Youth Movements and Elections in Non-Democracies

Olena Nikolayenko

Department of Political Science
Fordham University
onikolayenko@fordham.edu

NOTE: The attached document is an introductory chapter in the book-length manuscript about nonviolent youth movements in the post-communist region. The next page includes the Table of Contents to give you an idea of how the rest of the book is structured.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1. Introduction: The Revolt of Post-Communist Youth

Chapter 2. Elections as an Opportunity for Political Change

Chapter 3. Otpor's Resistance until Victory

Chapter 4. Zubr's Struggle against Lukashism

Chapter 5. Kmara! Enough of Corruption and Poverty in Georgia

Chapter 6. Pora: It's Time to Win in Ukraine

Chapter 7. Resistance of Azerbaijani Youth

Chapter 8. Conclusion

Chapter 1. Introduction: The Revolt of Post-Communist Youth

Over the past decade, there has been a tide of nonviolent youth movements in the post-communist region. Young people mobilized on the eve of national elections to demand political change in repressive political regimes that took root since the collapse of communism. In 2000 the Serbian social movement Otpor (Resistance) formed by a small group of students from the University of Belgrade recruited thousands of young people and propelled electoral defeat of the incumbent president. Within three months after Slobodan Milosevic's resignation, the Belarusian youth movement Zubr (Bison) was set up to call for the removal of the incumbent president from power through the 2001 presidential elections. Similarly, the youth movement Kmara (Enough) was formed in the Republic of Georgia shortly before the 2003 parliamentary elections to push for the turnover of power. This tide of youth activism continued with the emergence of two Ukrainian youth movements with the same name – Pora (It's Time) – on the eve of the 2004 presidential elections. Inspired by the example of prior success, Azerbaijani youth formed the youth movements Maqam (It's Time), Yeni Fikir (New Thinking), and Yokh (No) to campaign for political change in the run up to the 2005 parliamentary elections. Never before have post-communist youth mobilized against the regime on such a grand scale.

A striking feature of these youth movements was the adoption of similar strategies regarding the timing of mass mobilization, the content of movement claims, and the repertoire of contention. Almost all the youth movements were formed during an election year.[1] In anticipation of vote rigging, youth activists campaigned for free and fair elections and targeted the incumbent president as a major obstacle to democratization. Another common attribute of the youth movements was the use of nonviolent methods. The cross-national diffusion of ideas explains, to a large extent, cross-movement similarities.[2] Since post-communist youth shared similar political values and faced a similar set of institutional constraints on political participation, the attribution of similarity provided the basis for the adoption of Otpor's tactics.[3]

Some youth movements, however, were more successful than others in mobilizing young people in favor of political change. Otpor recruited thousands of youngsters to wage nonviolent struggle against the incumbent president. Similarly, thousands of young Ukrainians challenged the power of the ruling elite through nonviolent action. Albeit on a smaller scale, Kmara enlisted a sufficiently large number of young people to campaign for radical reforms. In contrast, Zubr mobilized a relatively small number of young people to tilt the power balance in its favor.

---

[1] Otpor was formed in October 1998, nearly two years prior to the 2000 federal elections. Yeni Fikir was set up in April 2004, nineteen months prior to the 2005 parliamentary elections.

[2] On the cross-national diffusion of ideas, see Arias-King, Fredo. 2007. "Orange People: A Brief History of Transnational Liberation Networks in East Central Europe." *Demokratizatsiya: Journal of Post-Soviet Democratization* (Winter): 293–71; Beissinger, Mark R. 2007. "Structure and Example in Modular Political Phenomena: The Diffusion of Bulldozer/Rose/Orange/Tulip Revolutions." *Perspectives on Politics* 5(2): 259–76; Beissinger, Mark R. 2009. "An Interrelated Wave." *Journal of Democracy* 20(1): 74–77; Bunce, Valerie and Sharon Wolchik. 2010. "Defeating Dictators: Electoral Change and Stability in Competitive Authoritarian Regimes." *World Politics* 43(1): 43–86; Bunce, Valerie and Sharon Wolchik. 2011. *Defeating Authoritarian Leaders in Post-Communist Countries*. New York: Cambridge University Press; Fenger, Menno. 2007. "The Diffusion of Revolutions: Comparing Recent Regime Turnovers in Five Post-communist States." *Demokratizatsiya: Journal of Post-Soviet Democratization* (Winter): 5–27.

[3] On belonging to the post-Soviet generation as the basis for the attribution of similarity, see Nikolayenko, Olena. 2007. "The Revolt of the Post-Soviet Generation: Youth Movements in Serbia, Georgia, and Ukraine." *Comparative Politics* 39(2): 169–88.

Furthermore, Maqam, Yeni Fikir, and Yokh had approximately 100 members each by the time of the parliamentary elections.

This book argues that tactical interactions between social movements and incumbent governments explain, in part, divergent levels of youth mobilization. Tactical interaction is "an ongoing process … in which insurgents and opponents seek, in chess-like fashion, to offset the moves of the other."[4] On the one hand, the social movement seeks to attain its goals through the deployment of novel tactics. On the other hand, the movement's adversary tries to counteract these threats through countermobilization tactics. The level of youth mobilization is affected by the extent to which the social movement and the incumbent government deploy innovative tactics and offset each other's moves.

This study further contends that learning is vital to the development of effective tactics. The analysis focuses on two learning mechanisms: participation in previous protest campaigns and the cross-national diffusion of ideas. The underlying assumption is that both civic activists and the ruling elite can draw lessons from earlier episodes of mass mobilization. Movement participants can devise more effective tactics if they critically assess the dynamics of previous protest campaigns inside and outside the country. Similarly, the incumbent government can deploy more effective countermobilization tactics if it takes cues from prior upheavals in politically affinitive contexts. The pace of learning by civic activists and incumbent rulers accounts, to some extent, for cross-country differences in state-movement interactions.

This research seeks to contribute to three bodies of literature. First, this study contributes to comparative democratization literature by examining the development of youth movements in the post-communist region. In recent years, there has been an explosion of research on the so-called electoral revolutions in Eastern Europe.[5] Moreover, the Arab Spring has stimulated interest in the study of mass protests and civic activism in the Middle East.[6] Young people played a prominent role in these protest events. Insufficient academic attention, however, has been devoted to youth movements as an agent of social change.[7] This study traces how youth

---

[4] McAdam, Doug. 1983. "Tactical Innovation and the Pace of Insurgency." *American Sociological Review* 48(6): 735–54, p. 736.

[5] See, for example, Beissinger, Mark R. 2007. "Structure and Example in Modular Political Phenomena: The Diffusion of Bulldozer/Rose/Orange/Tulip Revolutions"; Bunce, Valerie and Sharon Wolchik. 2011. *Defeating Authoritarian Leaders in Post-Communist Countries;* Forbig, Joerg and Pavol Demes, eds. 2007. *Reclaiming Democracy: Civil Society and Electoral Change in Central and Eastern Europe*. Washington, D.C.: The German Marshall Fund; Hale, Henry. 2006. "Democracy or Autocracy on the March?: The Colored Revolutions as Normal Dynamics of Patronal Presidentialism." *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 39: 305–29; Kuntz, Philipp and Mark Thompson. 2009. "More than Just the Final Straw: Stolen Elections as Revolutionary Triggers." *Comparative Politics* 41(3): 253–72; McFaul, Michael. 2005. "Transitions from Postcommunism." *Journal of Democracy* 16(3): 5–19; Way Lucan. 2008. "The Real Causes of the Color Revolutions." *Journal of Democracy* 19(3): 55–69.

[6] Anderson, Lisa. 2011. "Demystifying the Arab Spring: Parsing the Differences between Tunisia, Egypt, and Libya." *Foreign Affairs* 90(3): 2–7; Bellin, Eva. 2012. "Reconsidering the Robustness of Authoritarianism in the Middle East: Lessons from the Arab Spring." *Comparative Politics* 44(2): 127–49; Masoud, Tarek. 2011. "The Road to (and from) Liberation Square." *Journal of Democracy* 22(3): 20–34.

[7] Bunce, Valerie and Sharon Wolchik. 2006. "Youth and Electoral Revolutions in Slovakia, Serbia, and Georgia." *SAIS Review* 26(2): 55–65; Hoffman, Michael and Amaney Jamal. 2012. "The Youth and the Arab Spring: Cohort Differences and Similarities." *Middle East Law and Governance* 4(1): 168–88; Kuzio, Taras. 2006. "Civil Society, Youth, and Societal Mobilization in Democratic Revolutions." *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 39(3): 365–86; Lim, Merlyna. 2012. "Clicks, Cabs, and Coffee Houses: Social Media and Oppositional Movements in Egypt, 2004-2011." *Journal of Communication* 62(2): 231–48; Nikolayenko, Olena. 2012. "Tactical Interactions between

movements in five post-communist states sought to mobilize citizens against the regime on the eve of national elections.

Second, this research adds to social movement literature by analyzing state-movement interactions in political regimes falling somewhere between democracy and dictatorship. The bulk of empirical work has been done in advanced industrial democracies or autocracies.[8] The proliferation of hybrid regimes in the post-Cold War period provides an under-studied context for the analysis of contentious politics.[9] This study argues that the regime type affects the timing of mass mobilization, the scope of movement demands, the repertoire of contention, and the toolkit of state repression.

Third, this study contributes to the bourgeoning body of research on nonviolent action.[10] Within this literature, analysis of defeated unarmed insurrections is greatly outnumbered by examination of the triumphant use of nonviolent action. Unlike most previous work, this study includes cases of both successful and failed mobilization. While Azerbaijani and Belarusian youth movements were unable to mobilize thousands of young people against the regime during the covered period, the analysis of their tactical missteps can advance our understanding of nonviolent resistance and inform their ongoing struggle for political change.

The remainder of the chapter provides theoretical and empirical context for this study. The chapter sketches a profile of post-communist youth who grew up in the 1990s and revolted against the ruling elite in 2000s. The chapter also specifies the level of youth mobilization against the regime and explains the case selection. Next, the chapter lays out a theoretical framework for explaining the level of youth mobilization against the regime. The chapter concludes by describing data sources and providing a roadmap for the rest of the book.

Youth Movements and Incumbent Governments in Post-Communist States." *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts, and Change* 34: 27–61.

[8] Banaszak, Lee Ann, Karen Beckwith, and Dieter Rucht, eds. 2003. *Women's Movements Facing the Reconfigured State*. New York: Cambridge University Press; Boudreau, Vincent. 2004. *Resisting Dictatorship: Repression and Protest in Southeast Asia*. New York: Cambridge University Press; Goodwin, Jeff. 2001. *No Other Way Out: States and Revolutionary Movements, 1945-1991*. New York: Cambridge University Press; McAdam, Doug. 1983. "Tactical Innovation and the Pace of Insurgency." *American Sociological Review* 48(6): 735–54; Shriver, Thomas and Alison Adams. 2010. "Cycles of Repression and Tactical Innovation: The Evolution of Environmental Dissent in Communist Czechoslovakia." *Sociological Quarterly* 51: 329–54; Yashar, Deborah. 1997. *Demanding Democracy: Reform and Reaction in Costa Rica and Guatemala, 1870s-1950s*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press; Zwerman, Gilda and Patricia Steinhoff. 2005. "When Activists Ask for Trouble: State-Dissident Interactions and the New Left Cycle of Resistance in the United States and Japan." In Christian Davenport, Hank Johnston, and Carol Mueller, eds. *Repression and Mobilization*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 85–107.

[9] On the conceptualization of the hybrid regime, see Diamond, Larry. 2002. "Thinking about the Hybrid Regimes." *Journal of Democracy* 13(2): 21–35.

[10] Ackerman, Peter, and Jack DuVall. 2000. *A Force More Powerful: A Century of Nonviolent Conflict*. New York: St. Martin's Press; Martin, Brian and Wendy Varney. 2003. *Nonviolence Speaks: Communicating against Repression*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press; Nepstad, Sharon Erickson. 2011. *Nonviolent Revolutions: Civil Resistance in the Late 20th Century*. New York: Oxford University Press; Roberts, Adam and Timothy Garton Ash, eds. 2009. *Civil Resistance and Power Politics: The Experience of Non-violent Action from Gandhi to the Present*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; Schock, Kurt. 2005. *Unarmed Insurrections: People Power Movements in Nondemocracies*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press; Sharp, Gene. 2005. *Waging Nonviolent Struggle: Twentieth Century Practice and Twenty-First Century Potential*. Boston, MA: Porter Sargent; Stephan, Maria, ed. 2009. *Civilian Jihad: Nonviolent Struggle, Democratization, and Governance in the Middle East*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan; Zunes, Stephen, Lester Kurtz, and Sarah Beth Asher, eds. 1999. *Nonviolent Social Movements: A Geographical Perspective*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Post-Communist Youth
Youth is here conceptualized as a distinct life stage between adolescence and adulthood.[11] This life stage is marked by dramatic changes in one's education attainment, employment status, and personal relationships. At this life stage, individuals tend to complete education and move into the labor force. It is also a common period for courtship and marriage. Furthermore, youth is a period of experimentation and instability before settlement into enduring adult roles. These individual-level shifts in one's psychosocial development also leave an imprint on society. Youth is widely viewed as an agent of social change due to its tendency to question conventional norms and construct a distinct social identity.

For the purpose of statistical analysis, the United Nations defines youth as "those between the ages of 15 and 24."[12] In accordance with the UN definition, the youth population constitutes 1.2 billion people, or approximately one-fifth of the world's population.[13] The size of the youth population in the post-communist region falls below the world's average. Of the five selected states, Azerbaijan has the largest youth population (20.1 percent) and Serbia – the lowest (13.6 percent). The age boundaries of youth, however, vary across UN member states due to cross-country differences in the legal definition of youth and the social construction of youth identity.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

This study defines youth as persons between the ages of 15 and 29. As shown in Table 1, the legal definition of youth in the selected states extends into the late 20s or early 30s. The government of Azerbaijan, for example, defines youth as 14-29 year olds,[14] while the governments of Belarus and Serbia further extend the legal definition of youth by one or two years.[15] Since 1993, the Ukrainian government changed the age brackets for the legal definition of youth from 14-28 to 14-35.[16] Of five states, only Georgia currently lacks the legal definition of youth in its legislation. The reported age category is taken from a law on youth organizations, defined as non-commercial entities in which 18-26 year old citizens constitute no less than two-thirds of members.[17]

A pattern of recent demographic changes in the post-communist region provides another reason for a contextualized definition of youth. The mean age at first marriage increased in all

---

[11] On the conceptualization of youth, see Keniston, Kenneth. 1971. *Youth and Dissent: The Rise of a New Opposition*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace.

[12] United Nations. 2007. *World Youth Report. Young People's Transition to Adulthood: Progress and Challenges*. New York: Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, p. vi.

[13] United Nations. 2007. *World Youth Report. Young People's Transition to Adulthood: Progress and Challenges,* p.xv.

[14] Hajyev, Farhad. 2011. *Reviews on Youth Policies and Youth Work in the Countries of South East Europe, Eastern Europe and Caucasus: Azerbaijan*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe, p. 5.

[15] Nicolic,Tamara. 2011. *Reviews on Youth Policies and Youth Work in the Countries of South East Europe, Eastern Europe and Caucasus: Serbia*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe, p. 7; Oleinik, Yaroslav. 2011. *Reviews on Youth Policies and Youth Work in the Countries of South East Europe, Eastern Europe and Caucasus: Belarus*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe, p. 5.

[16] Borenko, Yaryna. 2010. *Reviews on Youth Policies and Youth Work in the Countries of South East Europe, Eastern Europe and Caucasus: Ukraine*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe, p. 8.

[17] Asanidze, Vakhtang. 2011. *Reviews on Youth Policies and Youth Work in the Countries of South East Europe, Eastern Europe and Caucasus: Georgia*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe, p. 7.

the selected states, with the exception of Azerbaijan.[18] In Serbia, for example, the mean age at first marriage climbed up from 27.5 for men and 24.0 for women in 1995 to 29.6 for men and 26.3 for women in 2007. Similarly, the mean age at first marriage increased from 27.1 for men and 23.6 for women in 1995 to 29.4 for men and 25.6 for women in 2007 in Georgia. In contrast, the timing of first marriage hardly changed in Azerbaijan,[19] with 27.5 as the mean age at first marriage for men and 23.0 as the mean age at first marriage for women. The percentage of persons ever married by certain age is another indicator of youth's postponement of marriage until late 20s. The percentage of ever married 20-24 year old persons stood at 9.7 percent in Serbia (2002), 15.2 percent in Azerbaijan (2006), 25.5 percent in Ukraine (2007), and 29.8 percent in Belarus (1999).[20] By the age of 29, the share of ever married surged to 40 percent in Serbia, 63.9 percent in Azerbaijan, 67.4 percent in Ukraine, and 72.3 percent in Belarus. By the same token, there is a gradual trend toward the delay of first childbirth.[21] In Belarus, for example, the mean age at first childbirth increased from 22.9 in 1995 to 24.2 in 2007. The mean age at first childbirth was the lowest in Azerbaijan (23.7) and the highest in Serbia (26.2) in 2007. Based upon these demographic trends, it is reasonable to extend the definition of youth into the late 20s.

As seen in Table 1, the youth population comprised of 15-29 year old people represents approximately 20 percent of the total population in the selected states. The size of the youth population is above the region's average in Azerbaijan, since this former Soviet republic continues to sustain positive population growth in the post-Soviet period.[22] Overall, however, population dynamics in the selected states reflect a global trend of the increasingly ageing population. Still, youth plays an important symbolic role in post-communist societies. As one former Otpor activist put it:

> Youth are small in numbers in the former Soviet republics, these are "old nations." But students are perceived as the future of the nation. If they turn to the street, it signals to the rest of people that something is wrong. They don't stand only for themselves, but also for their families.[23]

The symbolic importance of contemporary youth in the post-communist region is amplified by the fact that this cohort of young people represents a post-Soviet generation.[24] This

---

[18] See Table A3. Mean Age at First Marriage, in United Nations. 2011. *World Fertility Report 2009*. New York: Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/WFR2009_Web/Data/DataAndSources.html.

[19] The mean age at first marriage for men slightly dropped from 27.5 in 1995 to 27.4 in 2007, while the mean age at first marriage for women increased from 23.0 in 1995 to 23.3 in 2007.

[20] The data are unavailable for Georgia. See Table A5. Percentage Ever Married by Age Group, in United Nations. 2011. *World Fertility Report 2009*. New York: Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/WFR2009_Web/Data/DataAndSources.html.

[21] See Table A9. Mean Age at First Childbirth, in United Nations. 2011. *World Fertility Report 2009*. New York: Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/WFR2009_Web/Data/DataAndSources.html.

[22] On population growth rates in the region, see United Nations. 2008. *Demographic Yearbook 2006*. New York: Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division, pp. 58–69.

[23] Author's interview with Srdja Popovic, Belgrade, Serbia, 23 January 2008.

[24] On generational change, see Diuk, Nadia. 2004. "The Next Generation." *Journal of Democracy* 15(3): 59–66; Diuk, Nadia. 2012. *The Next Generation in Russia, Ukraine, and Azerbaijan: Youth, Politics, Identity, and Change*.

generation was born in the late Soviet period and grew up against the backdrop of dramatic societal transformations in the aftermath of the Soviet demise. As adolescents, they observed transition from communism and the introduction of market reforms.[25] A whirlwind of political transformations resulted in the public dismissal of Marxist-Leninist ideology and the steep decline of the Communist Youth League, known as Komsomol. In addition, the arrival of new economic freedoms enabled some young people to display their entrepreneurial skills, while others suffered from the abrupt loss of the state guarantee of lifetime employment and the dwindling pool of welfare services.

Moreover, post-communist youth witnessed the advancement of two concurrent processes: the revival of national culture and the influx of Western cultural products. Compared to older generations, young people had more opportunities to attend school with the language of the titular nation as the language of instruction and learn about previously forbidden episodes of national history. For example, the proportion of students enrolled in Ukrainian-language secondary schools increased from 47.4 percent in 1988-89 to 60.5 percent in 1996-97 in Ukraine.[26] As a result of de-Russification policies, the level of youth's fluency in Russian declined in the former Soviet republics. Less than half of Azerbaijani youth, for example, reported knowledge of the Russian language in 2003.[27] Meanwhile, the young generation had greater exposure to Western culture due to the newly gained freedom of movement and the increasing use of social media.[28] Young people became the most active Internet users in the region. In 2005, for example, 23.2 percent of 18-29 year old Ukrainians, compared to 2.1 percent of those over 55, used the Internet.[29] These socialization experiences left an imprint on political values and behavior of the young generation. An Otpor member Sveta Matic described his generation as follows:

> We're a generation that likes to play jokes, to laugh all the time, and that is our secret weapon. We're sick of being defined by a glorious loser. We want to join the rest of the world.[30]

Opinion polls show that young people exhibit a higher level of support for democracy than older citizenry in the post-communist region.[31] Haerpfer (2002), for example, finds that 18-

---

New York: Rowman and Littlefield; McFaul, Michael. 2003. "Generational Change in Russia." *Demokratizatsiya: Journal of Post-Soviet Democratization* 11(1): 64–78.

[25] For an overview of these processes, see Roberts, Kenneth, S.C. Clark, Colette Fagan, and Jochen Tholen. 2000. *Surviving Post-Communism: Young People in the Former Soviet Union*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

[26] Janmaat, Jan Germen. 1999. "Language Politics in Education and the Response of the Russians in Ukraine." *Nationalities Papers* 27: 475–501, p. 483.

[27] Diuk, Nadia. 2012. *The Next Generation in Russia, Ukraine, and Azerbaijan: Youth, Politics, Identity, and Change*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield, p. 149.

[28] For an in-depth analysis of globalization and youth culture in Eurasia, see Blum, Douglas. 2007. *Globalization, Identity, and State-Society Relations: Youth Socialization in Post-Soviet Eurasia*. New York: Cambridge University Press; Pilkington, Hillary, et al. 2002. *Looking West? Cultural Globalization and Russian Youth Cultures*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

[29] The Institute of Sociology. 2005. *Ukrainian Society 2005: Social Monitoring* [data file]. Kyiv, Ukraine: The National Academy of Science of Ukraine. N=1,800.

[30] Rubin, Joe. 2000. "The Kids Who Could Topple Milosevic." *Mother Jones* September 26. Retrieved from http://motherjones.com/politics/2000/09/kids-who-confronted-milosevic.

[31] See Gibson, James, Raymond Duch, and Kent Tedin. 1992. "Democratic Values and the Transformation of the Soviet Union." *Journal of Politics* 54(2): 329–71; Reisinger, William, Arthur Miller, Vicki Hesli, and Kristen Hill Maher. 1994. "Political Values in Russia, Ukraine, and Lithuania: Sources and Implications for Democracy." *British*

29 year old survey respondents were the strongest supporters of democratic values in twelve out of fifteen post-communist states included in the study.[32] Specifically, 32 percent of young Ukrainians and 28 percent of young Belarusians reported favorable attitudes toward democracy in 1994, compared to 25 percent of all voting-age Ukrainians and 23 percent of all Belarusians.[33] A more recent survey conducted in December 2000 also shows that the association of democracy with human rights declines with age in Ukraine, dropping from 73 percent among 18-24 year old respondents to 37 percent among those over 65.[34] Another opinion poll taken in Belarus in 1997 finds that 21.6 percent of 18-29 year old people, compared to 15.3 percent of all the survey respondents, favor "complete and rapid democratization."[35] Yet, positive orientations toward democracy do not necessarily translate into political action.

Consistent with a global trend, youth turnout is generally lower than voter turnout for all voting-age citizens in the post-communist states. The International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES), for example, finds that 52 percent of 18-25 year old survey respondents, compared to 78 percent of older respondents, reported voting in the 2003 presidential elections in Azerbaijan.[36] In particular, first-time voters tend to abstain from exercising the newly-acquired right to vote. In Serbia, for example, only five percent of first-time voters participated in elections preceding Milosevic's electoral defeat.[37] A common explanation for low youth turnout is the absence of strong professional and family commitments, which entails less youth's interest in maintaining the status quo and supporting the political establishment.

The rate of youth's participation in protest activity, on the contrary, tends to be higher. Turning around the above-mentioned explanation for non-voting, the conventional view is that young people are more prone to revolt because they are unsaddled with occupation and family responsibilities and they lack access to positions of power.[38] Nonetheless, the majority of post-communist youth chose to withdraw from contentious politics in the 1990s and early 2000s. For example, an opinion poll conducted in November-December 2000, a few weeks after the murder of the investigative journalist Heorhiy Gongandze, finds that 18-24 year old Ukrainians were slightly less likely to approve of strikes and boycotts as a form of protest than the middle-aged.[39] The newly formed youth movements engendered political awakening of the young generation.

Journal of Political Science 24(2): 183–223; Rose, Richard, William Mishler, and Christian Haerpfer. 1998. *Democracy and Its Alternatives: Understanding Post-Communist Societies.* Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

[32] Haerpfer, Christian. 2002. *Democracy and Enlargement in Post-Communist Europe: The Democratisation of the General Public in Fifteen Central and Eastern European Countries, 1991-1998.* London: Routlege, pp. 52–54.

[33] Haerpfer, Christian. 2002. *Democracy and Enlargement in Post-Communist Europe,* pp. 44, 53.

[34] Carson, Thomas. 2001. *Attitudes toward Change, the Current Situation and Civic Action in Ukraine.* Washington, DC: International Foundation for Electoral Systems, pp. 11–12.

[35] Titarenko, Larissa. 2003. "Post-Soviet Youth: Engagement in Civil Society – Belarus and Beyond." *Demokratizatsiya: Journal of Post-Soviet Democratization* 7(3): 413–36, p. 423.

[36] Sharma, Rakesh. 2005. *Azerbaijan Looks to Its Future: Social Attitudes and Trends 2004.* Washington, DC: International Foundation for Electoral Systems, p. 20.

[37] Paunovic, Zarko, Natasa Vuckovic, Miljenko Dereta, and Maja Djordevic. 2000. *Exit 2000: Non-governmental Organizations for Democratic and Fair Elections.* Belgrade: Verzal Printing House, p. 31.

[38] On this point, see Karklins, Rasma and Roger Petersen. 1993. "Decision Calculus of Protesters and Regimes." *Journal of Politics* 55: 588–615.

[39] The opinion poll was conducted between November 28 and December 5, 2000 (N=1,500). Carson, Thomas. 2001. *Attitudes toward Change, the Current Situation, and Civic Action in Ukraine*, p. 32.

At least, a visible minority of democracy-oriented youth became engaged in nonviolent resistance against the regime.

Youth Mobilization against the Regime
The emergence of youth movements, defined as "organized and conscious attempts on the part of young people to initiate or resist change in the social order,"[40] has been a recent phenomenon in the post-communist region. A number of youth movements were formed on the eve of national elections in political regimes falling somewhere between democracy and dictatorship. On the one hand, democratic institutions are nominally present and multicandidate elections are regularly held in these states. On the other hand, the incumbent ruler violates democratic procedures to the extent the turnover of power is hardly possible. For a combination of democratic and authoritarian features, these regimes are often labeled as hybrid or competitive authoritarian.[41] In this political context, youth activists sought to campaign for political change.

This study focuses on the following youth movements: Kmara (Georgia), Maqam (Azerbaijan), Otpor (Serbia), Pora (Ukraine), Yeni Fikir (Azerbaijan), Yokh (Azerbaijan), and Zubr (Belarus). A common feature of these youth movements is the adoption of similar strategies. Otpor is viewed here as an initiator movement that engendered the emergence of similar youth movements in the region.[42] The paired comparison method guides the selection of the remaining cases. The first pair includes the youth movements from Belarus and Ukraine, while the second pair consists of Azerbaijani and Georgian youth movements. This grouping is based upon the type of national elections and the extent of cultural affinity. The youth movements in Belarus and Ukraine were formed on the eve of the presidential elections, while the youth movements in Azerbaijan and Georgia emerged in the run-up to the parliamentary elections. Moreover, the paired cases share a number of common cultural characteristics. The Belarusian and Ukrainian youth movements were based in East European states with common Slavic heritage, while the Azerbaijani and Georgian youth movements sprang up in the South Caucasus, lying at the crossroads between Europe and Asia. An additional distinct feature of Azerbaijan is that more than 90 percent of the country's population self-identify with Islam.[43]

The present analysis registers cross-movement differences in the size of the youth movement. As shown in Table 1, the Serbian social movement developed the most extensive network of activists. With approximately 70,000 members in 130 branches across the country,[44] Otpor recruited more than four percent of Serbian youth by September 2000. A smaller fraction of the youth population reportedly joined the challenger organizations in Georgia and Ukraine. According to the most optimistic estimates, Kmara's membership reached 3,000 people at the

---

[40] Braungart, Richard G. and Margaret M. Braungart. 1990. "Youth Movements in the 1980s: A Global Perspective." *International Sociology* 5(June): 157–81, p. 157.

[41] Diamond, Larry. 2002. "Thinking about the Hybrid Regimes." *Journal of Democracy* 13 (2): 21–35; Levitsky, Steven and Lucan Way. 2002. "The Rise of Competitive Authoritarianism." *Journal of Democracy* 13 (1): 51–65; Levitsky, Steven and Lucan Way. 2010. *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes after the Cold War*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

[42] On the conceptualization of initiator and spin-off movements, see Doug McAdam. 1995. "'Initiator' and 'Spin-Off' Movements: Diffusion Processes in Protest Cycles." In *Repertoires and Cycles of Collective Action*, ed. Mark Traugott. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 217–39.

[43] On population statistics, see Central Intelligence Agency. 2012. *The World Factbook*. Washington, DC:CIA. Retrieved from https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/aj.html.

[44] Cohen, Roger. 2000. "Who Really Brought Down Milosevic?" *New York Times* November 26. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2000/11/26/magazine/who-really-brought-down-milosevic.html?src=pm.

peak of the movement's activity.[45] Kaskiv et al. (2005) report that Pora had more than 35,000 movement participants,[46] while other Ukrainian activists provide lower estimates of the movement's size. Zubr's membership peaked at approximately 5,000 people in fall 2001 and declined afterwards.[47] Finally, the Azerbaijani youth groups supposedly retained no more than 100 people each by November 2005,[48] while Yeni Fikir activists claimed that approximately 2,500 young people volunteered for the 2005 election campaign of the opposition bloc Azadlyq.[49]

Admittedly, reliable data on the movement size are missing for several reasons. First, the self-definition of the movement's membership was quite ambiguous. Maqam, for example, designated 50 members as activists, an additional 50 members as individuals responsible for "tasks related to the internal affairs of the group," and another 100 people as "general members."[50] Second, most challenger organizations refrained from the systematic collection and storage of membership information due to security concerns. Furthermore, the use of self-reports is problematic because movement leaders tend to exaggerate the movement's size. Notwithstanding data limitations, it is clear that some youth movements were more successful than others in recruiting young people to support their revolutionary cause.

In addition to the size of the youth movement, this study uses several indicators of youth mobilization against the regime. For this purpose, the study distinguishes two types of political participation: voting and protest activity. Youth turnout is a standard measure of youth participation in elections. The vote for an opposition political party or a presidential candidate from the united opposition is another measure of youth mobilization against the regime in non-democracies. The two protest-related indicators of youth mobilization are the size and the length of post-election protests, given the focal point of elections in the movement history.

The Youth Vote

The cross-national analysis of voting behavior is based upon a combination of public opinion polls from each country. The Belgrade-based Centre for Political Studies and Public Opinion Research of the Institute of Social Sciences and the Independent Institute of Socioeconomic and Political Studies founded by Aleh Manau polled voters in November 2000 and October 2001, respectively (N=1,504 for Serbia and N=1,465 for Belarus).[51] The Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Science of Ukraine conducted a survey of the voting-age population in

---

[45] Kandelaki, Giorgi. 2006. "Georgia's Rose Revolution: A Participant's Perspective." *Special Report 167 (July)*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, p. 8.

[46] Kaskiv, Vladyslav, Iryna Chupryna, Anastasiya Bezverkha, and Yevhen Zolotariov. 2005. *A Case Study of the Civic Campaign Pora and the Orange Revolution in Ukraine*. Retrieved from http://www.pora.org.ua.

[47] Author's interview with a Zubr member (via Skype), 11 March 2012.

[48] Author's interview with Emin Huseynov, Baku, Azerbaijan, 22 February 2008.

[49] Muradova, Mina and Rufat Abbasov. 2005. "Youth Groups in Azerbaijan Encounter Difficulties During Run-up to Parliamentary Elections." *EurasiaNet* November 3. Retrieved from http://www.eurasianet.org/azerbaijan/news/youth_20051103.html.

[50] Huseynov, Emin. 2006. *Open Letter to US President George Bush*. April 26. Retrieved from http://www.idee.org/Azerbaijan%20Youth%20Appeal%202006.html.

[51] The Centre for Political Studies and Public Opinion Research. *Public Opinion of Serbia 2000/18* [data file]. Belgrade, Serbia: The Institute of Social Sciences; Independent Institute for Socio-Economic and Political Studies. 2001. *Novosti NIESPI*, December Issue. Retrieved from http://www.iiseps.org/arhiv.html.

March 2005 (N=1,800).[52] The amount of available survey data from the South Caucasus is more limited. While the International Foundation for Electoral Systems released data from a public opinion survey conducted in Azerbaijan on November 17–December 20, 2006 (N=1,400),[53] the International Republican Institute restricted access to the raw survey data from the Georgian National Voter Study collected on 11-17 February 2004 (N=1,494).[54] Instead, this study utilizes data from the Caucasus Barometer administered in Tbilisi, the capital city of Georgia in June 2004, three months after the re-run of the parliamentary elections in 150 electoral districts (N=1,472).[55] The use of opinion polls makes it possible to compare voting behavior across age groups. The disadvantage, however, is that any estimate of voter participation in elections may be overstated due to reliance on self-reports of survey respondents.[56]

<div align="center">INSERT TABLE 2 HERE</div>

Table 2 presents a summary of youth participation in the elections under study. One of the findings that emerges from the cross-national analysis is that youth turnout, along with general turnout, varied depending upon the type of election. Voter turnout was higher for the presidential elections in Belarus, Serbia, and Ukraine than the parliamentary ones in Azerbaijan and Georgia. This is consistent with a general trend in voting behavior, indicating that voters tend participate in presidential elections at a higher rate. Nonetheless, the absolute level of self-reported voter participation in the selected presidential elections is quite striking. Nine out of ten survey respondents reported voting in Serbia and Ukraine. Similarly, 86 percent of polled Belarusians reported voting in the 2001 presidential elections. In contrast, 70 percent of Tbilisi voters reported voting in the parliamentary elections. The smallest proportion of the electorate turned to the polls in Azerbaijan. Sixty-four percent of the IFES survey respondents reported voting in the 2005 parliamentary elections.

Another major finding is cross-country differences in the level of voter turnout across age groups. As displayed in Table 2, the percentage difference between youth turnout and general turnout is quite small in Serbia and Ukraine. Remarkably, 86 percent of 18-29 year old survey respondents, compared to 90 percent of those over 60, reported voting in the 2000 elections in Serbia. Similarly, the level of youth turnout in Belarus (80 percent) and Ukraine (more than 80 percent in each round of the elections) nearly matched the level of voter turnout for all citizens.

---

[52] For details, see Panina, Natalia. *Ukrainske suspilstvo 1994-2005: Sotsiologichnyi monitoring*. Kyiv, Ukraine: Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Science of Ukraine and the Fund "Democratic Initiatives."

[53] For an in-depth analysis of survey findings, see International Foundation for Electoral Systems. 2006. *Public Opinion in Azerbaijan 2006: Findings from a Public Opinion Survey*. Washington, DC: International Foundation for Electoral Systems.

[54] The Tbilisi-based Institute of Polling and Marketing conducted the survey, with funding from the United States Agency for International Development. For a summary of survey results, see International Republican Institute. 2004. *Georgian National Voter Study* [PowerPoint Presentation]. Retrieved from http://www.iri.org/explore-our-resources/public-opinion-research/public-opinion-polls#three.

[55] On the survey methodology, see Caucasus Research Resource Centers. 2007. *The Data Initiative: A Brief Overview V. 1.0 Phases 1-3*. Tbilisi, Georgia: CRRC.

[56] On over-reporting of voting, see Ansolabehere, Stephen and Eitan Hersh. 2012. "Validation: What Big Data Reveal about Survey Misreporting and the Real Electorate." *Political Analysis* 20(4): 437–59; Highton, Benjamin. 2005. "Self-Reported Versus Proxy-Reported Voter Turnout in the Current Population Survey." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 69(1): 113–23.

In contrast, the age gap in voter turnout appears to be much wider in Azerbaijan and Georgia, with nearly half of young voters abstaining from participation in elections.

The severity of over-reporting voting is usually estimated based upon the comparison of self-reported voter participation with the official turnout rates. But the Central Election Commissions in the selected states are notorious for the manipulation of electoral results so the official turnout rates are highly unreliable. If we assume the accuracy of official turnout rates, then the highest level of over-reporting is found to be in Azerbaijan: the turnout estimate based upon the IFES opinion poll is 22 percent higher than the official turnout rate.[57] Similarly, the official turnout rate is 18 percent lower in Serbia and at least 10 percent lower in Georgia.[58] The differences between the survey-based turnout estimates (82-85 percent) and the official turnout rates (75-80 percent) are smaller in Ukraine.[59] Strikingly, the survey-based turnout estimate in Belarus closely corresponds to the official turnout rate released by the Central Election Commission (83.6 percent).[60] At least, these cross-country differences in estimates of voter turnout should be kept in mind when comparing levels of youth's participation in elections.

Turning to vote choice, the analysis finds cross-country differences in the size of youth vote for the political opposition, either opposition political parties in the case of the parliamentary elections in Azerbaijan and Georgia or a single candidate from the united opposition in the case of the presidential elections in Belarus, Serbia, and Ukraine. As shown in Table 2, the level of mass support for a presidential contender from the united opposition was higher in Serbia and Ukraine than in Belarus. Specifically, 80 percent of young Serbs and 60 percent of young Ukrainians, compared to only 27.2 percent of young Belarusians, reported voting for an opposition candidate. Another major finding is that the share of votes cast for the opposition by young people was only slightly higher than the share of votes cast for the opposition by older voters. This study, for example, finds that approximately the same proportion of young and older Ukrainians voted for the opposition candidate in 2004. This is somewhat surprising, given a higher level of youth's support for democratic values.

Opinion polls also demonstrate that a small share of Azerbaijani youth self-identify with the opposition political parties. Though the 2006 IFES survey omitted the use of a direct question about one's vote choice, the survey respondents were prompted to name a political party that represented best aspirations of people like them. Interestingly, only 3.7 percent of 18-29 year old Azerbaijanis named one of the three political parties that formed the electoral bloc "Azadlyq" (the Musavat Party, the Popular Front Party of Azerbaijan, and the Democratic Party of Azerbaijan. One-third of young Azerbaijanis mentioned Yeni Azerbaijan Party closely associated with the incumbent president Ilham Aliyev. Moreover, approximately 60 percent of all Azerbaijanis reported that no political party represented well their interests, signifying the absence of a strong opposition party in the country.

---

[57] The official voter turnout rate reported by the Central Election Commission was 42 percent. See OSCE. 2006. *Republic of Azerbaijan Parliamentary Elections (6 November 2005): OSCE/ODIHR Final Report*. February 1. Warsaw, Poland: Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, p. 20.
[58] On the official voter turnout rates, see The International IDEA Voter Turnout Website, http://www.idea.int/vt/.
[59] On the official results of the 2004 presidential elections, visit the web site of the Central Election Commission of Ukraine, http://www.cvk.gov.ua/pls/vp2004/wp0011.html.
[60] OSCE. 2001. *Republic of Belarus Presidential Elections (9 September 2001): OSCE/ODIHR Limited Election Observation Mission Final Report*. October 4. Warsaw, Poland: Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, p. 26.

The cross-age analysis of vote choice in Azerbaijan and Georgia is limited due to the lack of publicly available survey data. Opinion polls on the eve of the 2005 elections showed that mass support for the electoral bloc "Azadlyq" stood at 15 percent.[61] An exit poll by US-based pollsters Mitofsky International and Edison Media Research found that Azadlyq received 12 seats (15 percent of the vote) in the 125-seat national parliament,[62] while the Central Election Commission of Azerbaijan reported that the bloc "Azadlyq" secured only six seats.[63] In contrast, the level of popular support for the opposition was higher in Georgia. According to the parallel voter tabulation, the two main opposition forces in Georgia – National Movement and the Burjanadze-Democrats – received a total of 36.8 percent votes in November 2003.[64] Moreover, 93 percent of Georgians polled in February 2004 agreed that it was the right thing for President Eduard Shevardnadze to resign.[65] In sum, empirical evidence indicates that Azerbaijani voters, including youth, were less inclined to vote for the opposition than the electorate in neighboring Georgia.

Youth Participation in Protests

This study compares the size of post-election protests to gauge the level of youth participation in protest events. Public opinion polls show that young people protested against vote-rigging at a higher rate than older age groups during the selected period. For example, an opinion poll conducted by the Institute of Sociology finds that 8.2 percent of 18-29 year old Ukrainians, compared to 2.1 percent of those over 55, participated in Kyiv protests during the Orange Revolution.[66] Moreover, 17.8 percent of young Ukrainians versus 9 percent of those over 55 were involved in protests outside the capital city. The level of protest potential on the eve of stolen elections also attests to youth's propensity to engage in protest events. In May 2000, for example, 46.8 percent of 18-29 year old people, compared to 29.8 percent of 40-49 year old people, were willing to participate in protest rallies organized by the political opposition in Serbia.[67] By the same token, the media coverage of protest events stresses the role of youthful protesters as catalysts for change.[68] In light of this empirical evidence, the overall size of post-election protests can give us a good proxy for the level of youth participation in these protests.

---

[61] Beehner, Lionel. 2005. *The Importance of Azerbaijan's Parliamentary Elections* [backgrounder]. New York: Council on Foreign Relations. Retrieved from http://www.cfr.org/azerbaijan/importance-azerbaijans-parliamentary-elections/p9139.

[62] Simsek, Ayhan. 2005. "Aliyev Wins Victory, Opposition Rejects Results." *Journal of Turkish Weekly* November 9. Retrieved from http://www.turkishweekly.net/news/21447/aliyev-wins-victory-opposition-rejects-results.html.

[63] OSCE. 2006. *Republic of Azerbaijan Parliamentary Elections (6 November 2005): OSCE/ODIHR Final Report.* February 1. Warsaw, Poland: Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, p. 20.

[64] OSCE. 2003. *Georgia Parliamentary Elections: Post-Election Interim Report (3-25 November 2003).* Warsaw, Poland: Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, p. 5.

[65] International Republican Institute. 2004. *Georgian National Voter Study* [PowerPoint Presentation]. Retrieved from http://www.iri.org/explore-our-resources/public-opinion-research/public-opinion-polls#three.

[66] The Institute of Sociology. 2005. *Ukrainian Society 2005: Social Monitoring* [data file]. Kyiv, Ukraine: The National Academy of Science of Ukraine.

[67] The Centre for Political Studies and Public Opinion Research. *Public Opinion of Serbia 2000/3* [data file]. Belgrade, Serbia: The Institute of Social Sciences. N=1,152.

[68] See, for example, Chivers, C.J. 2004. "Youth Movement Underlies the Opposition in Ukraine." *New York Times* November 28. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2004/11/28/international/europe/28ukraine.html; Cohen, Roger. 2000. "Who Really Brought Down Milosevic?" *New York Times* November 26; Corwin, Julie. 2005. "Fledgling Youth Groups Worry Post-Soviet Authorities." *Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty* April 22. Retrieved from http://www.rferl.org/content/article/1347179.html; Rubin, Joe. 2000. "The Kids Who Could Topple

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

Based upon the media coverage of protest events,[69] this study estimates cross-country differences in the size of post-election protests. By any account, the largest post-election protests were held in Serbia and Ukraine. The number of protesters in Belgrade swelled from 20,000 people on September 26 to as many as 700,000 people on October 5 due to the arrival of citizens from different parts of the country.[70] Similarly, the number of protesters in Kyiv has surged to almost a million people, since the first post-election rally on November 22 attracted more than 100,000 people.[71] At least 50,000 people, representing more than four percent of Tbilisi's population, turned to the street in November 2003.[72] In contrast, the number of participants in post-election protest rallies fluctuated between 15,000 and 20,000 people in Baku.[73] As the least rebellious population, less than one percent of Minsk residents attended a protest rally on election night.[74]

In addition, this study identifies cross-country differences in the length of post-election protests. The longest protest campaign was held in Ukraine, in part, due to the permanent occupation of the main square and the installment of the tent city.[75] Thousands of Ukrainians stayed in the tent city from November to December 2004. Most people protested until the Supreme Court's ruling invalidated the fraudulent election results on December 3 and the

Milosevic." *Mother Jones* September 26. Retrieved from http://motherjones.com/politics/2000/09/kids-who-confronted-milosevic.

[69] The police records as an alternative source of information about protest events are inaccessible to the public, given the nature of the current regimes in these states.

[70] Erlanger, Steven. 2000a. "Yugoslavia's Opposition Leader Claims Victory over Milosevic." *New York Times* September 26. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2000/09/26/world/yugoslavia-s-opposition-leader-claims-victory-over-milosevic.html?pagewanted=all&src=pm; Erlanger, Steven. 2000b. "Milosevic Foes Stage Protests to Force Him to Concede." *New York Times* September 30. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2000/09/30/world/milosevic-foes-stage-protests-to-force-him-to-concede.html?pagewanted=all&src=pm; Vinci, Alessio. 2000. "Mayor Tells Inside Story of Belgrade Uprising." *CNN* October 12. Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2000/WORLD/europe/10/11/yugo.storm/index.html?iref=allsearch

[71] *BBC*. 2004. "Ukraine Poll Protests Escalate." November 23. Retrieved from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/4034287.stm; Chivers, C. J. 2004. "Ukraine Protests Grow, as Crisis Deepens." *New York Times* November 24. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2004/11/24/international/europe/24ukraine.html; Finn, Peter. 2004. "Rally Against Ukraine Vote Swells." *Washington Post* November 24. Page A01; *Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty*. 2004. "Protests Over Presidential Vote Continue in Kyiv." *Newsline* November 23. Retrieved from http://www.rferl.org/content/article/1143287.html**.**

[72] Nodia, Ghia. 2005. "Breaking the Mold of Powerlessness: The Meaning of Georgia's Latest Revolution." In *Enough! The Rose Revolution in the Republic of Georgia 2003*, eds. Zurab Karumidze and James V. Wertsch. New York: Nova Science Publishers, pp. 61–74.

[73] *Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty*. 2005a. "Azerbaijani Opposition Convenes Protest Rally." *RFE/RL Newsline* November 10. Retrieved from http://www.rferl.org/content/article/1143518.html; *Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty*. 2005b. "Azerbaijani Opposition Convenes Rally in Baku." *RFE/RL Newsline* November 14. Retrieved from http://www.rferl.org/content/article/1143519.html.

[74] Cole, Victor, ed. 2001. "Lukashenka Triumphant but Doomed, Say Papers." *Belarus Update* 4(37). New York: International League for Human Rights. Retrieved from http://www.ilhr.org/ilhr/regional/belarus/updates/2001/37.htm.

[75] On post-election protests in Ukraine, see the online archive of *Ukrainska Pravda*, http://www.pravda.com.ua/archives/year_2004/.

national parliament passed laws to provide a legal framework for cleaner elections on December 8, while a few activists stayed on Maidan until December 26, election day for the unprecedented re-run of the second round of the presidential elections. Another relatively long protest campaign was held in Georgia.[76] The opposition political parties organized the first post-election protest rally in Tbilisi on November 4, two days after the parliamentary elections. Subsequently, a round-the-clock protest rally was held in front of the parliamentary building from November 8 to November 14. After a weeklong break, the Georgian opposition forces resumed protest rallies and eventually ousted the incumbent president from office. Likewise, the protest events were held in Serbia for nearly two weeks until the president's resignation. In contrast, the Azerbaijani opposition parties convened only four state-sanctioned rallies in the post-election period, and the opposition leaders rejected youth's call for the installment of the tent city on November 13.[77] Similarly, the Belarusian opposition parties did not organize a sit-in action upon the end of the voting process, and post-election rallies lasted only three days, starting on election night and ending shortly after the terrorist attack on US soil.

Overall, the empirical analysis identifies cross-country differences in the level of youth mobilization against the regime. The Serbian youth movement attracted the largest portion of the youth population, while the total membership in the Azerbaijani youth groups was the lowest. In addition, the youth turnout rates were much higher in Belarus, Serbia, and Ukraine than in Azerbaijan and Georgia. The share of youth votes cast for the political opposition was also the highest in Serbia and Ukraine. Furthermore, post-election protests drew a larger number of people and lasted for a longer period of time in Georgia, Serbia, and Ukraine than in Azerbaijan and Belarus. The next section lays out a theoretical framework for explaining the divergent levels of youth mobilization.

The Significance of Tactics
The choice of tactics is central to the outcome of state-movement interactions. McCammon (2012), for example, demonstrates how the movement's choices affected the odds of struggle for women's jury rights in the United States.[78] Likewise, this study contends that tactics pursued by the youth movements and incumbent governments influenced the level of youth mobilization against the regime. While strategy is a long-term plan of action, tactics denote specific means to execute a strategy.

The present analysis focuses on three types of movement tactics based upon the target of their action: (1) recruitment tactics targeted at the youth population, (2) tactics vis-à-vis allies, and (3) tactics vis-à-vis opponents. Recruitment tactics are critical to the movement's growth because they determine whom and how to recruit into the movement. Moreover, tactics vis-à-vis allies affect the level of youth mobilization because the social movement needs to forge alliances with other social actors to tip the balance of power. Furthermore, tactics vis-à-vis opponents influence the level of youth mobilization, since state repression may trigger public outrage or withdrawal from politics.

---

[76] For a timeline of protest events in Georgia, see *Civil Georgia*, http://www.civil.ge/eng.
[77] *Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty*. 2005. "Azerbaijani Opposition Rally Ends Peacefully in Baku." November 9. Retrieved from http://www.rferl.org/content/article/1062793.html.
[78] McCammon, Holly. 2012. *The US Women's Jury Movements and Strategic Adaptation: A More Just Verdict*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

By the same token, this study distinguishes different types of countermovement tactics. State repression is often defined as "any actions taken by authorities to impede mobilization, harass and intimidate activists, divide organizations, and physically assault, arrest, imprison, and/or kill movement participants."[79] Broadly speaking, this study distinguishes legal, violent, and covert repression.[80] Legal repression involves "the use of laws or the legal system for the purpose of neutralizing dissent"; violent repression denotes the use of "police and other law enforcement to berate, intimidate, and physically rattle dissenters," and covert repression refers to "the practice of spying on an organization and causing disruption within that organization."[81] Another helpful distinction is between coercion, or the use of force, and channeling, a subtler form of repressive action "meant to affect the forms of protest available, the timing of protests, and/or flows of resources to movements."[82] Finally, this study considers the government's support for regime-friendly youth organizations as a form of state action directed against regime-threatening youth movements.

In analyzing movement tactics and state countermoves, this book applies the concept of tactical interaction. As defined by McAdam (1983), tactical interaction consists of two components: tactical innovation of the challenger organization and tactical innovation of its adversary.[83] A related concept describing the dynamic relationship between the social movement and its opponents is Sharp's (1973) idea of "political jiu-jitsu," which refers to the process in which nonviolent action can turn the opponent's repression into a liability by generating shifts in public opinion and tilting power relationships in favor of nonviolent activists.[84] More recently, Hess and Martin (2006) develop the concept of backfire to define "a public reaction of outrage to an event that is publicized and perceived as unjust."[85]

The concept of tactical interaction brings closer to each other two strands of research. One line of inquiry has focused on movement strategies and protest tactics.[86] A major finding in

---

[79] Stockdill, Brett C. 1996. "Multiple Oppressions and Their Influence on Collective Action: The Case of the AIDS Movement." Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Sociology, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL, p. 146.

[80] On this typology of state repression, see Wolfe, Alan. 1973. *The Seamy Side of Democracy: Repression in the United States.* New York: David McKay, pp. 93–124.

[81] Qtd. from Jeffries, Judson. 2002. "Black Radicalism and Political Repression in Baltimore: The Case of the Black Panther Party." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25(1): 64–98, p. 69.

[82] Earl, Jennifer. 2003. "Tanks, Tear Gas, and Taxes: Toward a Theory of Movement Repression." *Sociological Theory* 21(1): 44–68, p. 48.

[83] McAdam, Doug. 1983. "Tactical Innovation and the Pace of Insurgency." *American Sociological Review* 48(6): 735–54.

[84] Sharp, Gene. 1973. *The Politics of Nonviolent Action.* Boston: Porter Sargent.

[85] Hess, David and Brian Martin. 2006. "Repression, Backfire, and the Theory of Transformative Events." *Mobilization* 11(1): 249–67, p. 249.

[86] Beckwith, Karen. 2000. "Strategic Innovation in the Pittson Coal Strike." *Mobilization* 5(2): 179–99; Chabot, Sean. 2000. "Transnational Diffusion and the African American Reinvention of Gandhian Repertoire." *Mobilization* 5(2): 201–16; Gamson, William. 1990. *The Strategy of Social Protest*, 2nd edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing; Ganz, Marshall. 2000. "Resources and Resourcefulness: Strategic Capacity in the Unionization of California Agriculture: 1959–1966." *American Journal of Sociology* 105: 1003–62; Ganz, Marshall. 2009. *Why David Sometimes Wins: Strategy, Leadership, and the California Agricultural Movement.* New York: Oxford University Press; Jasper, James. 1997. *The Art of Moral Protest: Culture, Biography, and Creativity in Social Movements.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press; Jasper, James. 2004. "A Strategic Approach to Collective Action: Looking for Agency in Social Movement Choices." *Mobilization* 9(1): 1–16; McCammon, Holly, Soma Chaudhuri, Lyndi Hewitt, Courtney Sanders Muse, Harmony D. Newman, Carrie Lee Smith, and Teresa M. Terrell. 2008. "Becoming Full Citizens: The U.S. Women's Jury Rights Campaigns, the Pace of Reform, and Strategic Adaptation." *American Journal of Sociology* 113(4): 1104–47; Meyer, David and Suzanne Staggenborg. 2008.

this literature is that social movements tend to deploy a recurrent set of tactics to attain their goals. Tilly (1995) develops the concept of the repertoire of contention to describe "a limited set of routines that are learned, shared, and acted out through a relatively deliberate process of choice."[87] Strike, for example, is a common form of protest used by labor unions. Nonetheless, the repertoire of contention may undergo transformation, and a period of heightened protest activity can engender the development of innovative tactics. Tarrow (1993), for example, finds that Italian workers devised new forms of strike during the protest cycle of the 1960s and 1970s.[88] Empirical evidence further indicates that a significant political defeat may trigger the transformation of movement tactics.[89] This body of literature suggests that civic activists can exercise considerable creativity in nonviolent resistance.

Another strand of research has analyzed state repression.[90] A consistent finding in this literature is that dissent provokes some form of repressive action. The incumbent rulers, however, are not "actors devoid of strategic ability" who are "either blind to protests or able to crudely repress activists using the levers of the state." [91] Like regime opponents, incumbent governments may pursue a wide array of tactics to maintain their grip on power. Specifically, the coercive apparatus may modify its tactics to respond more effectively to a political threat. Della Porta (1995), for example, documents the evolution of policing styles in Italy and Germany from the 1950s to the 1980s.[92] In sum, both the repertoire of contention and the toolkit of state repression may change over time as a result of tactical interactions between the social movement and the incumbent government.

This book extends existing literature by examining state-movement interactions in hybrid regimes. Most empirical research on tactical interactions has been done in advanced industrial democracies.[93] There is also rich empirical literature on the linkage between mass mobilization

"Opposing Movement Strategies in U.S. Abortion Politics." *Research in Social Movements, Conflicts and Change* 28: 207–38; Minkoff, Debra. 1999. "Bending with the Wind: Strategic Change and Adoption by Women's and Racial Minority Organizations." *American Journal of Sociology* 104: 1666–1703; Taylor, Verta, Katrina Kimport, Nella van Dyke, and Ellen Ann Andersen. 2009. "Culture and Mobilization: Tactical Repertoires, Same-Sex Weddings, and the Impact on Gay Activism." *American Sociological Review* 74: 865–90.

[87] Tilly, Charles. 1995. "Contentious Repertoires in Great Britain, 1758-1834." In *Repertoires and Cycles of Collective Action*, ed. Mark Traugott. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 15–42, p. 26.

[88] Tarrow, Sidney. 1993. "Cycles of Collective Action: Between Moments of Madness and the Repertoire of Contention." *Social Science History* 17: 281–307.

[89] McCammon, Holly. 2003. "Out of the Parlors and into the Streets: The Changing Tactical Repertoire of US Women's Suffrage Social Movements." *Social Forces* 81(3): 787–818.

[90] Boykoff, Jules. 2007. "Limiting Dissent: The Mechanisms of State Repression in the United States." *Social Movement Studies* 6(3): 281–310; Davenport, Christian, ed. 2000. *Paths to State Repression: Human Rights Violations and Contentious Politics*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield; della Porta, Donatella and Herbert Reiter, eds. 1998. *Policing Protest: The Control of Mass Demonstrations in Western Democracies*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press; Earl, Jennifer, Sarah Soule and John McCarthy. 2003. "Protest under Fire? Explaining the Policing of Protest." *American Sociological Review* 68(4): 581–606; Moore, Will. 2000. "The Repression of Dissent: A Substitution Model of Government Coercion." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 44(1):107–27; Stanley, William. 1996. *The Protection Racket State: Elite Politics, Military Extortion, and Civil War in El Salvador*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

[91] Ingram, Paul, Lori Qingyuan Yue, and Hayagreeva Rao. 2010. "Trouble in Store: Probes, Protests, and Store Openings by Wal-Mart, 1998–2007." *American Journal of Sociology* 116(1): 53–92, p. 54.

[92] Della Porta, Donatella. 1995. *Social Movements, Political Violence, and the State*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

[93] See, for example, Banaszak, Lee Ann, Karen Beckwith, and Dieter Rucht, eds. 2003. *Women's Movements Facing the Reconfigured State*. New York: Cambridge University Press; Karapin, Roger. 2007. *Protest Politics in*

and repression in autocracies.[94] Shriver and Adams (2010), for example, trace the evolution of environmental dissent and state response in communist Czechoslovakia.[95] Since the collapse of communism, the rise of hybrid regimes provides an under-studied political context for analyzing the interplay between social movements and their opponents.

The tactical interaction in hybrid regimes is distinct in several ways. First, the regime type affects the timing of mass mobilization. Social movements in democracies may articulate their grievances and mobilize supporters anytime due to the systematic provision of political rights and civil liberties. The authoritarian system, on the contrary, regularly inhibits mass mobilization against the ruling elite, stifling most open forms of dissent. Embedded in hybrid regimes, incumbent rulers might open up the political space during an election period by allowing a modicum of political competition. As recent electoral revolutions in the post-communist region demonstrate, large-scale electoral fraud may trigger mass mobilization on an unprecedented level.[96]

Second, the regime type has an impact on the scope of movement demands. Social movements in democracies can advance a wide array of claims, reflecting a broad spectrum of political views in society. In contrast, the range of permissible political claims is quite limited in non-democracies. The most pressing issue for challenger organizations in hybrid regimes is free and fair elections, which is widely regarded as a major step toward democratization. A related movement's demand is state provision of the freedom of the press and freedom of assembly.

Third, the regime type affects movement choices regarding the repertoire of contentious collective action. Social movements in democracies can choose a wider range of protest tactics without fear of state repression. In contrast, the imminent threat of political violence imposes constraints on the repertoire of contention in autocracies. The political context in hybrid regimes, located between these two extremes, compels social movements to tread carefully in the grey zone of politics. In particular, social movements in hybrid regimes need to display more resourcefulness to combine protest tactics allowed in liberal democracies with those deployed in full-blown autocracies.

Furthermore, the regime type influences the toolkit of state repression. In dealing with social movements, incumbent governments in democracies are under public pressure to act

---

Germany: Movements on the Left and Right since the 1960s. University Park: Pennsylvania State Press; Zwerman, Gilda and Patricia Steinhoff. 2005. "When Activists Ask for Trouble: State-Dissident Interactions and the New Left Cycle of Resistance in the United States and Japan." In *Repression and Mobilization*, eds. Christian Davenport, Hank Johnston, and Carol Mueller. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 85–107.

[94]Boudreau, Vincent. 2004. *Resisting Dictatorship: Repression and Protest in Southeast Asia*. New York: Cambridge University Press; Francisco, Ronald A. 1995. "The Relationship between Coercion and Protest: An Empirical Evaluation in Three Coercive States." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 39(2): 263–82; Yashar, Deborah. 1997. *Demanding Democracy: Reform and Reaction in Costa Rica and Guatemala, 1870s-1950s*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press; Zhao, Dingxin. 2000. "State-Society Relations and the Discourses and Activities of the 1989 Beijing Student Movement." *American Journal of Sociology* 105:1592–1632.

[95] Shriver, Thomas and Alison Adams. 2010. "Cycles of Repression and Tactical Innovation: The Evolution of Environmental Dissent in Communist Czechoslovakia." *Sociological Quarterly* 51: 329–54.

[96] Forbig, Joerg and Pavol Demes, eds. 2007. *Reclaiming Democracy: Civil Society and Electoral Change in Central and Eastern Europe*. Washington, D.C.: The German Marshall Fund; Kuntz, Philipp and Mark Thompson. 2009. "More than Just the Final Straw: Stolen Elections as Revolutionary Triggers." *Comparative Politics* 41(3): 253–72; Lindberg, Staffan, ed. 2009. *Democratization by Elections: A New Mode of Transition*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press; Tucker, Joshua. 2007. "Enough! Electoral Fraud, Collective Action Problems, and Post-Communist Colored Revolutions." *Perspectives on Politics* 5(3): 537–53.

within legal boundaries, whereas authoritarian rulers have a freer reign to unleash violence against civic activists and safeguard monopoly on power. In hybrid regimes, however, the incumbent president seeks to maintain a facade of democracy, which precludes the deployment of an overt violent campaign against challenger organizations. Instead, incumbent authorities in hybrid regimes need to exercise ingenuity in manipulating laws and devising extra-legal means to strip social movements of power.

Learning through Experience and Example

This book further contends that learning is critical to the development of effective tactics. This study singles out two learning mechanisms: engagement in previous protest campaigns and the cross-national diffusion of ideas. It is plausible to assume that the domestic history of civic activism affects the dynamics of state-movement interactions. Participation in previous protest campaigns may enable civic activists to strengthen their organizational skills and advance their understanding of various protest tactics. Furthermore, previous episodes of mass mobilization may create "organizational holdovers" that can be activated at a later point in time.[97] Similarly, the incumbent ruler may respond to an outburst of contentious collective action more effectively if he takes a long-term view of state-society relations in the country. In addition, the systematic policing of protest events may bolster the coercive capacities of the state. In the absence of recent episodes of mass mobilization, it becomes more challenging for youth activists to effectively stage civil resistance from scratch and for state authorities to suppress a sudden spike in civic activism.

The cross-national diffusion of ideas, broadly defined as "the flow of social practices among actors within some larger system,"[98] supplies another opportunity for learning. Both youth movements and incumbent governments can exchange ideas with structurally equivalent actors to attain their goals.[99] Della Porta and Tarrow (2012) coin the term "interactive diffusion" to describe the cross-national spread of protest and police tactics in interaction with each other.[100] The model of nonviolent resistance – a set of innovative tactics against the regime – is here considered as the main diffusing item. Another diffusing item is the repertoire of countermovement tactics. The transmission of these conflicting ideas may occur through relational and non-relational channels. Relational channels of diffusion involve direct contact between the transmitter and the adopter of the diffusing item, whereas the use of non-relational channels implies reliance on such impersonal mechanisms as the mass media.[101] Empirically, personal ties between youth activists are easier to trace than behind-the-closed-doors meetings among incumbents in non-democracies.

---

[97] Almeida, Paul D. 2003. "Opportunity Organizations and Threat-Induced Contention: Protest Waves in Authoritarian Settings." *American Journal of Sociology* 109(2): 345–400.

[98] Qtd. from Soule, Sarah. 2004. "Diffusion Processes within and across Movements." In *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, eds. by David A. Snow, Sarah A. Soule, and Hanspeter Kriesi. Malden, MA: Blackwell, pp. 294–310, p. 275.

[99] On the concept of structural equivalence, see Burt, Ronald. 1987. "Social Contagion and Innovation: Cohesion versus Structural Equivalence." *American Journal of Sociology* 92: 1287–1335.

[100] Della Porta, Donatella and Sidney Tarrow. 2012. "Interactive Diffusion: The Coevolution of Police and Protest Behavior with an Application to Transnational Contention." *Comparative Political Studies* 45(1): 119–52, p. 122.

[101] For an overview of diffusion literature, see Strang, David and Sarah Soule. 1998. "Diffusion in Organizations and Social Movements: From Hybrid Corn to Poisonous Pills." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24: 265–90.

The attribution of similarity provides a basis for the diffusion of ideas.[102] Soule (1997), for example, finds that the tactic of the shantytown "diffused most rapidly between colleges and universities of the same institutional type, with similar levels of prestige, and with similar endowment sizes."[103] Similarly, the fact that members of the selected youth movements belonged to the post-Soviet generation and lived in repressive political regimes laid the foundation for the cross-national transmission of ideas. In turn, the incumbent presidents spent their formative years under the communist rule and subscribed to more authoritarian views. President of Belarus Alyaksandr Lukashenka's conception of democracy is a telling example of authoritarian thinking among political leaders in the region. In 1998, two years after a wave of anti-government protests in the country, Lukashenka stated, "We do not need democracy with hullabaloo. We do need the type of democracy where people work and get paid, even if not much but enough to buy bread, milk, sour cream, cottage cheese, and sometimes a piece of meat in order to feed their children."[104] In this political climate, the presence of "collaborative networks" composed of local NGOs, members of the international democracy assistance community, and participants in earlier electoral revolutions facilitated the diffusion of protest tactics.[105]

As mentioned earlier, this book seeks to contribute to the literature by underscoring the significance of learning in shaping tactical interactions between social movements and their opponents. Scholars tend to focus on proximate causes of mass mobilization. In addition, the media attention quickly shifts from one protest event to another, losing sight of long-term struggle against state authorities. Yet, the confrontation between challenger organizations and the ruling elite often lasts an extended period of time. An examination of the long-term record of civic activism can deepen our understanding of state-movement interactions at a particular moment in the country's history.

The Salience of Nonviolent Action

The use of nonviolent methods was a defining feature of the selected youth movements. As the phrase suggests, "nonviolent action is nonviolent – it does not involve physical violence or the threat of physical violence against human beings – and it is active – it involves activity in the collective pursuit of social or political objectives."[106] The deployment of nonviolent methods was primarily predicated on the assumption that nonviolence would enable movement participants to gain more legitimacy in the international community and enlist a higher degree of domestic support for their cause.[107] As illustrated in the subsequent chapters, a number of youth activists shared the view that a nonviolent campaign, rather than a violent one, would be more effective.

---

[102] For a review, see McAdam, Doug and Dieter Rucht. 1993. "The Cross-National Diffusion of Movement Ideas." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 528: 56–74.

[103] Soule, Sarah. 1997. "The Student Divestment Movement in the United States and Tactical Diffusion: The Shantytown Protest." *Social Forces* 75: 855–83, p. 857.

[104] Maksymiuk, Jan. 2006. "Analysis: When Bread is Dearer than Freedom in Belarus." *Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty* March 1. Retrieved from http://www.rferl.org/content/article/1066278.html.

[105] On the importance of transnational social networks, see Bunce, Valerie and Sharon Wolchik. 2006. "International Diffusion and Postcommunist Electoral Revolutions." *Communist and Post-Communist Studies* 39: 283–304.

[106] Schock, Kurt. 2005. *Unarmed Insurrections: People Power Movements in Nondemocracies.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, p. 6.

[107] Stephan, Maria and Erica Chenoweth. 2008. "Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict." *International Security* 33(1): 7–44.

The emergence of nonviolent youth movements in the post-communist region can be considered as a part of "a global wave of unarmed insurrections."[108] As Schock (2005) points out, there has been an explosion in the number of "organized popular challenges to government authority that depend primarily on the methods of nonviolent action" in non-democracies from the late 1970s to the early 1990s.[109] The triumph of such nonviolent social movements as the people's power movement in the Philippines and the Solidarity movement in Poland captured the media attention and inspired civic activists around the globe in the 1980s. More recently, there has been a wave of electoral revolutions in Eastern Europe and popular uprisings in the Middle East. As shown on TV screens around the globe, civic activists used nonviolent methods of resistance to press for political change in non-democracies. In particular, young people displayed a lot of creativity and humor to undermine the strength of the current regime.

This study adds to the growing body of research on civil resistance by comparing the use of nonviolent methods in several post-communist states. While the sight of electoral revolutions in Georgia, Serbia, and Ukraine sparked considerable interest in the study of civil resistance, post-election protests in Azerbaijan and Belarus attracted much less academic attention. This book assumes that the analysis of failed cases can advance our understanding of factors conducive to the effective use of nonviolent action.

Additional Factors

The choice of tactics alone cannot fully explain the level of youth mobilization against the regime, since there is a limit to the power of strategic thinking. The degree of political openness, the presence of social networks, and access to resources also affect the level of mass mobilization.[110] Nonetheless, it requires resourcefulness to take full advantage of openings in the political system and effectively utilize pre-existing social networks and available resources. As Ganz (2009) put it, "strategy is how we turn what we have into what we need to get what we want."[111]

In describing the political context in which the selected youth movements emerged, this study focuses on four dimensions of the political opportunity structure: elite divisions, alignments within the opposition, media access, and the international context. The political opportunity structure refers to "consistent—but not necessarily formal or permanent—dimensions of the political struggle that encourage people to engage in contentious politics."[112] The emergence of divisions within the ruling elite may undermine the government's response to nonviolent resistance against the regime and thus increase the level of youth's engagement in high-risk activism. In particular, security defections are important to the peaceful character of state-movement interactions.[113] Furthermore, the unification of chronically fragmented political

---

[108] Schock, Kurt. 2005. *Unarmed Insurrections*, p. 5.

[109] Schock, Kurt. 2005. *Unarmed Insurrections*, p. xvi.

[110] On the importance of these factors, see Jenkins, Craig. 1983. "Resource Mobilization Theory and the Study of Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology* 9: 527–83; McCarthy, John and Mayer Zald. 2002. "The Enduring Vitality of the Resource Mobilization Theory of Social Movements." In *Handbook of Sociological Theory*, ed. Jonathan Turner. New York: Plenum Publishers, pp. 533–65; Meyer, David S. 2004. "Protest and Political Opportunity." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30: 125–45.

[111] Ganz, Marshall. 2009. *Why David Sometimes Wins*, p. 8.

[112] Tarrow, Sidney. 1998. *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action, and Politics*, 2nd edition. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 19–20.

[113] On the significance of security defections, see Nepstad, Sharon Erickson. 2011. *Nonviolent Revolutions*.

opposition may boost the level of mass mobilization because citizens can identify a viable alternative to the incumbent ruler. In addition, the establishment of new independent media outlets resulting in the growing supply of alternative information may increase the level of mass mobilization.[114] Finally, shifts in world politics may affect the level of mass mobilization because challenger organizations in non-democracies tend to seek external support for their cause.[115]

The existence of mobilizing structures is another critical condition for mass mobilization. The concept of mobilizing structures refers to "collective vehicles, informal as well as formal, through which people mobilize and engage in collective action."[116] The activation of pre-existing social networks may enable youth activists to seize an opportunity for political change. Moreover, pre-existing social networks can serve as a vehicle for the diffusion of ideas. This study views youth organizations and student unions as formal organizations that have the potential to connect young people. In addition, informal social networks bound by common values can emerge in the aftermath of protest events. The present study seeks to determine the presence of pre-existing social networks through the examination of protest campaigns preceding the formation of the selected youth movements.

Furthermore, the movement's access to resources increases the odds of mass mobilization. According to the resource mobilization theory, resource-poor movements are less likely to achieve their goals.[117] This study distinguishes between tangible and non-tangible resources.[118] Monetary resources fall into the category of tangible assets, while human resources belong to non-tangible assets of the social movement. Based upon the available data, the present analysis will discuss the extent to which the selected youth movements enlisted support of influential allies and secured assistance of the international donor community. This study, however, places a higher value on the quality of human resources, rather than the amount of monetary funds, in explaining the level of youth mobilization because the development of savvy tactics hinges upon a cadre of skilful movement leaders.

The added value of studying tactics lies in illuminating how civic activists can alter the political climate, take advantage of pre-existing social networks, and use available resources to mobilize a large number of citizens. First, it is reasonable to assume that the social movement can introduce favorable changes in the political environment through the deployment of effective

---

[114] On the importance of media access in non-democracies, see Osa, Maryjane and Cristina Corduneanu-Huci. 2003. "Running Uphill: Political Opportunity in Non-democracies." *Comparative Sociology* 2(4): 605–29; Schock, Kurt. 1999. "People Power and Political Opportunities: Social Movement Mobilization and Outcomes in the Philippines and Burma." *Social Problems* 46 (3): 355–75.

[115] Voluminous research has examined the international dimensions of democratization. See, for example, Carothers, Thomas. 1999. *Aiding Democracy Abroad: The Learning Curve*. Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; Whitehead, Laurence, ed. 1996. *The International Dimensions of Democratization: Europe and the Americas*. New York: Oxford University Press; Youngs, Richard. 2005. *International Democracy and the West: The Role of Governments, Civil Society, and Multinational Business.* New York: Oxford University Press.

[116] McAdam, Doug, John McCarthy, and Mayer Zald. 1996. "Introduction: Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Framing Processes – Toward a Synthetic Comparative Perspective on Social Movements." In *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings,* eds. Doug McAdam, John McCarthy, and Mayer Zald. New York: Cambridge University Press, p. 3.

[117] McCarthy, John and Mayer Zald. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 82(6): 1212–41.

[118] Freeman, Jo. 1979. "Resource Mobilization and Strategy." In *The Dynamics of Social Movements*, eds. Mayer Zald and John McCarthy. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop, pp. 167–89.

tactics. The challenger organization, for example, can trigger an opening in the political opportunity structure if it skillfully pushes for the unity of the opposition political parties around one presidential candidate on the eve of elections. Second, the social movement can increase the value of pre-existing social networks if it builds a horizontal organizational structure and cultivates a sense of solidarity. Furthermore, the resource-poor movement can overcome its disadvantaged position by displaying creativity in the disbursement of scarce resources. For these reasons, the analysis of tactics contributes to a fuller understanding of factors facilitating or inhibiting mass mobilization.

Data
This research is based upon a combination of sources, including semi-structured interviews with former movement participants, public opinion polls, NGO publications, and media reports. Using the snowball approach, I identified key informants, "a small number of knowledgeable participants who observe and articulate social relationships for the researcher."[119] The main criterion for choosing respondents was a leadership role in the movement. For example, eight out of eleven founding members of Otpor participated in this study.[120] A total of 45 former movement participants were interviewed, representing Pora (N=17), Otpor (N=15), Kmara (N=7), Zubr (N=3), Yokh (N=2), and Maqam (N=1).[121] For ethical and security reasons, the number of respondents is very low in Azerbaijan and Belarus. A number of former movement participants in these two states either face the threat of arrest or are imprisoned. I conducted most interviews during my field trips to the region in January-April 2008 and March-April 2010. The interviews consisted of open-ended questions about movement tactics and state countermoves. A principal advantage of using semi-structured interviewing is that it opens up an opportunity to uncover the logic behind the movement's action and identify themes overlooked or misrepresented in the mass media.[122]

To date, it remains problematic to secure interviews with high-ranking officials responsible for the execution of repressive action in the region. According to the 2012 Freedom House rankings, the selected states, with the exception of Serbia, remain non-democratic.[123] Ukraine, for example, has been sliding into authoritarianism since the start of Viktor Yanukovych's presidency in 2010. The Ukrainian government faced international criticism for the imprisonment of the former Prime Minister Julia Tymoshenko and the former Minister of Internal Affairs Yuriy Lutsenko on trumped-up charges in retaliation for their leading roles in the Orange Revolution. The incumbent President of Georgia Mikheil Saakashvili was also criticized

---

[119] Seidler, John. 1974. "On Using Informants: A Technique for Collecting Quantitative Data and Controlling Measurement Error in Organizational Analysis." *American Sociological Review* 39(6): 816–31, p. 816.

[120] Otpor's eleven founding members were Ivan Andric, Slobodan Djindovic, Slobodan Homen, Milja Jovanovic, Nenad Konstantinovic, Ivan Marovic, Vladimir Pavlov, Vukasin Petrovic, Srdja Popovic, Dejan Randic, and Andreja Stamenkovic.

[121] A full list of interviewees is provided in the Appendix. Upon request, I conceal the identity of some former movement participants.

[122] On the advantages of this research method, see Blee, Kathleen M. and Verta Taylor. 2002. "Semi-Structured Interviewing in Social Movement Research." In *Methods of Social Movement Research*, eds. Bert Klandermans and Suzanne Staggenborg. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 92–117.

[123] Freedom House. 2012. *Freedom in the World Rankings 2012: The Arab Uprisings and their Global Repercussions*. New York: Freedom House, pp. 14–18.

for his non-democratic leadership style.[124] Furthermore, the incumbent presidents in Azerbaijan and Belarus continue to unleash political violence against civic activists for any regime-threatening action, including even an act of youth-organized ice-cream eating in the park.[125] Under these circumstances, most public officials are unlikely to divulge information that might compromise their privileged position.

To compensate for the absence of semi-structured interviews with representatives of the ruling elite, I collected data from government documents, NGO publications, and media reports. In particular, I consulted several online publications that supplied regular coverage of protest events in each country: *Charter 97* (Belarus), *Civil Georgia* (Georgia), *Free Serbia* (Serbia), *Ukrainska Pravda* (Ukraine), and *Zerkalo* (Azerbaijan). I gathered additional empirical evidence about state repression from reports prepared by international NGOs (e.g., Amnesty International, Article 19, and Human Rights Watch) and local NGOs (e.g., Belarus's Human Rights Center Viasna, Serbia's Humanitarian Law Center, and Ukraine's Kharkiv Human Rights Group). A combination of these sources enabled me to trace the government's response to the emergence of regime-threatening youth movements.

Overview of the Book

This book focuses on nonviolent youth movements in Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Serbia, and Ukraine. Chapter 2 describes the political context in the aforementioned states on the eve of national elections. The subsequent chapters analyze state-movement interactions in each country, starting with the case of Serbia and ending with the case of Azerbaijan. Chapter 3 scrutinizes tactical interactions between the Serbian movement Otpor and the incumbent government. Chapter 4 analyzes the adoption of Otpor's ideas and the deployment of countermovement tactics during the 2001 presidential elections in Belarus. Chapter 5 examines the interplay between the youth movement Kmara and the incumbent government on the eve of the 2003 parliamentary elections in Georgia. Chapter 6 is concerned with state-movement interactions during the 2004 presidential elections in Ukraine. Chapter 7 investigates the rise of several youth groups and state repression during the 2005 parliamentary elections in Azerbaijan. The book concludes by summarizing cross-country differences in state-movement interactions and identifying areas for future research.

---

[124] International Crisis Group. 2007. *Georgia: Sliding towards Authoritarianism*. Washington, DC: International Crisis Group.
[125] Khokhlova, Veronica. 2006. "Belarus: Ice Cream Eating Flash Mobbers Detained." *Global Voices* May 15. Retrieved from http://globalvoicesonline.org/2006/05/15/belarus-ice-cream-eating-flash-mobbers-detained/.

Table 1. The Size of the Youth Population and the Size of the Youth Movement

Country	Legal Definition of Youth (a)	Youth Population, 15-29 year old (b)	Youth Populations as % of the Total Population (c)	Size of YM (% of Youth Population) (d)
Azerbaijan	14-29	2,458,320	27.9% (8,825,439)	100 each (0.004%)
Belarus	14-31	2,283,001	22.8% (9,999,789)	5 ,000 (0.22%)
Georgia	18-26	1,033,586	21.9% (4,710,921)	3,000 (0.29%)
Serbia	15-30	1,544,545	20.3% (7,604,335)	70,000 (4.5%)
Ukraine	14-35	10,883,529	23.0% (47,305,388)	35,000 (0.32%)

Note: The legal definition of youth is retrieved from country reports prepared by Council of Europe experts. Population statistics for the election year are retrieved from US Census Bureau's International Database. Entries in column C report the size of the youth population as a percentage of the country's total population, with the size of the total population in parenthesis. The size of the youth movement is reported in raw numbers and as a percentage of the country's youth population in parenthesis.

(a) Asanidze, Vakhtang. 2011. *Reviews on Youth Policies and Youth Work in the Countries of South East Europe, Eastern Europe and Caucasus: Georgia*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe; Borenko, Yaryna. 2010. *Reviews on Youth Policies and Youth Work in the Countries of South East Europe, Eastern Europe and Caucasus: Ukraine*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe; Hajyev, Farhad. 2011. *Reviews on Youth Policies and Youth Work in the Countries of South East Europe, Eastern Europe and Caucasus: Azerbaijan*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe; Nicolic,Tamara. 2011. *Reviews on Youth Policies and Youth Work in the Countries of South East Europe, Eastern Europe and Caucasus: Serbia*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe; Oleinik, Yaroslav. 2011. *Reviews on Youth Policies and Youth Work in the Countries of South East Europe, Eastern Europe and Caucasus: Belarus*. Strasbourg, France: Council of Europe.

(b) and (c) US Census Bureau's International Database. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/population/international/data/idb/informationGateway.php.

(d) Interviews with former movement participants; Cohen, Roger. 2000. "Who Really Brought Down Milosevic?" *New York Times* November 26. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2000/11/26/magazine/who-really-brought-down-milosevic.html?src=pm; Kandelaki, Giorgi. 2006. "Georgia's Rose Revolution: A Participant's Perspective." *Special Report 167 (July)*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace; Kaskiv, Vladyslav, Iryna Chupryna, Anastasiya Bezverkha, and Yevhen Zolotariov. 2005. *A Case Study of the Civic Campaign Pora and the Orange Revolution in Ukraine*. Retrieved from http://www.pora.org.ua.

Table 2. The Youth Vote

Country	Youth Turnout	General Turnout	Youth Vote for the Opposition	All Citizen Vote for the Opposition
Azerbaijan (2005)	47.8	63.8	N/A	12.0
Belarus (2001)	83.3	87.9	27.2	21.0
Georgia (2003)	51.5	70.1	N/A	36.8
Serbia (2000)	86.0	90.0	80.7	70.2
Ukraine (2004)	82.7 85.0 83.7	90.4 90.2 89.2	53.7 60.5 61.6	50.2 60.3 62.4

Note: The turnout rates reported in the table are based upon self-reports of voter participation in the selected elections. The table reports voter turnout for Tbilisi only, rather than Georgia as a whole. For Ukraine, the table reports voter turnout for all three rounds of the presidential elections held on October 31, November 21, and December 26. The percentage of vote for the electoral bloc "Azadlyq" is reported based upon the results of an exit poll conducted by Mitofsky International and Edison Media Research.

Sources: The Caucasus Research Resource Centers. 2007. *Caucasus Barometer* [data file]. Tbilisi, Georgia: CRRC; The Centre for Political Studies and Public Opinion Research. 2000. *Public Opinion of Serbia 2000/18* [data file]. Belgrade, Serbia: Institute of Social Sciences; Independent Institute for Socio-Economic and Political Studies. 2001. *Novosti NIESPI*, December Issue. Retrieved from http://www.iiseps.org/arhiv.html; The Institute of Sociology. 2005. *Ukrainian Society 2005: Social Monitoring* [data file]. Kyiv, Ukraine: The National Academy of Science of Ukraine; International Foundation for Electoral Systems. 2006. *Public Opinion in Azerbaijan 2006* [data file]. Washington, DC: International Foundation for Electoral Systems; OSCE. 2003. *Georgia Parliamentary Elections: Post-Election Interim Report (3-25 November 2003)*. Warsaw, Poland: Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights; Simsek, Ayhan. 2005. "Aliyev Wins Victory, Opposition Rejects Results." *Journal of Turkish Weekly* November 9. Retrieved from http://www.turkishweekly.net/news/21447/aliyev-wins-victory-opposition-rejects-results.html.

Table 3. The Level of Protest Activity

Country	Size of Post-Election Protests (% of the City's Population)	Length of Post-Election Protests
Azerbaijan	20,000 (1.05%)	4 days (Nov. 9, 13, 19, 26)
Belarus	5,000 (0.3%)	3 days (Sept. 9–10, 13)
Georgia	50,000 (4.5%)	12 days (Nov. 4–5, 8–14, 21–23)
Serbia	700,000 (63.6%)	12 days (Sept. 24 – Oct. 5)
Ukraine	1 mln (35.7%)	17 days (Nov. 22 – Dec. 8)

Note: The approximate size of the largest post-election rally is reported in raw numbers and as a percentage of the population in the capital city in parenthesis. The population statistics are retrieved from *The World Factbook*.

Sources: Cole, Victor, ed. 2001. "Lukashenka Triumphant but Doomed, Say Papers." *Belarus Update, 4*(37). New York: International League for Human Rights. Retrieved from http://www.ilhr.org/ilhr/regional/belarus/ updates/2001/37. htm; Nodia, Ghia. 2005. "Breaking the Mold of Powerlessness: The Meaning of Georgia's Latest Revolution." In *Enough! The Rose Revolution in the Republic of Georgia 2003*, eds. Zurab Karumidze and James V. Wertsch. New York: Nova Science Publishers, pp. 61–74; *Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty*. 2005. "Azerbaijani Opposition Convenes Rally in Baku." *RFE/RL Newsline* November 14. Retrieved from http://www.rferl.org/content/article/1143519.html; *The World Factbook*. Washington, DC: Central Intelligence Agency. Retrieved from https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook.