn shaped domestic policy in the areas of religious freedom and migration control.

Geopolitical competition among major powers—Russia, China, the United States, and the European Union—in Central Asia influences Kazakhstan's position [11, 25]. The presence of the U.S. military base at Manas in Kyrgyzstan (2001–2014) introduced a new geopolitical configuration in the region, affecting Kazakhstan's relations with both the United States and Russia. Chinese investment through the Belt and Road Initiative altered the regional economic balance, creating opportunities for Kazakhstan while also raising new challenges. Russia's security integration through the CSTO—of which Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan are members—creates specific security commitments. As the region's largest economy, and as a state sharing extensive borders with both Russia and China, Kazakhstan sits at the epicenter of these dynamics and must balance among multiple centers of influence. Kazakhstan's multi-vector foreign policy is, in part, a response to the region's evolving geopolitical environment.

National-identity discourses emerging in neighboring states also shape debates within Kazakhstan [4, 8]. Ethnic nationalism in adjacent republics posed challenges to Kazakhstan's model of a “multiethnic nation.” For instance, Uzbekistan's policy of “Uzbekization” in the 1990s influenced discussions over language policy in Kazakhstan. The region's Islamic renaissance likewise affected the place of religion in Kazakhstan's public life. Rising Islamic identification in Uzbekistan and Tajikistan in the 1990s, after decades of Soviet atheism, exerted societal pressure toward greater religiosity. Cultural ties among the region's peoples, a shared history, and linguistic proximity—especially among Turkic

groups—create channels for the diffusion of ideas and practices. Kazakhstani intellectual circles closely followed cultural and intellectual developments in neighboring countries, which shaped national debates over modernization, tradition, and identity.

The diffusion of institutional practices and political “technologies” occurs through regional elite networks [5]. Kazakhstan drew on neighboring experiences in managing political processes, engaging with opposition actors, and organizing elections. For example, electoral-management techniques used in one country could become known to elites in others and be adapted to local conditions. Practices of oversight and restriction targeting NGOs and media also circulated through regional learning. At the same time, negative lessons served as warnings against certain choices: Kyrgyzstan’s experience highlighted the risks of overly rapid liberalization; Andijan illustrated the dangers of excessive coercion; and Tajikistan underscored the risks of state weakness. Regional organizations such as the SCO, the CSTO, and the Eurasian Economic Community (later the EAEU) provided venues for the exchange of governance experiences among regional elites. Informal ties among political and economic elites further facilitated the circulation of practices and ideas.

Conclusion

The analysis of socio-political processes in Central Asia and their impact on Kazakhstan over four decades (1980–2020) suggests that the region constitutes a complex system of interconnected states in which developments in one country inevitably affect its neighbors through multiple mechanisms—from demonstration effects to economic interdependence and migration linkages.

As the region’s largest and most economically developed state, Kazakhstan occupies a distinctive position. On the one hand, it shapes regional dynamics through its policies and the example it provides. On the other hand, developments in neighboring countries—Kyrgyz revolutions, Tajikistan’s civil war, and Uzbekistan’s reform trajectory—have significantly influenced the choices of Kazakhstan’s elites and the broader course of national development.

The period under review shows that Kazakhstan succeeded in developing its own model of development, avoiding both the revolutionary upheavals experienced by Kyrgyzstan and the extreme closure characteristic of Turkmenistan. This model rested on a combination of political stability, economic pragmatism, and a multi-vector foreign policy. Importantly, however, it did not emerge in a vacuum; it was shaped through a continuous engagement with regional experience—both positive and negative.

By 2020, the region had entered a new phase marked by leadership successions, economic pressures, and intensified geopolitical competition. The Zhanaozen events (2011) and Kazakhstan’s leadership transition (2019)

demonstrated that even comparatively stable systems require adaptation and reform. Uzbekistan's post-2016 reforms, in turn, illustrated the possibility of managed transformation within authoritarian regimes.

Future research should focus on emerging forms of regional cooperation and conflict, evaluate the effectiveness of different models of political transformation, and assess how a changing global order is reshaping regional dynamics. Of particular interest is a comparative analysis of leadership-transition models and their implications for political stability and economic development.

Central Asia remains a region where tradition and modernization, national interests and regional interdependence, domestic dynamics and external influences, are tightly intertwined. Understanding the mechanisms of this interaction is essential both for scholarly analysis and for practical policymaking.

REFERENCES

[1] Nazarbayev N.A. *Kazakhstanskii put'* (The Kazakhstani path). – Karaganda: Glasir, 2014. [in Russ.].

[2] Olcott M.B. *Central Asia's Second Chance*. – Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2005.

[3] Kumarov B.S. *Politicheskie rezhimy Tsentral'noi Azii: sravnitel'nyi analiz* [Political regimes of Central Asia: a comparative analysis]. – Bishkek: Ilim, 2017. [in Russ.].

[4] Junusova A.K. *Etnopoliticheskie protsessy v Kazakhstane: istoriya i sovremennost'* [Ethnopolitical processes in Kazakhstan: history and the present]. – Almaty: Qazaq universiteti, 2013. [in Russ.].

[5] Levitsky S., Way L.A. *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes After the Cold War*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

[6] Satpayev D.K. *Politicheskaya modernizatsiya Kazakhstana: mezhd avtoritarizmom i demokratiei* [Political modernization of Kazakhstan: between authoritarianism and democracy], *Tsentral'naya Aziya i Kavkaz*, 2015, vol. 18, No. 4, pp. 23–38. [in Russ.].

[7] Zhangozha R.S. *Politicheskie transformatsii v postsovetskom Kazakhstane: instituty i aktory* [Political transformations in post-Soviet Kazakhstan: institutions and actors], *Tsentral'naya Aziya i Kavkaz*, 2020, vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 45–62. [in Rus.].

[8] Masanov N.E. *Kochevaya tsivilizatsiya kazakhov: osnovy zhiznedeyatel'nosti nomadnogo obshchestva* [The nomadic civilization of the Kazakhs: foundations of nomadic society]. – Almaty: Sotsinvest; Moskva: Gorizont, 2002. [in Russ.].

[9] Kortunov A.V. *Tsentral'naya Aziya v novoi geopoliticheskoi real'nosti* [Central Asia in the new geopolitical reality] [Electronic resource], *Rossiiskii*

sovet po mezhdunarodnym delam (Russian International Affairs Council], 2018. [in Russ.].

[10] Bogatyryov K.A. Turkmenistan v XXI veke: politicheskaya sistema i vneshnyaya politika [Turkmenistan in the 21st century: political system and foreign policy]. – Moskva: Aspekt Press, 2016. [in Russ.].

[11] Laumulin M.T. Tsentral'naya Aziya v sovremennoi mirovoi politike [Central Asia in contemporary world politics]. – Almaty: KISI pri Prezidente RK, 2019. [in Russ.].

[12] Zhusupov S.B. Vodno-energeticheskie problemy Tsentral'noi Azii: konflikty i perspektivy sotrudnichestva [Water–energy problems of Central Asia: conflicts and prospects for cooperation]. – Almaty: Institut mirovoi ekonomiki i politiki, 2018. [in Russ.].

[13] Collins K. Clan Politics and Regime Transition in Central Asia. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

[14] Schatz E. Modern Clan Politics: The Power of “Blood” in Kazakhstan and Beyond. – Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2004.

[15] Heideman L. Reforms in Uzbekistan: Genuine Change or Authoritarian Upgrading? // Central Asian Survey. – 2020. – Vol. 39. – No. 4. – P. 527–545.

[16] Olimova I.S. Tadjikistan: postkonfliktnoe razvitie i vyzovy bezopasnosti [Tajikistan: post-conflict development and security challenges]. – Dushanbe: Institut vostokovedeniya, 2018. [in Russ.].

[17] Pomfret R. The Central Asian Economies in the Twenty-First Century: Paving a New Silk Road. – Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019.

[18] Sultanov K.A. Regional'naya integratsiya v Tsentral'noi Azii: problemy i perspektivy [Regional integration in Central Asia: problems and prospects]. Vestnik MGIMO-Universiteta, 2020, vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 167–185. [in Russ.].

[19] Lijphart A. Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method // American Political Science Review. – 1971. – Vol. 65. – No. 3. – P. 682–693.

[20] Easton D. A Framework for Political Analysis. – Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

[21] North D.C. Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

[22] Helmke G., Levitsky S. Informal Institutions and Comparative Politics: A Research Agenda // Perspectives on Politics. – 2004. – Vol. 2. – No. 4. – P. 725–740.

[23] Geddes B., Wright J., Frantz E. Autocratic Breakdown and Regime Transitions: A New Data Set // Perspectives on Politics. – 2014. – Vol. 12. – No. 2. – P. 313–331.

[24] Mackinder H.J. The Geographical Pivot of History // The Geographical Journal. – 1904. – Vol. 23. – No. 4. – P. 421–437.

[25] Brzezinski Z. The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives. – New York: Basic Books, 1997.

ОРТАЛЫҚ АЗИЯДАҒЫ ӘЛЕУМЕТТІК-САЯСИ ПРОЦЕСТЕРДІҢ ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯСЫ ЖӘНЕ ОЛАРДЫҢ ҚАЗАҚСТАНҒА ЫҚПАЛЫ

Сейтахметова Н.Л.¹, Жандосова Ш.М.², *Нуров М.М.³

^{1,2} ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Философия, саясаттану және дінтану институты,
Алматы, Қазақстан

*³ Қазақстан гуманитарлық-саяси конъюнктура орталығы, «Тұран»
университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

Аңдатпа. Мақала Орталық Азиядағы әлеуметтік-саяси үдерістердің эволюциясын және олардың Қазақстанның даму траекториясына төрт онжылдық (1980–2020 жж.) бойы тигізген салдарын кешенді түрде талдайды. Зерттеу кешкеңестік трансформациялардан ХХІ ғасырдың екінші онжылдығының аяқталуына дейінгі кезеңді қамтиды. Салыстырмалы-тарихи және жүйелік тәсілдерге сүйене отырып, автор өңірлік динамиканың негізгі қозғаушы факторларын, Орталық Азия мемлекеттерінің өзара ықпал ету механизмдерін және Қазақстанның саяси модернизация жолының айрықша қырларын айқындайды. Қырғызстандағы «түрлі-түсті революцияларына», Өзбекстан мен Түрікменстандағы авторитарлық консолидация үлгілеріне, сондай-ақ Тәжікстанның постқақтығыстық дамуына ерекше назар аударылып, аталған тәжірибелердің Қазақстандағы басқарылатын трансформация моделінің қалыптасуына қалай әсер еткені бағаланады.

Мақалада бұдан әрі өңірлік өзара тәуелділік бірнеше арна арқылы жүзеге асатыны – демонстрациялық әсерлер, қауіпсіздік саласындағы тәуекелдердің «таралуы», көші-қон және су-энергетикалық қайшылықтар арқылы – көрсетіліп, осы арқылы Қазақстандағы ішкі басқару таңдаулары кеңірек өңірлік ортадағы өзгерістермен байланыстырылатыны негізделеді. Сонымен қатар сыртқы акторлардың рөлі және өзгермелі геосаяси конфигурациялар өңір бойынша реформалардың ынталандырулары мен шектеулерін қалыптастыратын факторлар ретінде қарастырылады. Нәтижелер посткеңестік мемлекет құру және орталықазиялық регионализм жөніндегі зерттеулерге үлес қосып, өңірлік деңгейдегі шоктар мен саясаттағы сынақтардың ұлттық деңгейдегі тұрақтылық, институционалдық бейімделу және селективті модернизация траекторияларына қалай айналатынын нақтылайды.

Тірек сөздер: Орталық Азия, Қазақстан, саяси трансформация, регионализм, посткеңестік кеңістік, авторитаризм, саяси тұрақтылық, геосаясат

Қаржыландыру: Мақала Қазақстан Республикасы Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігі Ғылым комитетінің бағдарламалық-мақсатты қаржыландыру шеңберінде дайындалған (BR27195711 «Қазақстандағы әлеуметтік-саяси процестер (1980-2020): демократияландыру тәжірибесі және Әділетті мемлекеттің қалыптасуы»).

ТРАНСФОРМАЦИЯ СОЦИАЛЬНО-ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИХ ПРОЦЕССОВ В ЦЕНТРАЛЬНОЙ АЗИИ И ИХ ВЛИЯНИЕ НА КАЗАХСТАН

Сейтахметова Н.Л.¹, Жандосова Ш.М.², *Нуров М.М.³

^{1,2} Институт философии, политологии и религиоведения КН МНВО РК,
Алматы, Казахстан

*³ Казахстанский центр гуманитарно-политической конъюнктуры,
Университет «Туран», Алматы, Казахстан

Аннотация. Статья посвящена комплексному анализу эволюции социально-политических процессов в Центральной Азии и их воздействия на траекторию развития Казахстана на протяжении четырех десятилетий (1980-2020 гг.). Исследование охватывает период от позднесоветских трансформаций до завершения второго десятилетия XXI века. На основе сравнительно-исторического и системного подходов автор выявляет ключевые факторы региональной динамики, механизмы взаимовлияния государств Центральной Азии и специфику казахстанского пути политической модернизации. Особое внимание уделяется анализу «цветных революций» в Кыргызстане, авторитарной стабилизации в Узбекистане и Туркменистане, таджикского постконфликтного развития и их влияния на формирование казахстанской модели управляемой трансформации.

Далее в статье утверждается, что региональная взаимозависимость действует по нескольким каналам – через демонстрационные эффекты, «перетекание» рисков в сфере безопасности, миграцию и водно-энергетические противоречия, тем самым связывая выборы внутреннего управления в Казахстане со сдвигами в более широкой региональной среде. Также рассматривается роль внешних акторов и изменяющихся геополитических конфигураций в формировании стимулов и ограничений реформ в регионе. Полученные результаты вносят вклад в исследования

постсоветского государственного строительства и центральноазиатского регионализма, уточняя, каким образом шоки регионального уровня и эксперименты в политике трансформируются в национальные траектории стабильности, институциональной адаптации и селективной модернизации.

Ключевые слова: Центральная Азия, Казахстан, политическая трансформация, регионализм, постсоветское пространство, авторитаризм, политическая стабильность, геополитика

Финансирование: Статья подготовлена в рамках программно-целевого финансирования Комитета науки Министерства науки и высшего образования Республики Казахстан (BR27195711 «Социально-политические процессы в Казахстане (1980-2020): опыт демократизации и становление Справедливого государства»).

Received / Мақала түсті / Статья поступила: 02.01.2026.

Accepted / Жариялауға қабылданды / Принята к публикации: 27.03.2026.

Information about authors:

Seitakhmetova Nataliya L. – Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor, Chief Researcher of the Institute of Philosophy, Political Sciences and Religious Studies CS MSHE RK, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: natalieseyt@mail.ru

Zhandossova Sholpan M. – PhD (Political science), Associate Professor, Chief Researcher of the Institute of Philosophy, Political Science and Religious Studies CS MSHE RK, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: sholpan_zhandossova@mail.ru

Nurov Markhabbat M. – PhD (Political science), Kazakhstan Center for Humanitarian and Political Trends, Turan University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: markhabbatnur@gmail.com

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Сейтахметова Наталья Львовна – философия ғылымдарының докторы профессор, ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Философия, саясаттану және дінтану институтының Бас ғылыми қызметкері, Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: natalieseyt@mail.ru

Жандосова Шолпан Мүлькимановна – PhD докторы (Саясаттану), қауымдастырылған профессор, ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Философия, саясаттану және дінтану институтының Бас ғылыми қызметкері, Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: sholpan_zhandossova@mail.ru

Нуров Мархаббат Мешитбекович – PhD докторы (Саясаттану), Қазақстан гуманитарлық-саяси конъюнктура орталығы, Алматы, «Тұран» университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: markhabbatnur@gmail.com

Информация об авторах:

Сейтахметова Наталья Львовна – доктор философских наук, профессор, главный научный сотрудник Института философии, политологии и религиоведения КН МНВО РК, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: natalieseyt@mail.ru

Жандосова Шолпан Мулькимановна – доктор PhD (Политология), ассоциированный профессор, главный научный сотрудник Института философии, политологии и религиоведения КН МНВО РК, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: sholpan_zhandosova@mail.ru

Нуров Мархаббат Мешитбекович – доктор PhD (Политология), Казахстанский центр гуманитарно-политической конъюнктуры, Университет «Туран», Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: markhabbatnur@gmail.com