

Batbayar, Uurtsaikh; Bingöl, Yılmaz. (2022). "The Concerning Democratic Consolidation in Mongolia". *Asya Arařtırmaları Uluslararası Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. 6 (1), 1-16.

*Arařtırma Makalesi*

**THE CONCERNING DEMOCRATIC CONSOLIDATION IN MONGOLIA\***

*Moğolistan'daki Demokratik Konsolidasyona İliřkin*

**Uurtsaikh BATBAYAR\*\***

**Yılmaz BİNGÖL\*\***

**Abstract**

*The democratic transition in Mongolia took place in 1990 as a result of non-violence, peace, and mutual understanding in the social-political sphere. The study evaluates the democratic transition in Mongolia in terms of the relationship between strengthening democracy and consolidating state-building overviews. The paper puts forward the main argument that in the last three decades, the combination of strengthening democracy and consolidating state-building is vital based on transition practice in Mongolia. Thus, first, it is concerned with the term democracy meaning, its origin, and its theories. Second, it examines the transition and consolidation of democracy in Mongolia. Third, the paper offered a further development model for democracy and governance in Mongolia.*

**Keywords:** *Democracy, Democratic Transition, Governance, State-Building, Mongolia.*

**Öz**

*Moğolistan'da demokratik deęişim 1990 yılında şiddetsizlik, barış ve sosyal politik alanda karşılıklı anlayışın bir sonucu olarak gerçekleşmiştir. Çalışma, Moğolistan'daki demokratik deęişimi, demokrasinin güçlendirilmesi ile devlet inşası genel bakışlarının pekiştirilmesi arasındaki ilişki açısından değerlendirmektedir. Makale, son otuz yılda demokrasinin güçlendirilmesi ve devlet inşasının pekiştirilmesi kombinasyonunun Moğolistan'daki deęişim uygulamaları temelinde hayati önem taşıdığına dair temel bir argüman ortaya koymaktadır. Böylece ilk olarak, demokrasi teriminin anlamı, kökeni ve teorileri ile ilgilenilmiştir. İkincisi, Moğolistan'da demokrasinin deęişimi ve sağlamlaştırılmasının sağlanması analiz edilmiştir. Üçüncüsü, makale Moğolistan'da demokrasi ve yönetim için birleştirici bir gelişme modeli önermektedir.*

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** *Demokrasi, Demokratik Deęişim, Yönetim, Devlet İnşası, Moğolistan.*

\* Geliş Tarihi / Received: 30.01.2022, Kabul Tarihi / Accepted: 29.06.2022. DOI: 10.34189/asyam.6.1.001

\*\* PhD Candidate, Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University Political Science and Public Administration Department, uuree17@gmail.com, ORCID ID:https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3645-7251

\*\* Prof. Dr., Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University Political Science and Public Administration Department, ybingol@ybu.edu.tr, ORCID ID:https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9077-6798

## **Introduction**

In 1991, Samuel Huntington's book, *The Third Wave: Democratization in The Late Twentieth Century* was published and that categorized three waves of democracy in the world. The first wave began with the American and the French revolutions. The second wave began after World War II and lasted until the mid-1970s, while the third wave began in 1974. He claimed that democratic transitions belong to these three waves in terms of the periods. Democratic transition in Mongolia belongs to the third wave and began in 1990 after the end of the Cold War in the late 1980 and the collapse of the Soviet Union. Then the first free democratic elections were held, and a majority rule was established (Huntington, 1991: 16).

Huntington's *Third Wave of Democratization* had different consequences in Central Asia. One of them is the emergence of new monarchical leaders who are not liberal, who do not resign, and who hold elections in these countries by suppressing human rights. Mongolia is different from the Central Asian and other East Asian communist regimes. It was a non-violent and peaceful transition when compared with Russia and the traditionally, similar nations of Central Asian Turkic Republics. For example, the first democratic free elections were held in 1990, power has shifted peacefully and freely from autocracy to democracy in terms of political, social, and economic transition. Therefore, it is shown that democracy was based on consensus and harmony of people. However, Mongolia became the second communist country in 1924 (Jeffries, 2007: 2). It can be said that Mongolians have shown to the world that they are a people with a tradition of statehood, a culture of democracy, and freedom. Historically the Mongol Empire was the first to know religious tolerance and built a fair merit system at the level of politics and military. In the capital, Karakorum, churches, mosques, and temples stood side by side. In the empire, women had equal rights with men, even among the subject (ibid: 5). On one hand, Mongolia is a parliamentary system with a single chamber that has basic democratic characteristics in that a total of seventy-six members are directly elected popularly. On the other hand, Mongolia is a semi-presidential system in which the powers of the president are granted and extend beyond ceremonies and symbols (ibid: 12). The prime minister and his cabinet have collective or collegial executives that dependent on legislative confidence.

There are many challenges during the transition periods in Mongolia. As Bingöl cited the researchers of this process are called 'transitologist' that all the post-communist cases have been in a process of 'transition' from communism to democracy. They claim, that the transition process has already been completed, and the 'transition' is to be followed by another stage, which they call 'consolidation' (Bingöl, 2004: 43). To highlight it, Thomas Carothers has identified a standard template for consolidation of democracy in transition countries. The first phase of this process includes the collapse of the regime and establishment of a constitutional framework that respects human rights, the strengthening of competition between political parties, and the holding of democratic elections in line with international standards. The second phase is *consolidation* followed by capacity building to increase the effectiveness and participation of the legislature, independent judiciary, professional orientation of courts, decentralization of decision-making activities and transfer of power to local governments, civil society and non-governmental organizations, increase media participation initiatives (Carothers, 2002: 7).

Moreover, there are theoretical debates between strengthening democracy and consolidating state-building overviews at this time. Those who advocate the strengthening of the state preach to delay the promotion of democracy by holding multi-party elections in countries with weak transitions and failures, and by slowing down efforts to strengthen civil society organizations. Contrary, some of them suggest strengthening democracy on the basis of an advanced electoral system and so forth. And other theorists argue that the gradual consolidation of democracy should be accompanied by initiatives for state-building, both of which are essential to the development process (Norris, 2012: 3-43).

Therefore, this research paper evaluates these theoretical frameworks that strengthen democracy and the state-building initiatives and considers the significance of the unified theory proposed by Norris to be specific to the transition of Mongolia. Moreover, the study aims to achieve testing democratic theories in a particular case of Mongolia and considers three main spheres: the origin of democracy and

good governance, its practical case in Mongolia, and offered a united development model for democracy and governance in Mongolia.

### **The Origin of Democracy and The Scenario of Mongolia**

It is not supposed that Aristotle said ‘now it is evident that the form of government is best in which every man, whoever he is, can act best and live happily’ in a fourth century BCE, but it is taken from him. He stated that there are three forms of government: monarchy (one), aristocracy (few), and majority (many) in the fourth volume of his work, Politics. If the king is well-mannered, he can be a good ruler, but he easily will be a tyrant. If aristocracy (few) rules, rules only in the interests of the rich. Then they will be an oligarchy. But if everyone is involved in a state, the exclusion of interests of all others except the poor. Ultimately, the best structure would be a mixed political government of the rich and the poor based on tuition (Taylor, 2012: 25). So, democracy is a very problematic issue that the question of how the people will rule themselves will inevitably arise. To answer this question, we demand to explain the term democracy. It consists of two Greek words that *demos* (the people) and *kratos* (to rule). Although Aristotle wrote very clearly about democracy and majority rule, it was only a form of state in the late 18<sup>th</sup> and early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries (ibid: 31). Thus, democracy is one of the successful achievements in human history.

Today, it is mostly defined that democracy is governed by and for the people. First, this quote was addressed by Daniel Webster in 1830 which is thirty-three years before Abraham Lincoln’s Gettysburg address in which he spoke of a “people’s government, made for the people, made by the people, and answerable to the people.” (Lijphart, 2012: 1). In terms of the understanding of democracy, Robert A. Dahl’s measurements of democracy are more suitable in 1974 which are the right to vote, the right to be elected, the right of political leaders to compete for support and votes, elections that are free and fair, freedom of association, freedom of expression, alternative sources of information, and institutions for making public policies depend on votes and other expressions of preference. Similarly, “for the people” implies Dahl’s eighth criterion of responsiveness by the government to the voters’ preferences (Dahl, 1989: 221) However, these measurements give opportunities to people in terms of their participation in political activities, expressing their ideas, requesting the right policies from politicians, making requirements for public services, and so forth. The most important purpose of democracy is to build a good society for the people.

In last two decades, some scholars including Norris emphasize that deepening the principles and rules of liberal democracy is a means to ensure human rights and human security at the international level. Based on the above criteria, they believe that it is a tool to limit authoritarian leaders, increase public voice and participation, oust incapable leaders, and empower elected politicians to hold appointed officials accountable to publics. Thus, it is claimed that serving the public interest and resolving political disputes are solved more effectively (Norris, 2012: 3). For this purpose and consolidating, many countries consider on public services based on liberal democracy principles. Thus, democracy is foundation that we build good democratic institutions and good governance with development, happiness and peace for the future generations. On the other hand, Bruce Parrott defined the liberal democracy perspective that:

*“A political system in which the formal and actual leaders of the government are chosen within regular intervals through elections based on a comprehensive adult franchise with equally weighted voting, multiple candidacies, secret balloting, and other producers, such as freedom of the press and assembly that ensure real opportunities for electoral competition”* (Bingöl, 2004: 46).

Nevertheless, today many countries that belongs to different forms of state regimes except democracy. Obviously, the main purpose of regime is the result of development. It depends on a number of structural factors, such as economic and social conditions, ethnic structure and conflict, geographical location, natural resources, accumulation of human and physical capital, the historical course of the colonial administration, religious dominance and so forth.

In Lijphart’s account, democratic transition is good thing firstly but extending and consolidating democracy is significantly important to stabilize democracy. Thus, he mentioned some examples of democracies including Mongolia that have been continuously democratic since 1990, classified by year

of democratization (Lijphart, 2012: 52). One of main ideologies of these democratization came from immense ideological changes that has been described in Francis Fukuyama's famous book 'The End of History and the Last Man' in 1992. Fukuyama believed that it was the end of ideology that regimes of Eastern Europe based on Marxist-Leninist ideology had given their stages to liberal democracies. For this reason, he claimed that liberal democracy has been may describe as the 'end point of mankind's ideological evolution' and the 'final form of human government', 'and as such constituted the 'end of history' (Fukuyama, 1992: xi). One of these ideological movements and democratization cases was Mongolia called as 'Young Democracy', which is trying to consolidate a result of democratic transition within social and economic levels too.

Democracy refers to the free market, trade, economic development, and human development indexes. Rapidly growing countries such as South Africa, Brazil, and India improved in this matter since the mid-1990s, following democratic regimes, increasing investment and trade, and improving domestic stability and living standards. Likewise, most democratic developed countries have good indexes concentrating on the three fundamental dimensions of 'life expectancy, knowledge and wealth' (Norris, 2012: 144). It is a more accurate indicator of development because it is broader acceptance among social scientists (Lijphart, 2012: 58). From simple observation, it is evident that the human development index has changed in North and South Korea, which started from the same levels in the 1970s. Yet, currently, millions of North Koreans are starving to death due to long-term malnutrition and poor living conditions, and one in three girls suffers from malnutrition, while South Koreans live 14 years longer. These examples of the two Koreas' human development indexes can be seen in many international organization's reports (ibid: 13). Nevertheless, some researchers argue that every democratic regime is not good enough and does not increase the human development index. Under the authoritarian regimes have made significant progress in human development under China's rapid economic growth that has lifted millions of people out of poverty, Singapore's one-party regime is building an orderly and prosperous society, and Egypt's Mubarak and Morocco's Mohamed IV among others (ibid: 12). Moreover, democracy provides religious toleration in society. It is shown that many democracies accept minority religions and give them the right to celebrate their own religious holidays. But some non-democratic regimes control extremely high in this matter (Stepan, 2011: 121). Talal Asad claimed that the full part of a democracy, different religious beliefs share values that enable citizens to have a common political life. These values reflect the unity of the state that represents them. Without shared values, it is impossible to be integrated, without integration no political stability, without some measure of stability no justice, no freedom, and no tolerance (Asad, 2006: 494-526). Democracy provides freedom of speech on the basis of a liberal mind and individual rights. The most important thing is to ensure human rights and human security in a democratic regime. In a way, there are many factors such as there is no government pressure to speak, publish, or express one's views freely (Norris, 2012: 15). Not only free press is important for consolidating democracy but also these pillars are merely significant components such as civil society, private enterprise economy, and independent trade unions (Heywood, 2017: 83).

Indeed, there are many people in authoritarian regimes who want democracy and democratic transition. In this matter, there are some interesting criteria that are useful for democratic transitions. However, there are many currents of skepticism that the consequences of democratic governance and its strengthening are inevitable. For example, proponents of state-building initiatives have advocated strengthening good governance. Carothers's standard is not aimed at strengthening the state-building, and the civil service and central government ministries pay relatively little attention to strengthening public management, civilian oversight of the military police, and training security services (Norris, 2012: 4). This may be due to the fact that democracy supporters see the central government as part of a problem rather than a function of meeting social needs and supporting development goals. Yet, the process of gradual consolidation of democracy should be accompanied by initiatives for state-building, both of which are essential to the development process. Nevertheless, it seems that the two meanings of democracy and governance are completely different from one another. Thus, it is called democracy-promotion and state-building initiatives (ibid: 34).

Democracy and good governance have been discussed as very similar in practice. It reflected the belief that good governance should include the values and principles of liberal democracy. In Pippa

Norris's account, the division of scholars between the various branches of the research have led to intellectual divisions. Public administration scholars have turned their attention to the effective delivery of public goods and services. Contrary, scholars of international relations more consider the capabilities of the state such as the protection of security by military force and issues of international and civil conflict. Development economists emphasize the term of governance in prosperity and property rights. Conversely, comparative political analysts focus on the democratization process and the transition of regimes. While these divisions in the field of research are not rigid, it is clear that there will be duplication in the academic level, but isolation within the social sciences has exacerbated intellectual divisions. Unfortunately, these divisions have influenced international organizations. For instance, The World Bank (WB), International Monetary Fund (IMF), Transparency International, and the Global Integrity Project have been working to promote good governance. Other organizations have focused on developing and strengthening democratic institutions such as the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES), the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Systems (IDEA), Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, the Open Society Institute for Human Rights, Civil Society, and Independent Information. These organizations have implemented a program aimed at expanding civil society and independent media. With the exception of the United Nations Development Program, the United States Agency for International Development, and the United Kingdom's Department of International Development, very few development agencies have sought to reduce this gap by investing in both sides of democratic governance (ibid: 35).

In sum, countries that from democratic transition to consolidation process such as Mongolia have strengthened combination of liberal democracies and state-building initiatives, good governance can achieve development and sustain their results. Mongolia is an core example of these ideologies, and learnt at how this process works.

### **The Transition and Consolidation of Democracy and a Case of Mongolia**

In the literature on transition and consolidation of democracy, scholars have also emphasized many explanatory variables that consider structural factors like the international situations (Norris, 2012), the identity politics (Mansfield & Snyder, 1996; Bingöl, 2004), institutional patterns (Lijphart, 2012), social-economic issues under the state-building and good governance initiatives (Norris, 2012), and international relations and geopolitical issues (Lattimore, 1956 and Bold, 2018). Thus, we state of these factors determines the fate of Mongolian young democracy.

The democratic experience is one of the important factors, especially for transited countries such as Mongolia in terms of the consolidation process of democracy. As Bill Clinton said that however, democracy was inaugurated in the USA, but the principle of universal suffrage was also violated by the government until the passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965. Lijphart found that there have been twenty-five countries including Mongolia continuously democratic since 1990-2000 (Lijphart, 2012: 50-52). According to international financial institutions, there is a greater impact on these third-wave democracies such as considering minimizing government roles as the main way to increase economic efficiency during the creation of a free market. At the time, the Washington Consensus was drafted in 1989. Its main objectives were to promote the free market through privatization, deregulation, fiscal discipline, inflation, tax reform, trade liberalization, exchange rate reduction, and labor market openness. These policies aimed to reduce the scope and role of the central government by decentralizing and redistributing state power to local, private, and civil society forces. However, since the mid-1990s, many Latin American countries have not achieved sustainable economic growth, and widening inequality has led to the failure of the Washington Consensus. It was also affected by the 1997 Asian economic crisis, which led to growing criticism and political pressure from neo-Keynesian economists such as Joseph Stiglitz. But over the past 20 years, the Washington Consensus has gradually expanded again. His second-generation recipe is the *good governance* concept. Countries that adhere to the principles of good governance argue that they are effective development partners by delivering public goods and services and regulating market economies. Washington's expanded consensus underscores the rule of law, including access to justice, an independent judiciary, and professionally trained security services, which are important prerequisites for effective development. The rule of law promotes social stability, attracts foreign investment, and promotes economic growth by creating conditions for legal compliance and business confidence. It has also made it a priority to ensure that the public services are fair, transparent,

and free of corruption, improving public goods and services and targeting the poor rather than putting them in the pockets of politicians and elites. Democracy is sometimes seen as an important component of good governance, but most institutions view it separately (Norris, 2012: 102).

Thus, scholars began to separately, consider different views of the transition process so-called 'transitologists' in terms of geography, tradition, culture, and so forth (Bingöl, 2004: 43). Before evaluating Mongolian transition, it is indeed to take the regional history of transition. Huntington's Third Wave, or Democratic Transitions, have different consequences in Central Asia. In these countries, new authoritarian leaders are being born who are trying to control elections in violation of human rights and the results are not removed from the political powers. The emergence of leaders with a new image of the autocracy. Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder argued that in the transition to democracy, ethnic conflicts are more likely to escalate than peace. When mass nationalism or ethnic hatred and populists gain public support, danger of war increases due to imperfectly developed democratic institutions (Mansfield & Snyder, 1996: 197). Similarly, Yilmaz Bingöl strongly argued that it is indeed ethnic nationalism, not liberal democracy that is the real successor to communism at least in Central Asian Turkic Republics: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan. He claimed that identity politics played in decisive role in Central Asia. While democratic transition began there, Central Asian regimes have supported their respective languages, reinterpreted their respective histories, myths and memories, rehabilitated national figures, heroes, and taken many other symbolic steps toward 'nationalization' of their states. Notwithstanding, Central Asian leaders want to transform their regimes into democratic ones, an undemocratic trend is running through the new Central Asian countries toward stronger presidential powers and extending the terms of sitting presidents. These irremovable presidents were in charge of all three branches (legislative, judicial, and executive) of states with appointments of Supreme Court judges and other powers. Their democratic transition process that basic democratic rights such as freedom of political activity and free elections, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press have been regularly violated. Moreover, nationalizing policies and practices are manifest in, inter alia, the iconography of the new regimes, the privileged status accorded to the local languages, newly revised histories, and the exclusion of members of non-eponymous groups from the echelons of power'. Thus, Central Asian regimes have not moved very far at all toward democratization of their state institutions and societies (Bingöl, 2004: 43-60). Likewise, Mongolia has witnessed almost all attributes of nationalism. Mainly there were many new ethno nation-building processes were going on within nationalism ideology besides democratic reform. One of these examples was that before 1990, it was totally banned to talk and write about Mongolian Empire and Genghis Khan as well as no religious freedoms. Thus, people were educated by untruth and revised historiography based on communist ideology. They were very unsatisfied due to this pressure of ideology. Thus, during the early years of the transition process, many socialist names of districts, streets, and so forth have been changed to Mongolian names. Similarly, some Russian national and official days have been replaced with the traditional ones. Some nationalist groups began openly to articulate anti-Russian sentiments such as removing statues of Lenin and Stalin in most of the Mongolian territory. Nevertheless, it was known that in terms of theoretical and conceptual debate on nationalism, it cannot compare Mongolia with these Central Asian countries. Yet, borrowing Bingöl's research, it reversely had been shown that in Mongolia, the glass is full with democracy, on the other hand only a little nationalism at the bottom of the glass comparative to Central Asian ethno-nationalism (ibid: 45).

Yet, Mongolian transition has comprehensibly prevailed in Fish's account which cited by Jeffries 'the absence of five factors that are often regarded as propitious for democratization has actually eased Mongolian democratization'. The five factors are (1) superabundance of natural wealth, (2) substantial geo-strategic significance and/or an external patron, (3) regional power pretensions, (4) a father figure, and (5) concentration of executive power'. In terms of natural resources, Mongolia is not in natural resources in the geographical region, but it is enough for three million people. Natural superabundance often reduces politics to competition over access to the agencies that control the proceeds of sales of natural resources. This game corrupts the political class and distorts the state apparatus. Geo-strategically, Mongolia is not abundant for strategic value in terms of powerful external actors. It means major powers have not assigned great significance to the direction of Mongolian politics. Thus, the attention of influential actors are mixed blessing in terms of democracy. Mongolia is a landlocked developing country and has not any pretensions in terms of harboring becoming great power or regional

power. The positive way of a democratic transition period, Mongolia had not had a single dominant leader. No single person was universally regarded as the founder of democracy in Mongolia (Jeffries, 2007: 12). There is not any father figure such as Turkmenbashi, Nazarbayev, and so forth. The absence of such an individual has proved to be a good opportunity for democratization. Democratization has been a more peaceful and non-violence transition in Mongolia. The most important distinction between Mongolia and other Central Asian Turkic Republics was that Mongolia has chosen a semi-presidential system that had been an advantage to democratization. Constitution invested the separation of powers in all three branches of legislative, judicial, and executive, formidable power in parliament, as well as granting the presidential powers that extend beyond ceremonies and symbols (Ian Jeffries: 12).

The transition process of regime requires the mutual compromise. In the first stage of this process, the capacity to maintain public order and stability is simultaneously reduced as elections, human rights, and political freedoms expand. Only in the next stage can governance and democracy go together in a more balanced way. In Charles Tilly's theory, regimes in Central Asia such as Kazakhstan are facing a difficult choice because of the tensions between state capacity and democracy (Tilly, 2007: 18). In the case of Mongolia, however, all the compromises have been successful, and the transition to a non-violent and peaceful regime is one of the most successful examples of compromise. Obviously, researchers have warned that one of the main obstacles to regime change is weakened governance, public distrust of the state, and chaos. There is no one-size-fits-all recipe, so the regime transition is to be aware of the weaknesses of governance and democracy. Instead of restrictions on political freedom, the first priority of an authoritarian regime should be considered on a way to increase access to justice by holding legitimate multi-party elections that respect minority rights, meet constitutional and international standards, strengthen a legislature capable of overseeing government activities, and support an independent professional judiciary. The most important part of the transition is to establish the principles of liberal democracy and the formation of institutions (Norris, 2012: 8). As Lijphart cited, the democratic transaction is a good thing firstly, but consolidating and stabilizing democracy is the most important issue for procedural experiences (Lijphart, 2012: 50). Mongolia has not avoided this issue either, and it can be understood that it is now moving to the second stage which is procedural issues. Mongolia has had some success in holding legitimate, multi-party elections that meet international standards. Since 1992 and the last 28 years Mongolia tested all of the electoral systems. For example, parliamentary elections in 1990, 1992, 2008, 2012, and 2020 were held in 26 enlarged constituencies within the majority system, while 1996, 2000, 2004, and 2016 elections were held in 76 constituencies with 76 seats proportional (GECM, 2017).

The majoritarian model of democracy implements without any difficulties in terms of executive power. The main problematic issue in the consensus democracy model is to establish cabinets. Thus, Mongolia has faced this problematic struggle for four elections of parliament since 1992 during the transition. As Lijphart mentioned, the most majoritarian type of cabinet is one that is single-party and minimal winning—that is, a one-party majority cabinet. He argued that not only the most consensual type of cabinet is multiparty and oversized but also multiparty minority cabinets belong to it. In the parliamentary system after the election, one of the problematic issues is a political coalition between majoritarian and other minorities in terms of establishing a cabinet. Thus, he introduced six important theories of the coalition that includes a minimal winning coalition, minimum size coalition, bargaining proposition, minimal range, minimal connected winning, and policy-viable coalitions (Lijphart, 2012: 81). It is shown may be coalitions are good for countries where democracy is strengthened but it makes a lot of political struggles, bottlenecks, and political accountability and is lack of good governance capacity for countries such as Mongolia. These challenges of democracy are described in Table 1 in terms of the Mongolian case. Certainly, there is the majoritarian model that closely allied parties and one-party majority cabinets have been established in 1996, 2000, and 2016. During these election years, there were not any immense political conflicts between different parties but prevailed in the closely allied parties and the factionalized majority party. The worst example was in 1996, the first time the democratic closely allied parties won the election and had 50 of the 76 seats in parliament (GECM, 2017). But they withdraw their cabinets four times in four years, the last one was removed a year before the election. For the democratic allies, it was an unacceptable mistake at that time in terms of the communist perspective of Mongolians on that occasion. For example, one of the communist dictators, Yu. Tsedenbal was the longest leader for 44 years, between 1940 and 1984, and became the father of

communist ideology in Mongolia. Then, it gave the former communist party Mongolian People’s Party (MPP) a wonderful opportunity for winning election 72 of the 76 seats in 2000 and through three consecutive elections.

**Table 1.** Majoritarian and Coalition Cabinets in Mongolia, 1992-2020

Years	Parties	Small parties	Individuals	Democratic Party	Small parties	MPP (Ex-communist)
	(Total 76 seats in Parliament)	A	B	C	D	E
1992	<i>Consensus Model</i> <i>Not logical coalition</i> <i>ACE</i>	1	1	4	0	70
1996	<i>Majoritarian Model</i>	1	0	50	0	25
2000	<i>Majoritarian Model</i>	1	1	1	1	72
2004	<i>Consensus Model</i> <i>Bargaining proposition</i> <i>(CE+Small party)</i>	0	3	35	1	37
2008	<i>Consensus Model</i> <i>Policy-viable coalition</i> <i>(CE)</i>	1	1	26	1	47
2012	<i>Consensus Model</i> <i>Minimal winning coalition and minimum size</i> <i>(ACD) and</i> <i>Bargaining proposition</i> <i>(CE)</i>	11	3	33	2	25
2016	<i>Majoritarian Model</i>	1	1	9	0	65
2020	<i>Majoritarian Model</i>	1	1	11	1	62

**Source:** (Lijphart, 2012).

Interestingly, the 1992 coalition cabinet began officially in the Mongolian democratic transition. It was a very confusing model. Because MPP won 70 of the 76 seats but they include two deputy prime ministers from two different small parties that were new democratic parties in the cabinet (GECM, 2017). Perhaps it was an encouragement to support the democratic transition. In Lijphart’s account, it will be shown that there are mostly minimal winning coalitions for bargaining propositions in 2004, 2008, and 2012. Of course, in parliament, political parties increase their powers which means power in cabinets. Thus, minimal coalitions give advantages to a minority party C in Table 1. C contributes almost half of the parliamentary support in 2004 and 2012. It seems they have understandable situations that receive almost the half of seats in the cabinet. Therefore, they were politicized as toddlers snatching for toys rather than developing the economy and reducing the poverty. Nevertheless, there were unexpected coalitions in the political study that was CE coalition in 2008. Thus, the prime minister announced that our government is a non-standardized cabinet. Perhaps after three consecutive winning of the former communist party MPP, many Mongolians were suspecting ballot stuffing, proxy voting that was used by MPP in 2008. Moreover, after the result of the election, there was an immense protest



against MPP and that became a huge tension between the government and protestors. The results are five young protestors were killed by police. It gave a huge signal to the political parties and government officials that Mongolians are thirsty for liberal democracy last twelve years. Otherwise, political instability influenced the anarchist movement in peaceful Mongolia. These days had been writing Dark Age of Mongolian democratic transition. Due to these examples influenced a majority party to establish non-standard coalitions of cabinets as in Lijphart's account 'majority government disguise' in 2008 (Lijphart, 2012: 92). They have dealt with one of the big strategic mining projects, *Oyu Tolgoi* with western investors within the third-neighbor policy of the Foreign policy concept of Mongolia. It brought the Mongolian economy a huge impact and twice bigger investment than both neighbors China and Russia in terms of total investment. Thus, it was an 'effectively police-viable coalition' of the democratic history of Mongolia.

Moreover, in democracies with weak state-building capacity, it is important that international organizations support initiatives to address these issues, such as the unprofessional conduct of public officials, budget in the public sector, its management, capacity building of local service delivery organizations, incompetence, and misconduct in public affairs, and the reduction of corruption in public life (Norris, 2012: 10). In Norris's account, there is a good trade-off between effective mechanisms of democratic accountability (creating accountability and restricting the autonomy of rulers) and effective mechanisms of state capacity (the ability of public officials to pursue policies in the public interest). Thus, any democratic transition which keeps this trade-off is considered to be a success for facing the challenges (ibid: 9). Mongolia faced a certain step of social and economic transition since 1990 within the context of establishing effective mechanisms for democratic accountability. Today, there are enough political rights and freedoms as well as ranking high internationally in terms of the democratic index. For example, according to the democracy-monitoring organization Freedom House, Mongolia is on a par with Australia, North America, and Europe (Freedom House, 2022). A clear example of that is the situation of political parties in Mongolia. In a country like Mongolia with a population of 3 million, there are 36 political parties (Supreme Court of Mongolia, 2021). On one hand, it is certainly the value of democracy. On the other hand, these parties seem like in the twentieth century and prevail in the style of a mass party with strict membership that dates back to the 1980s. This suggests that Mongolian political parties are 30 to 40 years behind the development of political parties in developed countries. This is because instead of mass membership, political parties have become relatively small in the modern world. Yet, contrary, Mongolian parties are increasingly politicized in a left-leaning manner in order to win more seats in the elections and the electorates, which in turn leads to socialist, communist, and populist-style mass parties. On the other hand, they don't have the social, political, and legal conditions and opportunities to have a modern-style party. A truly democratic and liberal party, no matter how good or new, is first formed, but after a while, it becomes a mass left-wing or populist party. Party members want and demand the same. There is no other way currently in the development of political parties in Mongolia. Generally, there are few incapable politicians who are often elected in the parliament and are not the main producers of accountability for new politicians especially.

However, one of the key factors in creating effective mechanisms of state-building capacity is to focus on the improvement of the civil service. In the case of Mongolia, the first stage focused on the development of the civil service that was established under a new system of government from 1990 to 2001. In this period, it can be said that the basic foundation of the civil service has been laid. In 1992, a new constitution was adopted, laying the legal foundations for a human rights-based, democratic, market-based social system. It also outlines the direction of a democratic government and its policy on reform and the overall structure. The second stage was aimed at improving the capacity and efficiency of the civil service from 2001 to the present. The second stage strengthens the civil service, prohibits civil servants from running in elections, and the principle of merit promotion enshrined in Civil Servants' Law. New public management reform has also begun. The highlight of these is the new public management reform policy. The idea of this reform was to define the strategic goals and objectives of the public sector and to reform its internal structure based on private sector management in order to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of public service activities. In this context, good governance programs were supported and implemented.

Liberal democracies focus on several fields of resources such as human development, the economy and its growth, and the development of financial and technological resources. The main feature of liberal democracy is that it invests more in human capital without the need for any propaganda. These include literacy, education, and work skills. They create economic growth because they create a more productive and skilled workforce (Viotor, 2006). Lijphart's thesis is that the form of constitutional regulation has the economic effect of democracy in ensuring economic growth (Lijphart, 2012: 262). Similarly, Persson and Tabellini claimed which cited by Norris that the constitution is important for economic growth, that the presidential regime keeps the public sector small, and that the proportional electoral system increases government spending and budget deficits. They argue that electoral procedures (proportional representation, constituency size, and voting structure) influence both corruption and structural economic policies that facilitate growth. Consensus democracies are seen as pursuing stable, gradual, and predictable macroeconomic policies, avoiding top-down policies, such as authoritarian regimes. For all of the above reasons, consensus democracy is considered to be a remarkable economic achievement (Norris, 2012: 19).

It was shown that within the consensual model of democracies, Mongolia was invested successfully, in the field of mineral resources by western investors. It was twice the bigger foreign direct investment of both China and Russia. However, Norris stressed that the economy slows down in the early stages of the transition from an administrative to a democratic regime. Because bureaucratic regimes would lay the foundations for a stable state and industrialization would ensure economic growth. It has been proven in the post-communist countries including Mongolia that in the early years of the democratic transition, as the incomes of low and middle-income people increase, they become more vulnerable to tax pressures, political activism, and rising inflation and instability (Norris, 2012: 19). For example, before 1990, Mongolia's economy was dependent on the non-independent Soviet Union. This was 40 times less than the Soviet economy at the time and five to six times less than in Eastern Europe. As of 1990, Mongolia exported 586 million rubles of foreign trade with Russia but borrowed 749 million rubles at that time. Mongolia deceived themselves into believing that Mongolians were building socialism and living well. Thus, when Mongolia began its democratic transition, the Soviet Union started a direct ban on Mongolia's export and import. During the Soviet period, Mongolia and the Soviet Union had a contract to supply 34,000 tons of oil products (mostly benzene and diesel), but after the first democratic election in 1990, the Soviets cut fuel supply by 50 percent. Then, in the late 1990s, the *Soviet Politburo* passed a secret resolution banning all trade with Mongolia and imposing up to 1,500 percent custom taxes on all Mongolian exports. This has started to collapse the Mongolian economy hardly. In addition, Mongolian livestock exports to the Soviets were banned in 1990 due to an outbreak of an infectious disease in Mongolia. Then, in the first quarters of 1991 and 1992, the supply of oil products was suspended. In short, the transition of 1990 saw a complete ban on Mongolia's small economy becoming dependent on a single country. At the same time, the Soviet Union collapsed into 15 different countries. It became more complicated and bad reflects that trade partners such as purchasing tractors from Belarus, sugars from Ukraine, tea from Georgia, etc., have no trades, and even no diplomatic relations. This deepened the crisis seriously and reduced public confidence in democracy. Then it provided immense opportunities to the former communist party, MPP to win the new democratic elections. After these economic immense crises, there just 16 percent of Mongolians were supporting democratic transition in a survey in 1992 (Byambasuren, 2017: 51).

But in the last 10 years, Mongolia has been faced with many questions, such as whether it is able to fully enjoy its economic freedom, and whether this freedom can play a decisive role in attracting foreign direct investment, management techniques, technology, and know-how. In that sense, economic and business freedoms are at the heart of international decision-making. For example, the Canadian-based Fraser Institute, which introduces an economic freedom index and countries' ranks, annually updates the index and makes it public. The study divides the Economic Freedom Index into five main groups and uses 24 indicators. These groups include the size of government, the legal system and property rights, capital flows, freedom of trade, and business regulation. In a survey of 2017, Hong Kong, Singapore, New Zealand, Switzerland, and Canada are the countries with the highest levels of economic freedom, while Mongolia ranks 45th out of 162 countries surveyed and is included in the category of countries with the 'free' economic freedom (Fraser, 2020). But in the "Doing Business 2020" report jointly published by the World Bank and the International Finance Corporation, Mongolia

has dropped 17 places from the previous three years, ranking 81st out of 190 countries and one of the least economically free countries in the world (World Bank, 2020). Last two decades, Mongolia's economic growth is directly dependent on rising and falling commodity prices of mining products. Today, economic growth is unstable to 5,1% in 2019 from 7,2% in 2018, and 5,4% in 2017 depending on the mining sector following declining commodity prices and lower quality of mineral exports. Mongolia achieved 17,8 percent economic growth in 2011 and 0,8 percent in 2016, which is directly related to the lack of a pragmatic and flexible foreign direct investment policy. As World Bank claimed, political uncertainty reflects the economy negatively (World Bank, 2020). Moreover, in Huntington's account that Mongolia has been relatively calm compared to other countries. He continued about the potential causes of democracy in Mongolia that because the country has no experience of democracy, it could create a vulnerability to retreat from democracy as a result of a shift back to authoritarian rule in Russia (Huntington, 1991: 293). This can be seen in the current issues of Mongolia's economic policy and capacity.

The transition period has left Mongolia facing many new challenges at the international level politically, economically, and socially. One of them was the need to redefine foreign policy in accordance with the values of democracy. The pre-transition policy is that the imbalance of power defined by Lattimore never leads to a comprehensive and equal relationship. The more politically and militarily weak country becomes a 'satellite' state in terms of the imbalance of power. It is shown to be legally equal, but it is considered impractical. This made Mongolia a fully 'satellite' state of the Soviet Union (Lattimore, 1956: 37). Democracy, on the other hand, has eliminated this dependence on 'satellite' and allowed itself to determine its own foreign policy. Then it has given to Mongolians to develop their own foreign policy concept and which was approved in 1994 and amended in 2011. The most important thing in the foreign policy concept is that Mongolia, in addition to its two geographical neighbors which are China and Russia, has raised the issue of dealing with a 'third-neighbor' policy. The Foreign Policy Concept of Mongolia stipulates the development and cooperation of partnerships between the United States, Japan, the European Union, India, the Republic of Korea, and Turkey within the third-neighbor policy. Implementing this policy, it will intensify the development of bilateral and multilateral relations and cooperation with developed countries in political, economic, defense and cultural, and humanitarian sectors (FPCM, 2011). In this context, the relationship of the partnerships in the foreign policy of Mongolia is based on the following four levels in terms of content, importance, and carrying capacity of a country. It is (1) a Comprehensive Strategic partnership country (China and Russia), (2) strategic Partnership countries (Japan and India), (3) comprehensive partnership countries (South Korea, USA, Germany, and Turkey), and (4) wide-ranging partnership countries (Canada and Australia). It is certain that Mongolia's 'Third neighbor' policy seems to be more about self-defense and relations with new countries in terms of foreign policy.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, today Mongolia has established diplomatic relations with 187 member countries of United Nation (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Mongolia, 2021). However, Mongolia has a large geographical area and an unprofitable geographical location, and its strategic importance is limited to two neighbors and less important to third neighbors, so its impact on international policy is almost passive in geopolitical significance. Therefore, the realistic conclusion of Lattimore's foreign policy is that Mongolia should pay attention to the fact that a small developing country, which used to be a satellite of one country, then it will be easy to become a second satellite again to another country (Lattimore, 1956: 37). It is shown that today, Mongolia economically has become a satellite of China. This means that in the 30 years before the democratic transition, 80 percent of foreign trade was associated with the Soviet Union, and after the transition, 80 percent related to China (Bold, 2018: 21). It can be said that the democratic transition has given Mongolia an advantage in foreign policy and international relations. But Mongolia needs to be careful to observe a realistic approach to international relations. In the history of the Foreign Policy of Mongolia, there were many examples of Hans Morgenthau's realism theory that the most powerful make the rules and rule the powerless which influenced them to lose their independence (Taylor, 2012: 187). For example, it came into force in 1913 and renounced its independence. In 1950-53, it voluntarily renounced its independence and expressed its desire to join the Soviet Union (Bold, 2018: 19). It was shown that it is

---

<sup>1</sup> The Foreign Policy Concept of Mongolia stipulates that 'Third neighbour' policy is the development cooperation of partnerships between the United States, Japan, the European Union, India, Republic of Korea and Turkey.

easy for incapable politicians to run the country if they lose their democracy, national security, and even independence.

In sum, however, there were many challenges during the transition period, Mongolia's democratic transition is considered to be a certain success, and the next step is to formulate and implement important policies in terms of governance. This stage is seen as the key to strengthening democracy, a combination of liberal democracy that focuses solely on electoral responsibility, and good governance that focuses on fairness and integrity in the public sector.

### **The Further Development Issues for Democracy and Governance**

It has shown that transition covers a wide aspects within the social, cultural, economic and political levels. Thus, further the consolidating democracy must be considered the combined initiatives that focus merely on electoral responsibility and good governance that focuses on fairness and integrity in the public sector (Norris, 2012). Hence, researchers agree that one of the significant priorities of consolidating democracy is the development and implementation of government policy based on economic development (Huntington, 1991), political culture (Diamond, 1999) and foreign relations and geopolitical position (Linz & Stepan, 1996). Indeed, these issues deeply associated with the policy-making process that covers all of the fields such as the accumulation of capital, resources, natural resources, human and capital resources, integration into global and regional networks, social and ethnic divisions within national borders, history, culture, traditions, countries, and so forth. And each takes place within the limits and possibilities of the long-term structural conditions. The basic conditions for the implementation of the policy are related to two factors: first, educated politicians, and second, the basic capacity of governance (Norris, 2012: 34).

The first factor is one of the important issues for consolidating democracy. If non-educated and incapable politicians are elected, there will be a huge risk to implement the important policies at the social, political, and economic levels and easily destroy the long-term policies. In the end, people are dissatisfied with liberal democracies. Therefore, incompetent politicians and policymakers are the main challenge of liberal democracy (ibid: 22). It still matters in terms of transition and consolidation of democracy in Mongolia. For example, there had been 16 governments in Mongolia since the adoption of a new constitution, and the first elections in 1992. Seriously, only the governments of 1992 and 2000 completed an official term of four years, while the other governments prevailed just an average of 1.4 years. Thus, it is impossible to expect results from unstable cabinets. The foundations of development are political stability and policy continuity. Now it is observed that there is a lack of institutional memory in Mongolia. Thus, many calculations, research, and economic projects that have been done by previous governments are rejected within the new cabinet's program, and in fact, the new cabinets begin to provide new projects again. Then it makes uncertainty for domestic and foreign investors. Currently, Mongolian politicians have not matured and have not learned political studies well. In 1991, Huntington wrote that two main contextual problems affecting Mongolia's democracy which is poverty, and extensive state involvement in the economy (Huntington, 1991: 254). It is extremely true and has not solved problems after 30 years. Therefore, it is shown that this small, impoverished country eventually will lose its independence due to the chaotic and incapable politicians. Instead, there is no active policy that declines extensive state involvement in the economy. Unfortunately, the implementation of nonsensical state policies that support extensive state involvement in the economy such as the economicization of foreign relations and so forth. Perhaps it will have resulted in a shift back to authoritarian rule. Moreover, there is a failure in the political election that the elected officials can't implement their election promises due to a lack of capacity on the part of the government. It also casts doubt on the values of a liberal democratic regime due to untrustful conditions between electorates and elected politicians. Therefore, it requests to increase the efficiency of the government in order to create professional stability in the civil service, deliver public services to the people quickly, be free from corruption, and build a government capable of fulfilling the needs of the people. Hence, it is proposed to continue the above-mentioned civil service reforms and make them more sophisticated.

The second factor is a weak basic governance capacity that are important and difficult issue for strengthening the institution of representative democracy. It supports expressing the needs of citizens. This does not mean that strengthening the state is not a priority to postpone political reform such as

competitive elections in the executive and legislative branches. Contrary, it would be inappropriate without establishing a system of accountability and monitoring of executive power through liberal democratic institutions in order to expand the capacity of the transition supported by the tax authorities, equip special government agencies and strengthen the bureaucracy. For instance, the transition practices of Central Asia has been shown that political leaders of transitional regimes do not have a will to relinquish power. If they take positive economic steps, it will be more difficult to replace them. Nevertheless, it does not mean canceling establishing a stable democracy during the transition from an authoritarian regime (Norris, 2012: 38). Therefore, this issue is relatively feasible in Mongolia, so further attention should be paid to strengthening the civil service within good governance principles in order to reduce poverty and promote development (ibid: 32).

In terms of political identity, Larry Diamond expressed that political competitors see the democracy as ‘the only game in town’ and try to govern the society their own interest. At the macro level, there must be a wide consensus that covers class, religion, ethnic and nationality and so forth on the constitutional framework (Diamond, 1999: 65). Thus, identity politics play a decisive role not only in political elections but also in independence and democracy. Seven percent of the world's believers are Buddhists, and 20 percent of China’s population identify themselves as Buddhists. According to Huntington’s theory, Mongolia belongs to the Buddhist civilization. However, there are many sects within Buddhism, including Nepal, China (Tibet), Russia (Kalmykia), and Mongolia. These denominations respect the Dalai Lama (Bold, 2018: 26). The Dalai Lama was first created by the Mongolians and is considered one of the great spiritual values. He is one of the active figures in Buddhist countries in terms of the world democracies and geopolitics. The fact that the Dalai Lama, now in his 86 years old, will one day pass away will affect Mongolia’s democracy spiritually. Interestingly, the Chinese Communist Party renamed the next Dalai Lama in 2008. Therefore, if the next Dalai Lama will be selected in China, the inspirational attraction of Mongolians will flow to China and struggle for the spiritual support of democracy in the future (ibid: 26). Likewise, Mongolians have faced China’s *realism* in terms of economic level, which is already economically dependent on China. As Steven Taylor cited, the history of democracies is a real example of cultural imperialism, which will emerge in the future as a cultural dictatorship of China (Taylor, 2012: 142). Some scholars agree that the influence of Chinese culture on Mongolian society today goes back to the Manchu Qing Dynasty. It is shown that Mongolians watch Chinese television programs, movies and even more educates in China due to the deepening of education, culture, and people-to-people contacts. It is common for Chinese-speaking intellectuals to be at all levels of government, and they worship Chinese fashion globalization and their policy of the world’s superpower (Bold, 2018: 25). This may seem unimaginable today and maybe unknowingly influenced to trace back to socialist and communist ideology in terms of the external and internal forces of rapidly changing international politics.

Foreign policy and international relation are one of the most significant issues in order to strengthen the consolidating democracy that affects domestic affairs (Linz & Stephan 1996: 72-76). Mongolia is necessary to focus on attracting the policy of the ‘third neighbor’ rather than the two neighbors. Obviously, China and Russia do not actively support the democratic transition and its consolidating process in Mongolia. The fact that Russia and China have held several summits since 1990, and that the final status and legal documents do not contain a single provision that supports Mongolia’s current status quo and the transition to liberal democracy. Perhaps it is shown to indicate that Mongolia is a small problem in their relationships (Bayarkhuu, 2018: 21). Therefore, one of the most important resources for the protection of liberal democracy is natural resources, and Mongolia needs to be proactive in attracting moderate and modestly active economic policies based on the good relation with ‘third-neighbors’ such as Turkey. Initially, Mongolia needs to support Turkish Airlines, one of the European gateways in this area. It will give mutual benefits and a strong impact on the Mongolian economy in the long-term period. Practically, Mongolia has direct flights within only two main destinations, South Korea and Turkey except for two neighbors (Bold, 2018: 21). Mongolia needs to look at its foreign policy wisely. Because it is a very simple foreign policy. Geographically, there are 42 countries around the world that are landlocked, and most of them are neighbors of one of the most powerful countries. The largest of them are Kazakhstan and Mongolia, and the smallest is the Vatican in terms of territory. The common foreign policy of these countries is the struggle for survival of large countries bordering on the mainland, and on the other hand, to expand relations with developed

countries, which are the mainstay of increasing trade turnover at sea (Bayarkhuu, 2018: 20). Therefore, Daniel Schmücking wrote Mongolia's foreign policy is clear, and the key is to strengthen its economy by attracting the interest of many countries through the proper circulation of its natural resources. If inexperienced politicians take power, undermine governance, and poorly implement this policy. Thus, Mongolia is at the crossroads of retreating from democracy and even losing their independence (Schmücking, 2015: 37). There is also a history of foreign policy that was shown that the outcome of the tripartite agreement between the Russia-Mongolia-China is detrimental to Mongolia. Hence, in order to keep distance, it is necessary to carefully calculate the political consequences, separate foreign political and economic policies. One of the real conditions is maybe Turkey under the 'third neighbor' policy. Because Mongolia and Turkey have well historical and ethnic ties, a democratic regime, one of the Great Twenties, the eighth largest economy in the world, can play potentially a geopolitical game with Russia and China. Turkish culture is also influenced positively by Mongolia. In particular, if Turkey expands the soft power policy into Mongolia, it will be able to implement the 'third-neighbor' policy of Mongolia (Bold, 2018: 21). Thus, the first step is for Turkey to make a bold investment in Mongolia. And on both sides of the aisle, a democratic regime will be able to build on its values.

In short, well-educated politicians are one of the basic conditions for policy implementation in terms of consolidating democracy. Yet, at this time they are not enough. Some incapable politicians influenced to failure of the government, disruption of policies, and disillusionment of the liberal democracy. Moreover, it is necessary to pay attention to a good governance principles, economic, political culture, and international relations on the basis of the policy and work closely with the third-neighbor countries, especially Turkey.

### **Conclusion**

Democracy is the main value of human history. Currently, it is still characterized globally and determines the key factor of international development. Thus, it is important to study democracy on different themes like transition, consolidation, models, and differences between development levels as well as specific characters in particular countries.

Mongolia's transition has been peaceful, successful, and free of electoral fraud and nationalism. Today, it is necessary to simultaneously strengthen the formal institution of liberal democracy and state-building that focuses on accountability and good governance principles, fairness, and integrity. It will be an effective and key principle for consolidating democracy. At the time, the key issue is policy development and its implementation. The incapable politicians and officials have led to the failure of the governance to implement the necessary policies which has tend to the ruin of the executive institutions and influence to people on dissatisfaction with the liberal democracy. Moreover, poverty and extensive state involvement were main contextual problems since the transition period. It still matters of consolidating democracy periods. Thus, Mongolia have to build a good cooperation internationally on political, economic and cultural levels with democratic countries based on the 'third-neighbor' policy.

Ultimately, if Mongolia does not deviate from the values of liberal democracy and is not subject to external and internal influences, it will be possible to use the provisions of the Constitution in combination with liberal democracy that 'Mongolia is an independent, sovereign republic' and 'The supreme principles of the activities of the State shall be the guarantee of democracy, justice, freedom and equality and national unit and respect of law'.

### **References**

- Asad, T. (2006). Trying to Understand French Secularism. *Political Theologies: Public Religions in a Post-Secular World*. Ed. In H. d. Sullivan, & H. d. Sullivan. New York: Fordham University Press, 494-526.
- Bayarkhuu, D. (2018). *The Geopolitic and Foreign Policy of Mongolia*. Ulaanbaatar: Munkhiin Useg Press.
- Bingöl, Y. (2004). *Nationalism and Democracy in Post-Communist Central Asia*. Kocaeli: Carfax.

- Bold, R. (2018). *The Geopolitical Issues of Mongolia*. Ulaanbaatar: National Academy of Governance Press.
- Byambasuren, D. (2017). “Nadad 1990-Eed Ony Ued Uls Ornyhoo Tuluu Hiisen Alkhamuudaa Kharamsakh Zuil Baidaggui”. *Management Skill*. 51.
- Constitution. (1992). Constitution of Mongolia . *Constitution of Mongolia* . Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia: Parliament of Mongolia.
- Freedom House. (2020). *Freedom House*, <https://freedomhouse.org/>: <https://freedomhouse.org/explore-the-map?type=fiw&year=2020>.
- FPCM. (2011). *Foreign Policy Concept of Mongolia (FPCM)*. Ulaanbaatar, Mongolia: Parliament Press (30 October 2018).
- Fraser. (2020). *Fraser Institution*, <https://www.fraserinstitute.org/economicfreedom/map?geozone=world&page=map&year=2017&countries=MNG>.
- GECEM. (2017). *The General Election Commission of Mongolia (GECEM) 's Statistics on Parliament Elections in Mongolia 1992-2016*. Ulaanbaatar: Admon Print.
- Heywood, A. (2017). *Political Ideologies*. London: Palgrave.
- Huntington, S. P. (1991). *The Third Wave: Democratization in the late Twentieth Century*. London: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Jeffries, I. (2007). *Mongolia: A Guide to Economic and Political Developments*. New York: Routledge.
- Lattimore, O. (1956). “Satellite Politics: The Mongolian Prototype”. *The Western Political Quarterly*. 9 (1), 36-43, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/443249>.
- Lijphart, A. (2012). *PATTERNS OF DEMOCRACY Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- MFA. (2018). *Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Mongolia*. Ulaanbaatar: Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Mongolia, <http://www.mfa.gov.mn/> (12 May 2019).
- Norris, P. (2012). *Making Democratic Governance Work*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmücking, D. (2015). *Search for the Third Border: Mongolian Foreign Policy between Russia and China* . Bonn: Konrad Adenauer Foundation.
- SCM. (2020). *Supreme Court of Mongolia*, <http://www.supremecourt.mn/nam>.
- Stepan, A. (2011). The Multiple Secularisms of Modern Democratic and Non-Democratic Regimes. *Rethinking Secularism*. Ed. In M. J. Craig Calhoun. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 121.
- Taylor, S. L. (2012). *30-Second Politics*. London: Ivy Press Limited.
- Vietor, R. (2006). *How Countries Compete: Strategy and Structure*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- World Bank. (2020). *Doing Business 2020*, <http://www.doingbusiness.org> (12 January 2019).
- World Bank. (2020). *World Bank*, <https://www.worldbank.org/en/country/mongolia/overview>.

