



**Non-profit joint-stock
company**

**ALMATY UNIVERSITY
OF POWER
ENGINEERING AND
TELECOMMUNICATIONS**

Department of “Social
disciplines”

POLITICAL SCIENCE

Synopsis of the lectures
for all specialities

Almaty 2014

The synopsis has been prepared by: Kaparova R.B. Political science. Synopsis of the lectures for all specialities. – Almaty: AUPET, 2014. – P.45.

The proposed synopsis includes references lecture notes for all specialties on the discipline "Political science".

Reviewer: Abdullina Z.A. - PhD, Associate Professor of AUPET

Printed on the basis of Non-profit JSC “Almaty University of Power Engineering and Telecommunications” publishing in 2014 plan of publishing.

© Non-profit JSC “Almaty University of Power Engineering and Telecommunications” 2014 .

Introduction

The course purpose – judgment of policy – the most important phenomenon of human culture. Ability to be guided in political process, to understand an essence of the political phenomena in society, which can't arise at once. For this purpose the knowledge of the most various problems is necessary: character of power, typology of political regimes, condition of political culture. The knowledge of specifics of the government, ability to distinguish legality from legitimacy, etc. is necessary. Political science is the study of governments, public policies and political processes, systems, and political behavior. Political science subfields include political theory, political philosophy, political ideology, political economy, policy studies and analysis, comparative politics, international relations, and a host of related fields.

Problems of a course - to provide strict scientific character, continuity and availability of the content of lecture and seminar classes in a political science course. To provide systemacity, continuity and value of knowledge of a political science course. We know that the main core of the Kazakhstan patriotism are to form and develop at students such qualities as civic consciousness, a pride for the Fatherland, participation in its development. Also to develop and strengthen the skills of independent work received earlier with scientific and political sources, the analysis and ability to draw the correct conclusions.

The knowledge acquired by the person in the course of studying of political science, will allow it to estimate consciously more the place and a role in society, and also to choose the purposes and means of their realization at various levels. Therefore in the course of teaching it is necessary to rely on the principles of objectivity, scientific character, a historicism in the analysis of political realities.

To being formed democratic society of open type with the market relations are necessary the persons capable creatively to think, independently to make decisions and to bear for them responsibility, to direct collectives, effectively to interact in the most different situations with representatives of all social groups, political and ethnic groups of the population. In the solution of these problems the essential contribution can and the political science being an integral part of multidimensional system of knowledge of the person has to bring.

Content of lectures

Lecture 1. Political science subject.

1. Political science as science about policy. Categories of political science.
2. Political science and other humanities. Policy and morals.
3. Development of political thought. Political thought in spiritual heritage of the Kazakh people. Political views in the conditions of a transition period and the statement of Kazakhstan as sovereign state.

1. Political science.

Political science is a social science discipline concerned with the study of the state, nation, government, and politics and policies of government. Aristotle defined it as the study of the state. It deals extensively with the theory and practice of politics, and the analysis of political systems and political behavior, culture. Political scientists “see themselves engaged in revealing the relationships underlying political events and conditions, and from these revelations they attempt to construct general principles about the way the world of politics works”. Political science intersects with other fields; including economics, law, sociology, history, anthropology, public administration, public policy, national politics, international relations, comparative politics, psychology, political organization, and political theory. Although it was codified in the 19th century, when all the social sciences were established, political science has ancient roots; indeed, it originated almost 2,500 years ago with the works of Plato and Aristotle. Political science is commonly divided into five distinct sub-disciplines which together constitute the field:

- political theory;
- comparative politics;
- public administration;
- international relations;
- public law.

Political theory is more concerned with contributions of various classical thinkers such as Aristotle, Niccolò Machiavelli, Cicero, Plato and many others. Comparative politics is the science of comparison and teaching of different types of constitutions, political actors, legislature and associated fields, all of them from an intrastate perspective. International relations deals with the interaction between nation-states as well as intergovernmental and transnational organizations.

Political science is methodologically diverse and appropriates many methods originating in social research.

Approaches include positivism, interpretivism, rational choice theory, behavioralism, structuralism, post-structuralism, realism, institutionalism, and pluralism. Political science, as one of the social sciences, uses methods and techniques that relate to the kinds of inquiries sought: primary sources such as

historical documents and official records, secondary sources such as scholarly journal articles, survey research, statistical analysis, case studies, experimental research and model building.

2. Modern political science.

Because political science is essentially a study of human behavior, in all aspects of politics, observations in controlled environments are often challenging to reproduce or duplicate, though experimental methods are increasingly common (see experimental political science). Citing this difficulty, former American Political Science Association President Lawrence Lowell once said “We are limited by the impossibility of experiment. Politics is an observational, not an experimental science”. Because of this, political scientists have historically observed political elites, institutions, and individual or group behavior in order to identify patterns, draw generalizations, and build theories of politics.

Like all social sciences, political science faces the difficulty of observing human actors that can only be partially observed and who have the capacity for making conscious choices unlike other subjects such as non-human organisms in biology or inanimate objects as in physics. Despite the complexities, contemporary political science has progressed by adopting a variety of methods and theoretical approaches to understanding politics and methodological pluralism is a defining feature of contemporary political science. Often in contrast with national media, political science scholars seek to compile long-term data and research on the impact of political issues, producing in-depth articles breaking down the issues

The advent of political science as a university discipline was marked by the creation of university departments and chairs with the title of political science arising in the late 19th century. In fact, the designation “political scientist” is typically for those with a doctorate in the field. Integrating political studies of the past into a unified discipline is ongoing, and the history of political science has provided a rich field for the growth of both normative and positive political science, with each part of the discipline sharing some historical predecessors. The American Political Science Association was founded in 1903 and the American Political Science Review was founded in 1906 in an effort to distinguish the study of politics from economics and other social phenomena.

3. Political science in the Soviet Union.

In the Soviet Union, political studies were carried out under the guise of some other disciplines like theory of state and law, area studies, international relations, studies of labor movement, “critique of bourgeois theories” etc. Soviet scholars were represented at the International Political Science Association since 1955 (since 1960 by the Soviet Association of Political and State Studies). In 1979 11th World Congress of IPSA took place in Moscow. Until the late years of the

Soviet Union, political science as a field was subjected to tight control of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and was thus subjected to distrust. Anti-communists accused political scientists of being "false" scientists and of having served the old regime.

After the fall of the Soviet Union, two of the major institutions dealing with political science - the Institute of Contemporary Social Theories and the Institute of International Affairs - were disbanded, and most of their members were left without jobs. These institutes were victims of the first wave of anti-communist euphoria and of in many ways unfounded ideological attacks, despite many of the people working in these institutes being competent scientists with a proficient knowledge of political science, and some of them having played an important role in reforming the Communist Party. Today the Russian Political Science Association unites professionals-political scientists from in Russia.

Recent developments

In 2000, the Perestroika Movement in political science was introduced as a reaction against what supporters of the movement called the mathematicization of political science. Those who identified with the movement argued for a plurality of methodologies and approaches in political science and for more relevance of the discipline to those outside of it.

Evolutionary psychology theories argue that humans have evolved a highly developed set of psychological mechanisms for dealing with politics. However, these mechanisms evolved for dealing with the small group politics that characterized the ancestral environment and not the much larger political structures in today's world. This is argued to explain many important features and systematic cognitive biases of current politics.

Subfields

Most political scientists work broadly in one or more of the following five areas:

1. Comparative politics, including area studies.
2. International relations.
3. Political philosophy.
4. Public administration.
5. Public law.

Some political science departments also classify methodology as well as scholarship on the domestic politics of a particular country as distinct sub fields. In the United States, American politics is often treated as a separate subfield.

In contrast to this traditional classification, some academic departments organize scholarship into thematic categories, including political philosophy, political behavior (including public opinion, collective action, and identity), and political institutions (including legislatures and international

organizations). Political science conferences and journals often emphasize scholarship in more specific categories. The American Political Science Association, for example, has 42 organized sections that address various methods and topics of political inquiry.

Lecture 2. Power. Political power and political system.

1. Power as public phenomenon. Types of the power.
2. Power theories. Political power. Its essence and distinctive signs. Power carriers.
3. Concept, definition of political system. Political system, its public functions. Structure of political system.

1. Power as public phenomenon. Types of the power.

In social science and politics, *power* is the ability to influence the behavior of people. The term *authority* is often used for power perceived as legitimate by the social structure. Power can be seen as evil or unjust, but the exercise of power is accepted as endemic to humans as social beings. In the corporate environment, power is often expressed as upward or downward. With downward power, a company's superior influences subordinates. When a company exerts upward power, it is the subordinates who influence the decisions of the leader (Greiner & Schein, 1988).

The use of power need not involve coercion (force or the threat of force). At one extreme, it more closely resembles what everyday English-speakers call influence, although some authors make a distinction between power and influence – the means by which power is used (Handy, C. 1993 *Understanding Organisations*).

Much of the recent sociological debate on power revolves around the issue of the enabling nature of power. A comprehensive account of power can be found in Steven Lukes *Power: A Radical View* where he discusses the three dimensions of power. Thus, power can be seen as various forms of constraint on human action, but also as that which makes action possible, although in a limited scope. Much of this debate is related to the works of the French philosopher Michel Foucault (1926–1984), who, following the Italian political philosopher Niccolò Machiavelli (1469–1527), sees power as “a complex strategic situation in a given society social setting”. Being deeply structural, his concept involves both constraint and enablement. For a purely enabling (and voluntaristic) concept of power see the works of Anthony Giddens.

Tactics

People use more than rewards, threats, and information to influence people. In everyday situations people use a variety of power tactics to push or prompt

people into particular action. There are plenty of examples of power tactics that are quite common and employed every day. Some of these tactics include bullying, collaboration, complaining, criticizing, demanding, disengaging, evading, humor, inspiring, manipulating, negotiating, socializing, and supplicating. These power tactics can be classified along three different dimensions: softness, rationality, and laterality (Falbo & Pepalu, 1980; Raven et al., 1998).

Balance of power

Because power operates both relationally and reciprocally, sociologists speak of the balance of power between parties to a relationship: all parties to all relationships have *some* power: the sociological examination of power concerns itself with discovering and describing the relative strengths: equal or unequal, stable or subject to periodic change. Sociologists usually analyse relationships in which the parties have relatively equal or nearly equal power in terms of *constraint* rather than of power. Thus 'power' has a connotation of unilateralism. If this were not so, then all relationships could be described in terms of 'power', and its meaning would be lost. Given that power is not innate and can be granted to others, to acquire power you must possess or control a form of power currency.

Psychological research

Recent experimental psychology suggests that the more power one has, the less one takes on the perspective of others, implying that the powerful have less empathy. Adam Galinsky, along with several coauthors, found that when those who are reminded of their powerlessness are instructed to draw Es on their forehead, they are 3 times more likely to draw them such that they are legible to others than those who are reminded of their power. Powerful people are also more likely to take action. In one example, powerful people turned off an irritatingly close fan twice as much as less powerful people. Researchers have documented the bystander effect: they found that powerful people are three times as likely to first offer help to a “stranger in distress”.

A study involving over 50 college students suggested that those primed to feel powerful through stating “power words” were less susceptible to external pressure, more willing to give honest feedback, and more creative.

Bargaining games

Bargaining games were explored in year 2003 and year 2004. These studies compared behavior done in different power given situation.

Ultimatum game.

In an ultimatum game, the person in given power offers an ultimatum and the recipient would have to accept that offer or else both the proposer and the recipient will receive no reward.

Dictator game.

In a dictator game, the person in given power offers a proposal and the recipient would have to accept that offer. The recipient has no choice of rejecting the offer.

Bargaining games, conclusion

The dictator game gives no power to the recipient whereas the ultimatum game gives some power to the recipient. The behavior observed was that the person offering the proposal would act less strategically than would the one offering in the ultimatum game. Self-serving also occurred and a lot of pro-social behavior was observed.

When the counterpart recipient is completely powerless, lack of strategy, social responsibility and moral consideration is often observed from the behavior of the proposal given (the one with the power).

Power and control in abusive relationships

In abusive relationships, violence is posited to arise out of a need for power and control of one partner over the other. An abuser will use various tactics of abuse (e.g., physical, verbal, emotional, sexual or financial) in order to establish and maintain control over the partner.

2. Theories.

Five bases of power.

Social psychologists John R. P. French and Bertram Raven, in a now-classic study (1959), developed a schema of sources of power by which to analyse how power plays work (or fail to work) in a specific relationship.

According to French and Raven, power must be distinguished from influence in the following way: power is that state of affairs which holds in a given relationship, A-B, such that a given influence attempt by A over B makes A's desired change in B more likely. Conceived this way, power is fundamentally *relative* – it depends on the specific understandings A and B each apply to their relationship, and, interestingly, requires B's recognition of a quality in A which would motivate B to change in the way A intends. A must draw on the “base” or combination of bases of power appropriate to the relationship, to effect the desired outcome. Drawing on the wrong power base can have unintended effects, including a reduction in A's own power.

French and Raven argue that there are five significant categories of such qualities, while not excluding other minor categories. Further bases have since been adduced – in particular by Morgan (1986: ch.6), who identifies 14, while others have suggested a simpler model for practical purposes – for example, Handy (1976), who recommends three.

Also called “Positional power” it is the power of an individual because of the relative position and duties of the holder of the position within an organization. Legitimate power is formal authority delegated to the holder of the position. It is usually accompanied by various attributes of power such as uniforms, offices etc. This is the most obvious and also the most important kind of power.

Referent power is the power or ability of individuals to attract others and build loyalty. It's based on the charisma and interpersonal skills of the power holder. A person may be admired because of specific personal trait, and this admiration creates the opportunity for interpersonal influence. Here the person under power desires to identify with these personal qualities, and gains satisfaction from being an accepted follower. Nationalism and patriotism count towards an intangible sort of referent power. For example, soldiers fight in wars to defend the honor of the country. This is the second least obvious power, but the most effective. Advertisers have long used the referent power of sports figures for products endorsements, for example. The charismatic appeal of the sports star supposedly leads to an acceptance of the endorsement, although the individual may have little real credibility outside the sports arena. Abuse is possible when someone that is likable, yet lacks integrity and honesty, rises to power, placing them in a situation to gain personal advantage at the cost of the group's position. Referent power is unstable alone, and is not enough for a leader who wants longevity and respect. When combined with other sources of power, however, it can help you achieve great success.

Rational choice framework

Game theory, with its foundations in the Walrasian theory of rational choice, is increasingly used in various disciplines to help analyze power relationships. One rational choice definition of power is given by Keith Dowding in his book *Power*.

In rational choice theory, human individuals or groups can be modelled as “actors” who choose from a “choice set” of possible actions in order to try to achieve desired outcomes. An actor's “incentive structure” comprises (its beliefs about) the costs associated with different actions in the choice set, and the likelihoods that different actions will lead to desired outcomes.

In this setting we can differentiate between:

a) *outcome power* – the ability of an actor to bring about or help bring about outcomes;

b) *social power* – the ability of an actor to change the incentive structures of other actors in order to bring about outcomes.

This framework can be used to model a wide range of social interactions where actors have the ability to exert power over others. For example a “powerful” actor can take options away from another's choice set; can change the relative costs of actions; can change the likelihood that a given action will lead to a given outcome; or might simply change the other's beliefs about its incentive structure.

As with other models of power, this framework is neutral as to the use of “coercion”. For example: a threat of violence can change the likely costs and benefits of different actions; so can a financial penalty in a “voluntarily agreed” contract, or indeed a friendly offer.

Marxism

In the Marxist tradition, the Italian writer Antonio Gramsci elaborated the role of cultural hegemony in ideology as a means of bolstering the power of capitalism and of the nation-state. Drawing on Niccolò Machiavelli in *The Prince*, and trying to understand why there had been no Communist revolution in Western Europe, whilst there had been in Russia, Gramsci conceptualised this hegemony as a centaur, consisting of two halves. The back end, the beast, represented the more classic, material image of power, power through coercion, through brute force, be it physical or economic. But the capitalist hegemony, he argued, depended even more strongly on the front end, the human face, which projected power through “consent”. In Russia, this power was lacking, allowing for a revolution. However, in Western Europe, specifically in Italy, capitalism had succeeded in exercising *consensual* power, convincing the working classes that their interests were the same as those of capitalists. In this way revolution had been avoided.

While Gramsci stresses the significance of ideology in power structures, Marxist-feminist writers such as Michele Barrett stress the role of ideologies in extolling the virtues of family life. The classic argument to illustrate this point of view is the use of women as a “reserve army of labour”. In wartime it is accepted that women perform masculine tasks, while after the war the roles are easily reversed. Therefore, according to Barrett, the destruction of capitalist economic relations is necessary but not sufficient for the liberation of women.

Other theories

1) Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679) defined power as a man's “present means, to obtain some future apparent good” (*Leviathan*, Ch. 10).

2) The thought of Friedrich Nietzsche underlies much 20th century analysis of power. Nietzsche disseminated ideas on the “will to power”, which he saw as the domination of other humans as much as the exercise of control over one's environment.

3) Some schools of psychology, notably that associated with Alfred Adler, place power dynamics at the core of their theory (where orthodox Freudians might place sexuality).

3. The Republic of Kazakhstan has a parliamentary system dominated by President.

Nursultan Nazarbayev and the ruling Nur Otan Party. The constitution concentrates power in the presidency. The president controls the legislature and the judiciary as well as the regional and local government. Changes or amendments to the constitution require presidential consent. The April 3 presidential election, in which President Nazarbayev received 95 percent of the vote, fell short of international standards. The 2007 national elections for the Mazhilis (lower house of parliament), in which Nur Otan won every seat in the chamber with 88 percent of the vote, also were flawed. Some security forces reported to civilian authorities; intelligence services reported to an army general who was appointed as head of the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

According to the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan passed on the republican referendum in August 30, 1995 the Parliament of two Houses of the Republic of Kazakhstan is a high representative organ of the Republic, realizing legislative functions. The organization and activity of the Parliament of the Republic of Kazakhstan, legal position of its deputies are determined by the Constitution, Constitutional Law “Parliament of the Republic of Kazakhstan and status of its deputies” and other legislative acts. The authorities of the Parliament begin since the moment of the opening of its first session and end with the beginning of the work of first session of the Parliament of the new convocation. The term of the Parliament authorities is defined by the term of the Mazhilis deputies authorities of the regular convocation. The Prior cessation of the Parliament authorities can be only realized in the case and order provided by the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

The Parliament consists of two Chambers: Senate and Mazhilis acting on a constant basis. The Senate is formed by the deputies elected on two persons from each region, cities of the republican importance and capitals of the Republic of Kazakhstan on a joint meeting of the deputies of all representative bodies according to the region, city of the republican importance and capital of the Republic. Seven deputies are designated by the President of the Republic for the term of Senate authorities. The half of elected Senate deputies is re-elected each three years. The term of authorities of the Senate deputies is six years.

The Chair person leading the Chamber, elected by the Senate from the number of deputies with a fluent speaking state language, and by the secret voting majority from the total number of deputies of the Chamber. The candidature on a post of the Chair person of Senate is nominated by the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Mazhilis consists of seventy seven deputies. Sixty seven deputies are elected on one-mandate territorial electoral district formed with taking into account administrative-territorial division of the Republic and with approximately equal number of the voters. Ten deputies are elected on the basis of party tickets on a system of proportional representation and on a territory of united national electoral district. The term of authorities of the Mazhilis deputies is five years.

The Chair person leading the Chamber, elected by the Mazhilis from the number of deputies with a fluent speaking state language, and by the secret voting majority from the total number of deputies of the Chamber. The candidature on a post of the Chair person of the Mazhilis is nominated by the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

Lecture 3. Civil society and rule of law.

1. The idea of Civil society.
2. The rule of law.
3. Civil Society and Democracy.
 1. *The idea of Civil society.*

The idea has ancient roots. From the earliest times, human communities required cooperative behavior for survival, and it is clear that ancient patterns of social coordination imprinted institutional practices and beliefs that still shape our contemporary world. Recent decades have witnessed a great surge of new interest in civil society. Scholars, commentators, and political actors of all stripes have debated the concept, universally acknowledging its centrality to the rise of modern democracy while disputing its definition and function. It remains a contested and elusive idea, simultaneously animating and complicating contemporary debates about the nature of political life and the best paths toward solutions to social problems.

One fact is given. We are all members of civil society. Just as citizens relate to the state and family members relate to domestic life, we all connect to each other in society through a network of values and institutions that define us as actors in the civil sphere. The quality of our participation in private and public life is in fact closely intertwined with the character of our actions in civil society.

The term “civil society” evokes many meanings in the modern era – a mediating realm between the individual and the state, the worlds of nonprofit associations and philanthropy, the network of international NGOs, social relations of mutual respect, and, many others. Common to all of these meanings, however, are two central ideas: pluralism and social benefit. Together these ideas reflect the myriad interests and identities present in contemporary society and the task of working to improve conditions in the world. In a social environment increasingly beset by intolerance, threats to freedom of belief and action, and an inability to pursue common goods, the prospect of strengthening civil society suggests a ray of hope in an otherwise dishearteningly bleak picture.

This hope is justified, I believe, not just because the mores of civility suggest an aspiration toward more harmonious social relations, but also because the historical development of civil society has been a vital force in the creation of modern liberal democracy and continues to play that role today. Civil society's complex framework of freedoms, rights, common commitments, and procedures for peaceful dispute resolution is the source of its promise for the future.

While civil society provides an enabling framework for democracy, it contains at the same time an intrinsic tension, a fragile balance between private and public interests. Maintaining this balance is essential to finding solutions to vital challenges in modern democracies that demand public resolution, challenges such as environmental degradation, fundamental educational needs, ethnic and religious strife, and deterioration of public decision-making processes. These are often described as issues of the commons, the resolution of which will determine the future of humankind.

The concept of the “commons” is key to understanding civil society. It refers to a central tradition in Western thought: the shared sphere of communal life where collective goods reside. These goods include not only air and water, but also such public benefit ideals as social justice and civic commitment, and they cannot be achieved by individual decision-making alone. Rather, they are created and sustained by common action and by the frameworks of institutions and norms that make such action possible. The commons are critical to the well-being and ultimately the survival of the community.

2. The rule of law.

Inextricably connected to both the defense of individual rights and the pursuit of the common good is the “rule of law”. Ralf Dahrendorf, in particular, has emphasized the rule of law as a defining characteristic of civil society in its capacity to establish fair and predictable rules for the exercise of public authority. Although laws are set and enforced by governmental bodies, they require a pre-political legitimacy that inheres in civil society and transcends the authority of a given regime. As Dahrendorf and others suggest, the rule of law is essential to guarantee other elements of civil society, especially the protection of individual rights, from the arbitrary exercise of power.

Philanthropy. Robert Payton and Kathleen McCarthy argue, from quite different theoretical perspectives, the critical significance of philanthropic values and practices to the constitution of civil society. Closely related to the tradition emphasizing individual action on behalf of the common good, philanthropy becomes an essential vehicle to realize this intention. Payton views philanthropy as the central value of civil society, and McCarthy describes how a wide range of groups animated by a philanthropic impulse shaped the emergence of American civil society in the 18th and 19th centuries.

Free expression. The concept of free public communication has flowed into the stream of the development of civil society since the early modern period. This concept, most notably grounded in Jürgen Habermas's notion of the “public sphere”, is a prerequisite for the free formation of public opinion that enables civil society to function effectively, i.e., to create a “reasoning public”. Charles Taylor similarly emphasizes that a definitive characteristic of early modern civil society is the emergence of a system of free expression.

Tolerance. Not as frequently invoked, but nevertheless widely understood as essential to the gestation of the civil society idea, is the norm of tolerance. An outcome (albeit unintended) of the religious wars of 16th and 17th century Europe, this normative element is implicit in the growth of idea of civility. Dominique Colas brings tolerance to center stage in the development of civil society (contrasted with “fanaticism”), describing its emergence in 17th century philosophical theories as “the essential, defining virtue of civil society”. The notion of tolerance is also an essential feature of descriptions of civil society in Ernest Gellner's “modular man”, Edward Shils's concept of civility, and John Hall's explication of cultural adaptation to “multi-polar pluralism”.

Synthesizing the Seven Strands

These seven strands appear in various constellations in the work of many contemporary theorists. My central argument is that they are constitutive and interactive components that together create the necessary conditions for the successful functioning of modern civil society. They are mutually supportive and interdependent.

This approach views civil society as a singular social construct, comprising both institutions and norms, that has historically evolved through the seven conceptual streams. The overarching definition that best captures these integrated elements is one proposed by Helmut Anheier as a modification of that employed by CIVICUS in its Global Survey of the State of Civil Society:

Civil society is the arena outside family, government, and market where people voluntarily associate to advance common interests based on civility.

The seven constitutive elements complement and reinforce each other in the operation of civil society. For example, private associations depend upon individual rights (specifically the right to associate and to freely advocate points of view), legal protection of those rights, dedication to common purposes, philanthropy, and tolerance of co-existing associations to carry out their purposes. Similarly, a system of free expression requires legally sanctioned individual rights and an ethic of tolerating diverse points of view. Philanthropic institutions rely on a commitment to pursue the common good (albeit interpreted in individualized terms), the right to express that commitment through the contribution of money and/or time, a legal guaranty that a philanthropic purpose will be carried out, tolerance for differing and even opposing philanthropic purposes, and the ability to create a private organization to carry out a philanthropic mission.

What becomes evident in the way the seven elements interact is the centrally important relationship among the three constitutive norms. Given civil society's equally significant commitment to individual rights and to the common good – a dualism that can create fundamental tension between individual and communal impulses – what allows the two value systems to find congruence in a coherent social agenda? The third norm. Tolerance has become the connecting link that allows competing individual visions of the public good to coexist and to reconcile the private and the public in civil society, albeit always provisionally.

3. Civil Society and Democracy.

The development of modern civil society has been inextricably linked to the development of liberal democracy. Robert Post and Nancy Rosenblum describe a consensus among contemporary theorists “that democracy depends on the particularist, self-determining associations of civil society, where independent commitments, interests, and voices, are developed.... Civil society is the precondition for democratic decision making, whether democracy is conceived as deliberation or as interest group pluralism, and this is true even if the goal of democracy is to transcend particularism and arrive at uncoerced agreement or a common will”.

This close interconnection between civil society and the democratic state is historically rooted in the fact that the concept of the individual and of individual rights emerged at the very time when the idea of government itself was being radically reconceived in the early tug of war between democratic and the absolutist theories of the state.

In the 17th century, James Harrington famously described this evolving complex of ideas when he advanced an idea of government that was beginning to appear in the works of non-traditional political writers: “Government ... is an art whereby a civil society of men is instituted upon the common foundation of common right or interest, or ... it is the empire of laws and not of men.” Harrington was in the forefront of those developing the new theory in which government is grounded in “civil society” as defined by the rule of law and an accompanying commitment to individual rights. These, in effect, became the founding pillars of the newly emerging liberal democratic state.

Lecture 4. Democracy. Modern concepts and political practice. Civil society and constitutional state.

1. Concept of democracy, its essence as like the political power. Democracy as government form. Democracy as norm of political life.

2. Democracy as political regime. Democracy as outlook and political value. Basic principles of democracy. Types of democracy. Political science about transition problems to democracy in modern conditions.

3. Concept of civil society and constitutional state and their interrelation. Formation of civil society and the constitutional state in Kazakhstan.

1. Democracy.

Democracy is a form of government in which all eligible citizens participate equally – either directly or through elected representatives – in the proposal, development, and creation of laws. It encompasses social, economic and cultural conditions that enable the free and equal practice of political self-determination.

The term originates from the Greek “rule of the people”. While theoretically these definitions are in opposition, in practice the distinction has been blurred historically. The political system of Classical Athens, for example, granted democratic citizenship to an elite class of free men and excluded slaves and women from political participation. In virtually all democratic governments throughout ancient and modern history, democratic citizenship consisted of an elite class until full enfranchisement was won for all adult citizens in most modern democracies through the suffrage movements of the 19th and 20th centuries. The English word dates to the 16th century, from the older Middle French and Middle Latin equivalents.

Democracy contrasts with forms of government where power is either held by one person, as in a monarchy, or where power is held by a small number of individuals, as in an oligarchy. Nevertheless, these oppositions, inherited from Greek philosophy, are now ambiguous because contemporary governments have mixed democratic, oligarchic, and monarchic elements. Karl Popper defined democracy in contrast to dictatorship or tyranny, thus focusing on opportunities for the people to control their leaders and to oust them without the need for a revolution. Several variants of democracy exist, but there are two basic forms, both of which concern how the whole body of all eligible citizens executes its will. One form of democracy is direct democracy, in which all eligible citizens have direct and active participation in the decision making of the government. In most modern democracies, the whole body of all eligible citizens remain the sovereign power but political power is exercised indirectly through elected representatives; this is called representative democracy. The concept of representative democracy arose largely from ideas and institutions that developed during the European Middle Ages, the Reformation, the Age of Enlightenment, and the American and French Revolutions.

2. The various meanings of the term democracy.

As is well known, Democracy is taken from a Greek word which means government of the people, by the people and for the people. Demos means people, and cratos means government. This is the meaning of the word (the nominal definition), but the concept to which the word corresponds (the real definition), has been the subject of an evolution or development through history. And it is of the utmost importance to be acquainted with this evolution, so as to grasp the reality to which the concept corresponds.

The term democracy has been claimed by both the capitalist world and the socialist world. Think for instance of the former East Germany calling itself German Democratic Republic, and Viet Nam likewise. When Lenin first set up the Russian marxist party in exile, in preparation for the revolution against the czarist regime, he called it Russian Social Democratic Workers Party. Later he changed its name to Russian Communist Party, and after the split of 1903 with Plekhanov, to Bolshevik Party.

Lenin maintained that genuine democracy would only come about through the marxist revolution, which leads to the State socialism of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and finally to the classless communist society. He accused bourgeois democracies of being fake democracies, in which parliament seats were systematically bought by the highest bidder, thus perpetuating the status quo of the propertied class a statement which, incidentally, is an unwarranted generalization.

Be that as it may, the point is that even the communists have employed the terms democracy and republic with an obviously different meaning as compared to their Western usage. In order to clarify the meaning of the concepts, it is then necessary to take a look at their historical development ever since the coining of the terms in ancient Greece and Rome. Terms like democracy, republic, aristocracy, and monarchy have to be thus analyzed.

While democracy is a Greek word, republic is a Latin word which means the public thing: *res publica*. The concept behind it, however is taken from the Greek polis, which means a group of men living and working together, and *politeia*, which means the ordering of this group into a public thing or commonwealth or commonweal by means of laws guiding towards the common good. Hence the English polity and city (from the Latin equivalent *civitas*).

Thus, through the work of logos (reason) on physis (nature), society would evolve from jungle to civilization, from herds to communities, from chaos (disorder) to cosmos (order), as man ceases to behave like an animal, guided only by his sensitive feelings and emotions, and learns to guide himself instead by his reason and free will, as well as his suprarational, not irrational, emotions.

Men organize themselves into civilized societies or republics in order to work together in pursuit of the good of all the people, viz. in pursuit of happiness. But since they have to be coordinated in the pursuit of this goal, power or authority (*arche* or *auctoritas*) is given to some of them called rulers (*archai* or *reges*) so that they can exercise government (*cratos* or *regimen*).

One of the Dialogues of Plato is entitled precisely *Politeia* or *The Republic*. He wrote it early in his career and it is interesting to compare it with his later Dialogue entitled *Nomoi* or *The Laws*, to see the evolution of his thought, and then compare Plato's thought with that of his disciple Aristotle, both of whom, by the way, were almost exact contemporaries of Lao Tze and Confucius respectively. Between these two pairs a parallel relationship occurred. Greek and Chinese civilizations did become the most advanced both technologically and as regards political thought and institutions. But we shall see the profound impact of Christianity in the later transformation of European civilization.

Towards modern democracy

But going back to Aristotle, what he means by the term democracy is, as we have seen, quite different from what we now mean in the Western world First, because for him it would be rather mob-rule or anarchy. But furthermore, even if he would accept a polity in the sense of our modern democracy, his concept of

citizen (polos or inhabitant of the polis) is that of the free-man, viz. the owner of property. And he classifies this type into three categories: rulers, warriors and priests, all of them male (same as for Plato, with philosophers instead of priests). The rest of the population are lumped together into the category of slaves, manufacturers, laborers, builders, engineers, traders, servants... and women, in short, all those engaged in producing goods and services. Obviously, this category was not enfranchised as citizens.

When Christianity appeared on the scene, it proclaimed the radical equality of all persons: as St. Paul put it, there is neither Jew nor Greek; there is neither slave nor freeman; there is neither male or female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus. A quiet but most powerful and unprecedented revolution was thus set in motion on the deepest level of human consciousness and life the moral and religious level, wherein man perceives his fundamental relationship to transcendent divinity and to his fellow-men, spelled out in the biblical love God with your whole heart and your neighbor as yourself. It is with this level of human experience that Christianity is directly concerned, not with the temporal levels of socio-economic, political and cultural development, since Jesus, though living on those levels like any other man, most emphatically denied any direct involvement in them by himself and his Church as such: my kingdom is not of this world.

Jesus would leave those levels to the personal and communal responsibility of the citizens (of the laity, not the sacred ministers), once they are fully converted to God and to their neighbor in that innermost core of their being, on that deepest level of human experience the moral and religious level of conscience.

Democracy and pluralism

Thus, democracy, understood as the life of the political community, in which are admitted both (a) a fundamental equality of human rights, and (b) a diversity of functions in the pursuit of the common good, is the final political flowering of the trans-political Gospel values, as Jacques Maritain endeavored to show, even though, also according to the Gospel, there are many systems of implementing this democracy, depending on the local culture, and the Church is not bound to any particular concrete form. As John XXIII put it in *Pacem in Terris*:

It is impossible to determine, once and for all, what is the most suitable form of government, or how civil authorities can most effectively fulfill their respective functions, i.e., the legislative judicial and executive functions of the State. In determining the structure and operation of government which a State is to have, great weight has to be given to the historical background and circumstances of given political communities, circumstances which will vary at different times and in different places.

We consider, however, that it is in keeping with the innate demands of human nature that the State should take a form which embodies the threefold division of powers corresponding to the three principal functions of public

authority. In that type of State, not only the official functions of government but also the mutual relations between citizens and public officials are set down according to law, which in itself affords protection to the citizens both in the enjoyment of their rights and in the fulfillment of their duties.

3. Person and community: Human rights.

To be a real community, society must respect the freedom of each person, so that he or she can attain his or her perfection and happiness by developing all his or her capacities for the good, and thus contribute to the common wealth. And for this we have our rights.

What are these human rights? A right is something one can claim not out of caprice or arbitrariness, but something due in justice, something strictly due (the word duty comes therefrom). It can not therefore respond to a passing and subjective need, but only to a need inherent to our nature. Our nature is rational, and hence our need for the truth, our duty to seek the truth, and our right to the truth. Our rational and free will aims for the good, and hence our need for the good, our duty to do what is good (and hence avoid evil), and our right to the good. A right to do evil would be a contradiction in terms.

These rights are thus rooted in our rational human nature, oriented to the ultimate values of reality: unity in diversity, truth, goodness or perfection of being, and beauty or harmonious blending of all values. All of these converge and coalesce in the infinite Being, Creator of heaven and earth. That is why morality is inseparable from religion, and groundless without it. In this we are clearly distinguished from irrational animals: since they are confined to their sensitive feelings and emotions, they have no capacity to attain to God, who being a spirit, is beyond all sensitive perceptions. Animals are thus at the service of man, as the Bible has also clarified: cf. Gen 1:28-30; 2:19-20.

The right to life

And what is the most basic human right? The right to life, of course. The moment a human being comes into existence, he or she has the right to life, as necessary basis for all the other human rights. To take his or her life for any reason directly, is therefore a most grievous violation of human rights, an enormous evil, an outrageous crime against humanity, a radically anti-social and anti-human act. This is one of the principles assumed in the democratic form of government and social organization, in its mature perfection. Authentic democracy is possible only in a state ruled by law, and on the basis of a correct conception of the human person, a conception rooted in the infinite dignity of the latter, attested by human reason enlightened by the Biblical tradition and forcefully maintained by the Catholic Church throughout the ages.

Lecture 5. Personality and policy. Place of the person in political life.

1. Personality as object of policy. Political socialization of the personality and her essence.

2. Types of the political personality. Personality as subject of policy. Political participation, its motives. Forms of political participation. Political leadership and its essence. Problem of typology of leadership in political science. Influence of the leader on historical process.

3. Typology of political culture. Features of political culture in the former Soviet society.

1. Personality as object of policy. Political socialization of the personality and her essence.

One of the interesting developments in political science in the last half century is the extent to which the role of personality in politics and policy-making has gradually been de-emphasized and downplayed in importance (if not totally disregarded). Whereas in the middle of this century, most studies of congressional leadership emphasized *personalistic* factors (e.g., traits, styles, characteristics) to better understand leadership, in more recent times increasing emphasis has been given to the political *contexts* in which leaders operate (i.e., the political or social circumstances or environment in which they work).

Richard Fenno, in his 1966 book on the House and Senate appropriations committees, explained why he did not use “individual personality data” in his framework of analysis:

The relevance of personality as a variable is fully recognized and is discussed at length and by example. But no attempt has been made at a systematic interpretation of the behavior of individuals in terms of their psychological characteristics. If anything, reference to specific individuals has been systematically underplayed.

However, Fenno goes on to explain just how difficult it is to ignore personality as part of a formal framework of analysis of committees:

In one sense, this is a self-denying-ordinance since the Washington researcher inevitably gets drowned in a flood of personality-centered talk – each item of which purports to explain some specific event.

Nevertheless, he rejects trying to collect personality data from a large number of participants and applying it to institutional behavior, and instead opts for deriving empirical interpretation from repeated events, that is, of viewing things in context, “using a minimum of personality data”.

By 1984, Steven Smith and Christopher Deering are not as apologetic about ignoring personality data in their book on committees in Congress, writing that, “...individuals might well bring some personal talents to a position of authority, but the institutional context within which they serve will be the primary determinant of their styles and their success or failure”.

The authors go on to concede that, “the ability of personalistic and contextual factors to explain aspects of leadership varies from one situation to another”. For example, “where committee structures and procedures are only loosely defined, personalistic factors are more likely to be the primary determinant of leadership strategy and success”. But when those structures and procedures are clearly specified, “leadership options are more limited and personal qualities are less likely to distinguish various committees”.

The authors note that since the 1970s, when committee procedures and structures were more formalized, “contextual factors have become more useful in explaining differences among committee chairs’ approaches to committee politics”. However, the authors add that given these new constraints on their powers, committee chairs may have to rely more on their “personal skills, expertise and shrewdness to get things done”.

Joseph Cooper and David Brady come to a similar conclusion as Smith and Deering that, “institutional context rather than personal traits primarily determines leadership style in the House”. They go on to write, in their study of Speakers from Cannon to Rayburn:

To be sure, style is affected by personal traits. Nonetheless, style is and must be responsive to and congruent with both the inducements available to leaders’ and members’ expectations regarding proper behavior.... Thus, if Rayburn was a more permissive and consensual leader than Cannon or Reed, this is not because he was inherently a less tough or more affective person, but rather because of his weaker sources of leverage and the heightened individualism of members.

2. Types of the political personality.

Participation is an ingredient of every polity, large or small. Whether the society is an oligarchy or a democracy, someone must make political decisions and appoint, uphold, and remove leaders. Those who fail to participate, whether out of neglect or exclusion, are likely to enjoy less power than other men. Although not all who participate possess effective power, those who do not participate cannot exercise or share power.

As these observations imply, the right to participate is an essential element of democratic government, inseparable from such other attributes of democracy as consent, accountability, majority rule, equality, and popular sovereignty. Indeed, the growth of democratic government is in part measured by the extension of the suffrage and the correlative rights to hold office and to associate for political purposes. Whereas traditional monarchies restrict power and participation largely to the nobility and their agents, democracies have in principle transformed these prerogatives into rights enjoyed by everyone.

This expansion of participation was partly stimulated by the desire to give meaning and force to the principles of consent, accountability, and political opposition. Participation is the principal means by which consent is granted or withdrawn in a democracy and rulers are made accountable to the ruled. Since men

can be equal and free only if they share in the determination of their own affairs, participation has been viewed as a means for realizing these democratic objectives as well.

From Aristotle to John Dewey, political philosophers have extolled popular participation as a source of vitality and creative energy, as a defense against tyranny, and as a means of enacting the collective wisdom. By involving the many in the affairs of the state, participation should promote stability and order; and by giving everyone the opportunity to express his own interests, it should secure the greatest good for the greatest number. The community should gain, furthermore, by drawing upon the talents and skills of the largest possible number of people. Some philosophers have claimed, in addition, that participation benefits the participants as well as the larger community. It ennobles men by giving them a sense of their own dignity and value, alerts both rulers and ruled to their duties and responsibilities, and broadens political understanding.

Arguments like these lay behind the exclusion of slaves and aliens from Athenian democratic processes; of commoners and Jews and other nonCatholics from participation in medieval principalities; and of Catholics from governments formed in the wake of the Reformation. Even the American constitution, as originally framed, implicitly sanctioned prohibitions against voting or holding office for reasons of race, property, religion, or sex. At the present time, the suffrage in some parts of the United States is, in law or in fact, denied to aliens, illiterates, paupers, criminals, Indians, and Negroes. Nevertheless, as democratic institutions have advanced, the trend has been for such barriers to be dropped.

Despite their historical association, widespread participation is not peculiar to democracy. Even greater emphasis is placed upon participation by the modern mass dictatorships, both communist and fascist. Their desire to involve every citizen in political affairs is evident not only in their efforts to achieve unanimous voting in elections but also in their organization of the masses into an elaborate network of youth groups, mass parties, trade unions, people's councils, cooperatives, recreational and cultural societies, study circles, conferences, rallies, parades, demonstrations, and staged mass demonstrations.

Social scientists aim to develop general theories of human behavior that will account for as many relevant facts as possible with the smallest number of assumptions and explanatory variables. So far no general theory of participation even approaches this ideal. Participation appears to be a complex phenomenon that depends on a great many variables of different relative weights. This does not necessarily mean that no conceptual model can be employed to explain it. For one can at least group the relevant independent variables into those influences which are essentially internal (psychological and cognitive) and those which derive from the individual's external environment, social and political. Any model employing these broad categories is bound to be oversimplified. One may nevertheless reason that (*a*) individuals are embedded in a matrix of social forces (status, education, religion, etc.) that orients them toward or away from political participation; (*b*) in addition, characteristic differences in drives and capacities will cause individuals to

vary in their readiness to respond to political stimuli; and (c) the degree to which these social and psychological predispositions find expression as political activity depends partly on the nature of the political environment itself – including the political structure and institutions, the party system, and the pattern of political values and beliefs. The three sets of variables are closely linked and intermingled. A change in any of them can, therefore, increase or decrease participation, and an analysis based on only one of them is bound to be misleading and incomplete.

Available evidence suggests that a number of the more basic or genotypic personality traits – rigidity, guilt neurasthenia, intolerance of ambiguity, manic-depressive tendencies, manifest anxiety – do not correlate highly with political participation. The weakness of these relationships is particularly evident at the more passive end of the participation continuum. Thus, voters scarcely differ from nonvoters on the traits mentioned above. However, apathetic individuals tend to be slightly more aggressive and paranoid than voters. In general, the more active participants exhibit less hostility than the general population, except in the case of activists who belong to extreme or messianic movements. Participants in such movements, which aim at quick and drastic refashioning of the world, are frequently motivated by rage and paranoia and find that participation gives them a legitimized context for discharging their aggression (Almond 1954).

Although basic personality dimensions such as guilt and rigidity do not adequately distinguish participants from nonparticipants, they do differentiate somewhat the less active from the more active, the inactives exhibiting these traits in greater measure. The correlations are not high, but one would not expect them to be. Participation is so complex a phenomenon that the connection between any particular activity (e.g., voting) and any source trait (e.g., rigidity) is bound to be extremely tenuous. Then, too, for many people – especially the more passive participants – the psychological investment in politics is so slight that one would be surprised to discover that deep-seated motives were attached to a given activity. Furthermore, the “distance” between a basic personality trait and a specific manifestation of political activity is too great and the route between them too circuitous for the one to be directly engaged by the other. Nevertheless, correlations do turn up between certain personality traits and participation that appear to be due mainly to the impairment of social functioning induced by personality disturbances. An individual who scores high on measures of paranoia, inflexibility, guilt, hostility, and so on will *ipso facto* function less effectively in many social contexts. He will be less able to perform tasks that require accurate appraisals of reality and may find threatening such political activities as organizing, deciding, bargaining, interacting, cooperating, debating, and proselytizing.

Participants are also distinguished from nonparticipants by such cognitive variables as belief in one’s own adequacy and in the amenability of the social order to change. Even the elementary forms of participation, such as voting, may present some people with threatening questions about their ability to understand and affect external institutions that strike them as bewildering or remote. An individual’s

sense of his own personal competence tends to color his judgment of his political effectiveness, which in turn strengthens his motivation to participate. Confronted with the challenge of trying to change political and social conditions, lower-status groups and the psychologically handicapped are prone to feel bewildered and helpless; they are, in general, more susceptible to feelings of alienation, anomie, and pessimism – both personal and political . In their view, the social-political system is hostile and inaccessible. They find few of the personal rewards received by the politically active (approval of friends, being “on the inside,” the “excitement” of politics, and so on). Accordingly, they not only vote less frequently but also are less interested and personally involved in politics, have fewer and less. Coherent opinions, and are less concerned with issues and with the outcome of elections.

The party system. Of all political influences on participation, the party is probably the most potent. Its role is partly expressive and partly instrumental. The party resembles the nation or the church both in its symbolic force and in its capacity for arousing affection, devotion, and sacrifice on the part of its loyal members. The vast majority of the party faithful would no more think of switching parties than of changing their nationality or religion. The party inspires in its members feelings of belonging and, equally, of opposition to those in other parties. While membership in cognate social groups may strengthen party influence on participation, the party is a powerful reference group in its own right. Indeed, it may help to solidify attachments to other social groups. This mystique keeps large numbers of people persistently active even though they have only a slim chance of affecting the outcome of important public events.

3. Political culture. Features of political culture.

Political culture includes formal rules as well as customs and traditions, sometimes referred to as “habits of the heart,” that are passed on generationally. People agree to abide by certain formal rules, such as the country’s constitution and codified laws. Political culture sets the boundaries of acceptable political behavior in a society.

Political culture consists of a variety of different elements. Some aspects of culture are abstract, such as political beliefs and values. Other elements are visible and readily identifiable, such as rituals, traditions, symbols, folklore, and heroes. These aspects of political culture can generate feelings of national pride that form a bond between people and their country. Political culture is not monolithic. It consists of diverse subcultures based on group characteristics such as race, ethnicity, and social circumstances, including living in a particular place or in a certain part of the country.

The principle of individualism stresses the centrality and dignity of individual people. It privileges free action and people’s ability to take the initiative in making their own lives as well as those of others more prosperous and satisfying. In keeping with the Constitution’s preoccupation with liberty.

Lecture 6. Formation of statehood of independent Kazakhstan. Political system and its development.

1. Sources of statehood of Kazakhstan. Formation of the state independence of Kazakhstan and its feature.

2. Constitutional law of the Republic of Kazakhstan on the state independence.

3. Legislature. Parliament: structure, principles of formation, governing bodies.

4. Executive power. Government: powers, structure. Controls and counterbalances in system the president, parliament and the government.

1. Sources of statehood of Kazakhstan. Formation of the state independence of Kazakhstan and its feature.

The composition of Kazakh statehood took place at the turn of the fifteenth to the sixteenth century. By this time the Kazakhs were primarily a political union. The Kazakh khanate and the Kazakh people were synonymous, a people formed by the union of previously disparate clans and tribes of Turkish descent. The Kazakh union, founded by Dzhani-bek and Kerei (1465 - 1466), offered potential for both continued control and future expansion. Tribal unity implied increased military potential, with more warriors to mount a common defense against outside invaders. The Kazakh khanate initially experienced a period of economic growth and relative power due to the unification of several tribes.

It is known that the Kazakh khanate initially began to take form within the Golden Horde. Orus-Khan, a fifth-generation descendant of Dzhuchi, is considered the founder of the line of Kazakh khans. The Chengisids, standing outside the division of the zhuzes (hordes) were the aristocrats. Historians trace the division of the Kazakhs into three zhuzes back to the times of Batu-Khan. The southeastern part of his father's ulus belonged to Dzhuchi's eldest son, Orda-Ezhen, while the western lands belonged to Tokai-Temir. Over the expanse between them, Batu and Sheibani held sway. Corresponding to this configuration of Dzhuchi's ulus, the zhuzes were designated "Ulu" (Elder), "Orta" (Middle) and "Kishi" (Younger).

The tripartite division of the Kazakh people was in response to the unique geography of the steppe. Within the Kazakh-held territories of the sixteenth century there were three natural geographic regions, each containing both summer and winter pasturage.

In the first half of the sixteenth century, during the rule of Hakh Nazar (1538 - 1580), the Kazakhs formed their three distinctive zhuzes reintroducing a sense of organization and order. The conception of the zhuzes as unions of related tribes and the development of the so-called "tradition of the zhuzes" fit the interests of the ruling clans, both in solidifying power within the horde of their own tribes and in the struggle for centralized power.

The Kazakh zhuzes were, in fact, federations or unions of tribes that normally did not share a common ancestry. They were instead simply an extension of the temporary military unions formed by both Turkish and Mongol tribes. It is probable that the Kazakh hordes formed largely for military purposes - to make the Kazakh lands more secure in the absence of any stronger central authority.

The zhuzes stood in contradistinction to the tribes that were ethnic units. The former were military unions, consisting of rank-and-file and commanding components. The elders of the tribes tended toward a peaceful life via compromise; the khans of the hordes preferred the military mode of life. The coexistence of horde and tribe was called *el*. This is a particularly characteristic term, corresponding to the political constructs of the Steppe and assuming the presence of subjugated tribes.

Thus, the social structure of Kazakh society in the khanate period (XV to XIX centuries) was based on two main principles. One of them is that all Kazakh clans and tribes entered into three associations named by the Kazakhs themselves as Ulu Zhuz, Orta Zhuz, and Kishi Zhuz.

The first figure in the power hierarchy, the leader, was the khan. A khan was elected at a meeting of sultans, biys, and clan or family elders. The power of the khan was vested in the person, not the office, so the power a particular Kazakh khan enjoyed was a reflection of his perceived particular fitness to rule. Periods of Kazakh unity, such as the reigns of Kasym (1511 - 1518, or 1523), Hakh Nazar (1538 - 1580), and Khan Tauke (1680 - 1718), occurred because the khans of the other hordes recognized the military superiority of these individuals and were willing to defer to their authority. After the deaths of Hakh Nazar and Tauke, the three hordes again became separate entities.

The khan controlled the relations between clans and auls (the Kazakh migratory unit). He also made the principal decisions about declaring of waging wars as well as preparing defensive arrangements for the horde. The khan allocated pasturelands for the clans and decided when and where the horde would migrate. This choice was closely connected to the military position of the horde, since it depended upon which lands were safely under the khan's control.

The khans functioned primarily as military leaders. The khan attempted to tax allied clans only in times of war, when the livestock and food collected were used to provision troops. Since the Kazakh khans did not exact regular tribute from their subject populations, it is difficult to consider them feudal rulers. 6 Furthermore, the rulers' life-style was not distinct. Proved military skills were required for selection as khan, since the khan led his horde in military campaigns and routine plundering.

Thus, the early Kazakh state thus was not a feudal society but rather a military democracy 7 with a dual authority structure: an aristocracy of khans and sultans was superimposed upon a clan-based authority system.

The division on “*ak-suyek*” and “*kara-suyek*” was a clear sign of aristocratic and non-democratic structure of society. However, Kazakh nobility had some particular features. Any sultan had a right to be a khan, but should have not

only noble origins, but also excellent reputation and personal features like valor or courage.

Electoral procedure was based on meritocracy principle. Clear historical example is election of Abulkhair khan (1710) who was famous by his personal characteristics, but did not have any khan predecessor in his generation except only the founder of the Kazakh khanate Zhanibek who was a predecessor of all Kazakh khans.

Great changes in political system of Kazakhs took place in 20s of XIX century: the Russian tsarist administration abolished khan's authority and introduced a new system of territorial administration (in 1822 on the territory of Orta Zhuz and partly Ulu Zhuz, in 1824 in Kishi Zhuz). Traditional electoral system was eliminated, and all officials beginning from aul starshina (foreman) to ruling sultan were appointed by Russian administration. Thus, in the early 20s of the XIX century the last remainders of political independence of Kazakhs were abolished.

Nomadic society developed its own mechanism of regulation of social and personal disputes. The colonization of the Kazakh Steppe by the tsarist regime in the XIX century and the introduction of a unified Russian legal system led to the significant deformation of traditional mechanisms for protection of human rights and liberties. It took a long time while a unified legal system of Russian empire started work efficiently in Kazakh steppe.

When Kazakhstan achieved sovereignty in 1991, it had a long democratic tradition behind it. Sovereignty was won by the experience of the Kazakhs' ancestors and by the events in December 1986. And the relatively successful realization of social and political transformation and democratization in contemporary Kazakhstan mainly can be explained by the country's good synthesis of traditional and modern values.

2. Constitutional law of the Republic of Kazakhstan on the state independence.

The Republic of Kazakhstan is a unitary state with a presidential form of government. According to the Constitution, the state proclaims itself a democratic, secular, legal and social state whose highest values are an individual, his life, rights and freedoms.

Kazakhstan gained independence on December 16, 1991. The capital is the city of Astana. The state language is Kazakh. The Russian language has the status of a language of interethnic communication. Monetary unit - tenge.

The President of the Republic of Kazakhstan is the head of state, its highest official, who determines the main directions of the domestic and foreign policy of the state and represents Kazakhstan within the country and in international relations. The President is the symbol and guarantor of the unity of the people and the state power, inviolability of the Constitution, rights and freedoms of an individual and citizen.

The Government implements the executive power of the Republic of Kazakhstan, heads the system of executive bodies and exercises supervision of their activity.

Legislative functions are performed by the Parliament of the Republic of Kazakhstan, which consists of two Chambers acting on a permanent basis: the Senate and the Majilis.

The Senate is composed of deputies represented in an order, established by the constitutional law, on two persons from each oblast, major city and the capital of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Fifteen deputies of the Senate are appointed by the President of the Republic taking into account necessity of maintenance of representation for the Senate of national-cultural and other significant interests of a society. The Majilis consists of hundred seven deputies elected in an order, established by the constitutional law. Nine deputies of the Majilis are elected by the Assembly of the people of Kazakhstan. Term of the powers of Senate deputies is six years; term of the powers of the Majilis deputies is five years. Currently three parties are presented in the Mazhilis – “Nur Otan” People's Democratic Party, “Ak zhol” Democratic Party of Kazakhstan and Communist People’s Party of Kazakhstan.

The stable growth of all branches of the economy, the international recognition, the political stability serve as a basis for prosperity of the Kazakhstani society. Kazakhstan is a country that aspires to the future, honors its cultural traditions and successfully realizes the huge creative potential in the modern highly-competitive world.

3. Legislature. Parliament: structure, principles of formation, governing bodies.

From time immemorial representative authority as the demonstration form of national democracy inheres in the Kazakhstan society. It modified depending on existing political system.

The modern Kazakhstani Parliament replaced one-Chamber body of the representative power - the Supreme Soviet, which was first formed on the basis of the Constitution of Kazakh SSR of 1937 and then - on the basis of the Constitution of Kazakh SSR of 1978 and the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan of 1993.

During the existence the Supreme Soviet was selected thirteen times. The first elections to the Supreme Soviet of Kazakh SSR were held on June, 24th, 1938. Elections were carried out on the basis of universal, equal and direct elective right by secret ballot.

At the same time, formation of deputy corps was conducted on the non-alternative basis under the rigid control of Communist party. Candidates for election were selected as to class, party, national, gender and age, and other quotas set by party organizations. Therefore, prior to beginning of elections there had already been known how many members of collective farms, industrial and office

workers, communists, Comsomols, Kazakhs, Russians, Ukrainians as well as the representatives of other nationalities, women, youth, etc. would be the members of the legislative body. High-ranking state officials, heads of parties, comsomol and trade union bodies were nominated as candidates for election according to the posts they held.

The Constitution of Kazakh SSR of 1978 introduced some amendments to the electoral system. According to this Fundamental law of the country, the Supreme Soviet of Kazakh SSR was the highest body of the state power. The Supreme Soviet of Kazakh SSR was competent to decide all issues attributed by the Constitution of USSR and by the Constitution of Kazakh SSR to conduct Kazakh SSR. Working body of the Supreme Soviet – Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Kazakh SSR in the period between the sessions of the Supreme Soviet introduced, in case of necessity, amendments to the legislative acts of Kazakh SSR with their subsequent submissions for approval. The Supreme Soviet of Kazakh SSR created, when considered necessary, auditing and other commissions on any issue. All state and public bodies, organizations and high officials were obliged to fulfil requirements of standing and other commissions, to present them necessary materials and documents. The Supreme Soviet of Kazakh SSR was empowered to take into consideration and to decide any issue attributed to conduct Kazakh SSR.

The elections to the Supreme Soviet of Kazakh SSR of the twelfth convocation took place in March 1990. They were the first more democratic elections to the highest legislative body of the Republic, in conditions of still sufficient influence of the administrative-command system. More than two thousand applicants took part in the pre-election struggle for 360 deputy mandates. The peculiarity of the elections was that 90 people were elected from Republican public organizations. And though the elections were carried out in the absence of proper political parties, the processes of transformation of totalitarian system were deemed irreversible. The Supreme Soviet of the twelfth convocation played a particular role in the history of formation of parliamentarism in Kazakhstan. That found a reflection in adopting a number of principal legislative acts, legislative ensuring of the state policy in the 1990-s.

The Constitution of 1993 opened expanse for the positive dynamics of developing Kazakhstani society, having refused of one party political form of government, monopolistic economic system, and ideology of historic violence.

At the stage of transition period to socio-oriented market economy, the Fundamental law legitimated Republic, as a new independent state in the world community. The Constitution of 1993 declared, that Kazakhstan positioning itself as a component of modern civilization, has intentions of good-neighbourliness and multiple mutually beneficial cooperation, adheres to universal human values.

In the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan of 1993 as in the former one, the Supreme Soviet was vested with very broad authorities that impeded the implementation of the principle of partition of power and creation of the system of checks and balances. Further implementation of reforms revealed inefficiency of the Republican bodies of power, in the first place representative, which could not

react effectively to rapidly changed events and to take adequate decisions. The results of the work of the separate bodies of the Supreme Soviet of the twelfth convocation, functioning on permanent basis, also confirmed the necessity of creating professional Parliament. Nonworking mechanisms of checks and balances allowed the Supreme Soviet to interfere in the activity of the Government or replace it, which led to pre-term termination of the activity of the representative body of the Republic.

However, the fate of the Supreme Soviet of the thirteenth convocation turned out to be very dramatic. It entered into rights in the most complex period of state constructing, when the mechanism of partition of the branches of power was not led to the logical completion, the system of checks and balances was not filled with real content and was not defined the status of the Supreme Soviet, The President and the Government.

At 30th August 1995 referendum a new Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan was adopted, eliminating blemishes of former state structure.

A draft of the new Constitution was widely discussed in a society. About 30 000 proposals were inserted by citizens and specially created expert-advisory council had studied them under the guidance of the President of the Republic of Kazakhstan. More than thousand amendments were taken into account while working on the text, as a result 55 articles out of 99 of a draft Constitution underwent substantial changes.

On 30th August 1995 81,9 percent of population, participated at the referendum, had spoken out for the adoption of a new Fundamental Law.

The Constitution of the Republic had not simply proclaimed a principle of power partition, ensuring stability, effective functioning and interaction of legislative, executive and judicial branches in which a specific system of checks and balances was fixed. A person's life, rights and freedoms were affirmed as superior values of a person.

The principle of partition of the state power does not contradict its unity but supposes the coordinated interaction of all the branches, impossibility of full power concentration in one of the branches. And so manifests a dialectical interaction of the branches of unitary state power, and mechanism of checks and balances contributes to the ensuring of political stability in the country.

The Constitution of 1995, which proclaimed Kazakhstan a Presidential Republic, as well as the Constitutional laws "On Parliament of the Republic of Kazakhstan and the status of its deputies", "On the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan", "On Judicial system and the status of judges" settled the status and functions of every branch of power.

According to the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan of 1995 the Parliament of the Republic is the highest representative body of the Republic performing legislative functions.

The Parliament consists of two Chambers: the Senate and the Mazhilis, acting on a constant basis.

In accordance with the legislation of the Republic of Kazakhstan at the elections of September 1999 and October 2002, half of the composition of the Senate was re-elected. Due to five regions closing of the Republic of Kazakhstan, deputies of the Senate of the second convocation were elected from 14 regions and cities – Astana and Almaty until expiry of the term of their authorities, deputies from closing regions continued working, therefore until December 1999- 44 deputies worked at the Senate.

4. Executive power. Government: powers, structure. Controls and counterbalances in system the president, parliament and the government.

The government exercises executive authority of the Republic of Kazakhstan, head the executive system and provide guidance to them. In its activities it is responsible to the President and accountable to the Parliament of the country. It comprises the Prime Minister, his deputies, ministers, heads of other central bodies of executive power. Government members take an oath to the people and the President of Kazakhstan.

Local state government is formed by representative and executive organs. Maslikhats are elected by people, based on a universal, equal and direct elective franchise, through a secret ballot, for the term of four years. Executive organs are included in the united system of executive organs of the country. They are headed by Akims, representatives of the President and Government of the country. They are appointed by the President. Local self-government is recognised for independent solution of local issues by the population.

The president is elected by popular vote for a five-year term. The prime minister and first deputy prime minister are appointed by the president. Council of Ministers is also appointed by the president. President Nazarbayev expanded his presidential powers by decree: only he can initiate constitutional amendments, appoint and dismiss the government, dissolve Parliament, call referendums at his discretion, and appoint administrative heads of regions and cities.

The president is the head of state. He also is the commander in chief of the armed forces and may veto legislation that has been passed by the Parliament. President *Nursultan Nazarbayev*, who has been in office since Kazakhstan became independent, won a new 7-year term in the 1999 election that the *Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe* said fell short of international standards. A major political opponent, former prime minister Akezhan Kazhegeldin, was prohibited from running against the president because he had attended an unauthorized meeting of “the movement for free elections”. On top of this the election was unconstitutionally called two years ahead of schedule. Free access to the media is also denied to opposing opinions. In 2002 a law set very stringent requirements for the maintenance of legal status of a political party, which lowered the number of legal parties from 19 in 2002 to 8 in 2003. The prime minister, who serves at the pleasure of the president, chairs the Council of Ministers and serves as

Kazakhstan's head of government. There are three deputy prime ministers and 17 ministers in the Council.

Lecture 7. Political parties of Kazakhstan. The rights and freedoms of the person in RK.

1. Democratization of political life and multi-party system development in independent Kazakhstan.

2. Typology of political parties in the Republic at the present stage, the characteristic of their program purposes.

3. Political parties in the RK and its functions.

1. Democratization of political life and multi-party system development in independent Kazakhstan.

Politics is the process to organise how we live together in a society. In a democracy, every citizen can participate in this process – by freely accessing information about political issues, by openly expressing the own opinion on public affairs, by formulating expectations, proposals or requirements without fear of repression, by voting in elections, by engaging in civil society organisations or political parties, or by standing up as a candidate in democratic elections. In this way, democracy is the “government of the people, by the people, for the people”, in the famous words of Abraham Lincoln, president of the United States of America from 1861-65. To fully meet all the requirements of a government ‘of the people, by the people, and for the people’, politics in a democracy need to satisfy certain conditions:

1) Politics require ideas and values that set the goals and standards of political organization. Freedom, justice and solidarity are such principles that can guide the political organization of any society.

2) Politics require social organizations that collect interests, aggregate, and communicate them to the political and governmental institutions. Political parties, but also business and workers associations as well as other non-governmental organizations of the civil society, are such organizations that collect and aggregate social interests.

3) Politics require institutions that collect proposals for the organization of society, and then represent, discuss, decide and implement them. Parliaments and governments –which normally rely on political parties – are the most important institutions of politics in a democratic state.

4) Politics require active citizens who take part in political discussions with ideas, demands and expectations, and actively contribute to the functioning of political institutions. In a democracy, most if not all citizens should be involved in political activities. However, a direct democracy where every citizen is directly involved in all political decisions is not possible within modern mass societies.

This is why a modern democracy needs institutions and organizations that represent the will and the interests of the citizens as authentically as possible. These can be associations, informal groups or non-governmental organizations. In particular, the political parties carry out such a representative function. They offer to the citizens the possibility to influence politics and political decisions. They are an important instrument and institution of politics. Without political parties, a modern representative democracy is not conceivable. Only, the parties ensure that the citizens are permanently capable to act politically. They articulate and integrate different interests, visions and opinions. They are also the main source for the recruitment of political elites.

This is to convey fundamental information on the different facets of political parties. At the same time it is meant to raise interest in, and willingness to contribute to, a party. Even though criticism of political parties is easy and always popular, political parties are indispensable for a democracy. They will only be able to fulfill their functions when more citizens are willing to engage politically in parties. Political parties are a special form of social organization. They should not be confused with associations, federations, and social clubs. A well-known definition of political parties comes from the American political scientist Antony Downs, who wrote: “A political party is a team of men seeking to control the governing apparatus by gaining office in a duly constituted election”.

2. Typology of political parties in the Republic at the present stage, the characteristic of their program purposes.

Likewise party systems, also the political parties itself can be distinguished by certain criteria. Such typologies help to sort the heterogeneity of social phenomena, in order to better understand it. To identify parties, one can consider the characteristic features in order to note commonalities and differences between individual parties.

Parties can be classified according to a number of different criteria: according to their level of organisation, their socio-political targets, the social classes that they want to represent and approach, or their positioning towards the political system. Some parties can be classified also by their names, which often express special socio-political objectives that the parties want to be identified with. By their names, parties demonstrate how they want to be perceived, and that means how they want to be classified. This confirms that the classification or construction of typologies is not a mere academic exercise, but part of the political competition of parties.

The typologies emerged initially in view of the multi-party systems in Europe but can also be applied to other regions. Several typologies are introduced below. Differentiation of parties by their degree of organization:

Electorate parties: such parties attach less importance to a large membership, but are particularly active in the scope of elections. The bond of the voters to such a party is usually weak.

Membership parties: such parties seek a large membership, preferably in all parts of the country. Traditionally, it is usually the popular parties and labour parties that strive for a well-organised party apparatus and a large membership (“mass political party”). At the minimum, this facilitates the financing of the party through membership fees.

Differentiation by socio-political objectives:

With regard to the criteria of socio-political objectives, which are aspired to by political parties, one can distinguish between those parties that seek social or political changes in the frame of the existing democratic order and parties that strive for changes by radical, extremist or revolutionary means. The first group is composed of conservative, liberal, Christian democratic, social democratic, in-part socialist, and also parties that define themselves by religion or confession as long as they do not represent extremist positions. To the second group belong mainly extreme rightist or leftist parties and among those the communist parties, beside others. *Conservative parties:* such parties want to retain the “approved” order or restore it; they are sceptical of innovations and changes, for instance, with regard to the perception and the role of the family, and alternative models of life (for example, same-sex marriages). They also do not like the transfer of national sovereignty to supranational institutions, but they do acknowledge that traditional ideas, values and principles cannot be continuously maintained without moderate reforms.

Liberal parties: such parties espouse the rights of individual freedom and emphasize the democratic character of the constitution. Traditionally, they are anti-clerical and mostly committed to a free market economy.

Social democratic parties: such parties mostly emerged in close relation to the labour movement and their political concepts are based on social equality of the people; they assign the state with a strong regulating role in the economy and society. *Socialist parties:* such parties also emerged in close contact to parts of the labour movement, but they represent a more radical approach to achieving social equality; the abolition of private ownership of the means of production and a state-driven economy are central targets of these parties. Parties defined by religion are special forms of parties that are characterized by their social-political objectives. Worldwide, a vast number of parties are more or less strongly based on religious convictions. There are Christian or Christian democratic, Islamic and Hindu parties that establish their programs on the values and standards of their religion or confession. This can lead to considerable differences in the political programs and political objectives of such parties, depending on how individual parties consider their respective religion’s stand with regard to individual human rights and individual freedom or to political democracy. The European Christian Democratic parties, for instance, are committed to individual freedom, social solidarity and justice, self-responsibility of the citizens and a discrete role for the state under the supervision of economic and social actors.

Extreme right-wing parties: such parties preach nationalistic ideologies, which are often inter-mixed with a vague ethnic ideology and possibly racist perceptions.

Communist parties: such parties propagate the dictatorship of the proletariat and assume a predetermination of history..

Principles of party financing

1) The parties shall annually and officially account for their finances, especially in cases where they receive public funds.

2) Membership fees should be a major part of a parties' revenue. Membership fees not only has a financial effect, but also improves the identity and obliges the party leadership to be transparent towards their own members.

3) Government contributions to parties should respect the principle of equal opportunity, as well as the impact of an election, which is expressed by its election results.

4) The total annual volume of government contributions to parties should be fixed.

5) With regard to government contributions to parties, the volume of donations to a party should be considered.

6) The limit of tax deductibility for membership fees and donations should be fixed as low as possible.

7) From a preferably low limit onwards donations to parties should be made public.

Criteria to identify political parties

1) A party strives to influence the formation of political opinion and aims to have a general political impact. The active influence of political opinion-making is aimed at a longer period of time as well as a wider region and should not be concentrated on a local level or a single issue.

2) A party is an association of citizens holding individual memberships, and shall have a minimum number of members, so that the seriousness of its targets and the prospects of success remain clear.

3) A party has to demonstrate the will to consistently take part in the political representation of the people during elections. It, therefore, distinguishes itself from unions, non-governmental organizations and other initiatives that do not want to carry any political responsibilities for larger sectors but only try to have selective influence, and that do not participate in elections.

4) A party has to be an independent and permanent organization; it shall not be formed only for one election and cease to exist afterwards.

5) A party must be willing to appear in public.

6) A party does not necessarily need to win a seat in parliament, but it has to fulfill all the other criteria.

Parties can therefore be understood as permanent associations of citizens that are based on free membership and a program, and which are anxious to occupy through the path of elections, the politically decisive positions of the country with their team of leaders, in order to materialize suggestions for resolving outstanding problems. The means of elections implies the competition of at least two parties. Parties not only strive to participate in the formation of political opinion.

3. Political parties in the RK and it's functions.

To participate successfully in the political process and to contribute to the consolidation of democracy, political parties have to demonstrate certain capacities. In political science, these capacities are called “functions”.

Functions of political parties:

1) They articulate and aggregate social interests: Parties express public expectations and demands of social groupings to the political system (= function of political opinion-making).

2) They recruit political personnel and nurture future generations of politicians: They select persons and present them as candidates for elections (= function of selection).

3) They develop political programs: Parties integrate various interests into a general political project and transform it into a political program, for which they campaign to receive the consent and support of a majority (= function of integration).

4) They promote the political socialization and participation of citizens: Parties create a link between citizens and the political system; they enable political participation of individuals and groupings with the prospect of success (= function of socialization and participation).

5) They organize the government. They participate in elections to occupy political charges. Normally in party democracies, a good part of government authorities arise from political parties (= function of exercising political power).

6) They contribute to the legitimacy of the political system: in establishing the connection between citizens, social groupings and the political system, the parties contribute in anchoring the political order in the consciousness of the citizens and in social forces (= function of legitimating). In modern societies, the process of political opinion-building is a polymorphic process: The mass media, social organizations, associations, citizen's initiatives, religious communities and the modern form of electronic communication via Internet, sms, Facebook, Twitter and other virtual communities exercise enormous influence on political opinions and political decisions. Nevertheless, political parties are still the principal agents to aggregate public opinion and represent it in the political decision-making process – and they finally also take the political decisions through their representatives in the parliament and government. By following the work of the parties, perceiving and evaluating its argumentation during political debate, citizens can orientate themselves politically through the parties. Furthermore, by

engaging with a party, every citizen can exercise some influence on the political decision-making process. Besides its candidates, the political program is the “merchandise” of a party, which it offers to the voters. The party program fulfill in particular two main functions: on the one hand, they shall articulate the interests of the population (parties as “organs” of the people) and on the other hand, they orientate and influence the opinions of the citizens (parties as “former” of public will; see also point 4.2.). With regard to the party program the voters can evaluate if a party has sufficient sensibility for societal problems and if they are able to propose adequate suggestions for the resolution of problems and challenges.

Oppositional parties have the function to criticize the government, control it and put up constructive alternatives. This function is of great significance for a democracy, because without opposition a government tends to drift towards complacency and presumptuousness and fails to search for alternatives. By fulfilling these functions, political parties are providing important services for the democratically organized society. The quality of the “delivery” – that is, the way they comply with their functions – contributes decisively to the reputation and the potential of the political parties.

The achievement of political Power is one of the essential goals of the political party. The Power in this case is like the challenge cup in the championship. You are enjoying public confidence? Then, please, form the Government on the base of parliamentary majority. You haven't this majority? Then you should form the coalition with other parties or go to the country, trying to earn the public confidence. So many things in the world depend on the confidence. Even the cause of the global economic crisis was the crisis of confidence between the bancs, between the creditors and borrowers. Currently three parties are presented in the Mazhilis – “Nur Otan” People's Democratic Party, “Ak zhol” Democratic Party of Kazakhstan and Communist People’s Party of Kazakhstan.

The Democratic party of Kazakhstan was created by high-ranking officials. But neither Tajin, nor Shaykenov, nor Sarsenbaev, the initiators of the Democratic Party's creation had the interest to create a real concurrent to the Party of the people's unity of Kazakhstan. More effective as the «Pressure groups» were the Civil party of Kazakhstan and the Agrarian party of Kazakhstan. Business wished to have a «party umbrella» over its head: the first were the Mashkevich's group and big agrarians (initiators of the Agrarian party). In 1999 other business groups were far from the autonomous participation in politic.

The situation changed in 2001. The domestic business was getting stronger and wished more power. That was the cause of creation at the end of 2001 of a new Movement – “Democratic choice of Kazakhstan”. The split of the Movement led to the formation of the new party – “Ak Jol”. At the moment it became obvious that a radical restriction of the Parliament's power in 1995 delivered high-ranking officials from the Parliament's control. But this restriction was the cause of a new problem. The phenomenon of Rakhat Aliev was predictable. There was no power to control him: the Parliament' power is limited, the officials can't be against the

all-powerful President's relation, and courts are under control of the same executive power.

The subjective factor of Rakhat Aliev has accelerated the process of politicization of disaffected businessmen. On the other hand the authorities have learned to operate delicately. The party-list elections of 10 deputies of Mazhilis, introduced in 1999, were the cause of the opposition's split. The creation of the opposition Republic popular party in 1998 with A.Kajegeldin at its head, of the National patriotic Movement "Azat" at the beginning of 1990-s on base of the part of the same name Movement, of the National party "Alash" and of the party "Azamat", was the manifestation of this opposition fragmentation. The aspiration to be the second party brought to the concurrence for the votes of opposition part of electorate between Republic popular party, Communist party and party "Azamat". Next to them were the party outsiders: Renaissance party of Kazakhstan (Rukhaniyat) and non-existent party National party "Alash". In the present time in this concurrence take part also party "Auil", Rukhaniyat, Patriots party and Communist popular party of Kazakhstan, which broke off from Communist party.

The power patronage could be seen right in this split. The ordinary causes of the opposition split are the difficulties between the party leaders and the "hand" of the power. These causes are grounded but the attention to the inner causes is also necessary. The Kazakh parties are built on very strange principle: the head of the party (the leader or the co-chairmen) matters more than all other party structures. In other words it is not the head which rests upon the whole "party body", but all this party structure is an adjunct to this head. If the head is "switched off", the party activity is also ended. There are many ways of such "turning off": transfer of the leader to the governmental post, change of his political views, loss of interest to the party activity and so on. One of the consequences of this one-man concentration is the leader's irremovability. This one-man concentration is fatal for the opposition parties and weakens the dominant party.

The last initiative was to unite the opposition parties. The Organizing Committee, created 11 April 2009 represents the new attempt of this consolidation. But the last experience shows the lack of any prospect to this project. Would these lessons be taken into account? Forum of democratic powers, the Movement "For the fair Kazakhstan", different blocks appeared in the period before or after the elections. Then they departed from life. If there were no real creative to propose something new to revive the activity of former parties, then it is necessary to present some new vision of the problem. The interest of other persons of the party, who are near the leader, should be also taken into account. It is also necessary to remember that the «one-man concentration» could play a bad joke with all unifying processes.

Four opposition parties – Communist party of Kazakhstan, Democratic Party "Azat" (created on base of former "Nagiz Ak Jol"), All-National Social-Democratic Party of Kazakhstan and party "Alga", which is not registered, differ in ideological guidelines. Communist party of Kazakhstan remains a Marxist organization; All-National Social-Democratic Party of Kazakhstan tries to

assimilate social-democratic ideology. Democratic Party “Azat” holds the liberal point of economic liberties plus uses some populism of ethnic character. Party “Alga” has demonstrated the largest political non-conformism without any pronounced ideological bindings. All these ideologies were taken from the past (as in the case with the Communist party) or were the substitutes of the real doctrines. Then the attempt to create a party could have no success because of the ideology. The effectiveness of the consolidation in this case is really poor.

From the beginning of 1990-s the Kazakh political parties have some clear main features: they were playing the role of “Pressure groups”, one-man concentration and big importance of their leaders, the absence of the base system – (expression of interests of large social sections). The other characteristics are the instability of party's influence and their short life. These two characteristics are the consequence of the strong role of governmental power. Even for the loyal parties as for example for the Party of the people's unity of Kazakhstan the proximity to the authorities is a big problem to its full-fledged development. So the national political system is characterized by the “marking time” process. The problem of development of political parties, which should become real mediators between society and Government, is not as before resolved.

Lecture 8. National policy in RK. The Republic of Kazakhstan – the subject of the international relations.

1. The main directions of national policy in RK.
2. Priorities and tasks of the Kazakhstan foreign policy.

1. The main directions of national policy in RK.

Kazakhstan – the multinational republic. Negative consequences of a Stalin totalitarian mode for historical development of the Kazakh people. Finding of the state independence by Kazakhstan and course on strengthenings of national unity of Kazakhstan citizens. Idea of an *evraziystvo*. Ensuring full social and spiritual development of all people of the republic. Development of national and cultural associations. Role of Assembly of the people of Kazakhstan as advisory body at the President on problems of an international consent. Independent Kazakhstan – the subject of the international relations. RK acceptance in members of the UN (1992) and other international organizations. RK constitution about the basic principles of foreign policy of the state. The president of RK about the main directions external politicians. Kazakhstan and problem of the answer to the calls of the changing world generated by process of globalization. Policy of RK concerning terrorism, political and religious extremism. Presidential strategy “Kazakhstan-2030”. President Nazarbayev N. A. about mission of Kazakhstan. The message of the President of RK to the people of Kazakhstan “New decade – new economic recovery – new opportunities of Kazakhstan”.

Kazakhstan has entered the third decade of its independence as an established and stable state with a dynamically developing economy and clearly set foreign policy priorities.

The increased participation of Kazakhstan in world affairs can be seen by the rising role and strengthening international reputation of the state, its increased regional weight and importance for the world financial institutions and global economy.

Facing the current realities, the foreign policy of the Republic of Kazakhstan requires modernization and promotion of the national interests on the basis of principles of pragmatism. This process is influenced by a range of internal and external factors.

Among the important internal factors are cardinal changes in the political and socio-economic development of Kazakhstan, completion of our transformational stage and turning towards a new strategy of long-term sustainable development until 2050.

External factors include the need to overcome the world financial-economic crisis, intensified conflicts and current problems of humanity, emergence of qualitatively new geopolitical and geo-economic situation on regional and global scale.

Goals of Kazakhstan's foreign policy.

With due account of Kazakhstan's national interests, our main foreign policy efforts will be focused on achieving the following goals.

1) Measures that will ensure national security, defense capacity, sovereignty and territorial unity of the country.

2) Strengthening peace through regional and global security.

3) Sustainable international position and positive global image of Kazakhstan.

4) Establishment of fair and democratic world order under the guiding and coordinating role of the United Nations Organization (UN).

5) Further integration into the system of regional and international trade-economic relations.

6) Creation of favorable external conditions for the successful implementation of the Strategy 2050; providing high living standards for the population; strengthening unity of the multi-national society; reinforcing rule of law and democratic institutions; protection of human rights and freedoms.

7) Diversification, industrial-technological development and increased competitiveness of the national economy.

8) Focusing the country onto the green development path and bringing it to the list of the 30 top-developed nations of the world.

9) Saving the national-cultural uniqueness and following the own original way of the state development.

10) Protection of the rights of personal, family and business interests of citizens and legal entities of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

11) Support to Kazakh diaspora and Kazakh language overseas.

2. Priorities and tasks of the Kazakhstan foreign policy.

1. Kazakhstan is interested in a politically stable, economically sustainable and safe development of Central Asia.

Acknowledging its responsibility and the role in the region, Kazakhstan will exert every effort to provide regional stability and security and take action against new challenges and threats, including those originating from the neighboring territories.

Kazakhstan will strive to develop intra-regional integration in Central Asia with the purpose of diminishing conflict potential, solving social-economic problems, and tackling water-energy issues and other considerations.

As a final goal, transformation of the region into a unique area of the international politics and economy is envisioned.

Viewing Eurasian economic integration as an effective tool for the promotion of a sustainable position in the modern world, Kazakhstan will strengthen the Customs Union and the Common Economic Space in order to build the Eurasian Economic Union on its basis.

During the course of implementing the process the following principles will be observed: inviolability of the political sovereignty, economic rationalization of the decisions, gradual approach, pragmatism and mutual benefit, equal representativeness of parties in all integration organs and consensus at all levels of collaboration.

2. Kazakhstan will continue the work leading to completion of the international legal formalization of the state borders, as well as defining of the legal status of the Caspian sea and establishment of stable and amiable relations between littoral states, based on the universally accepted principles and norms of the international law.

3. Kazakhstan, being a responsible UN member, a member of Commonwealth of Independent States, Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia, Collective Security Organization, Shanghai Cooperation Organization, Organization of Security and Cooperation in Europe, Organization of Islamic Cooperation, Council Cooperation of Turkic speaking States, and other international organizations and forums, envisions the following tasks within those organizations:

1) Ensuring protection of national interests in the process of development and making decisions of regional and global character in various spheres.

2) Constructive participation and contribution to regional and global security.

3) Promotion of Kazakhstan's foreign policy initiatives.

4) Establishment of optimal and mutually acceptable ways of cooperation between regional and international organizations and forums in order to provide stability and security in the region.

5) Advancement of political – legal and organizational – administrative functions of regional and global organizations in order to increase effectiveness of their work.

Kazakhstan participates solely in those regional and international organizations, whose activities respond to its national interests and bring practical benefit.

In the process of fulfillment the task on strengthening regional and global security, Kazakhstan:

1) Develops amiable and predictable relations with all countries in the world and the alliances they forge.

2) Is committed to aims and tasks of the UN Charter and accepts the fundamental meaning of the principle of supremacy of law for the political dialogue and cooperation between the states.

3) Acts towards resolution of regional and international conflicts according to existing internationally-accepted negotiating formats. Kazakhstan's position is based on fundamental UN principles on defending sovereignty and territorial unity of states within their internationally-accepted borders, search for peaceful resolution of contradictory issues on the basis of observing the terms of the documents on crises resolution and most importantly, in the resolutions of the United Nations Security Council.

4) Puts all efforts to achieving the world order free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction; participates in development of multilateral mechanisms for a comprehensive ban and destruction of such weapons, as well as in creation of zones free of nuclear weapons;

5) Consistently opposes any arms race, creation and deployment of new weapons, including in space.

6) Supports international efforts to combat illicit arms trafficking.

7) in cooperation with other countries on a bilateral and multilateral basis, takes resolute measures to counter terrorism, extremism, illicit narcotics trafficking, psychotropic substances and their precursors, human trafficking and illegal migration, organized crime and corruption.

8) Will continue working on ensuring international information security and combating cyber-terrorism.

References

1. Кравченко А.И. Политология. - М.: «Проспект», 2012.
2. Козырев Г.И. Политология. - М.: «Форум-Инфра-М», 2011.
3. Мухаев Р.Т. Политология. - М., 2011.
4. Политология. Конспект лекций. - А., 2010
5. Пугачев В.П. Введение в политологию. - М., 2010.
6. Козырев Г.И. Политическая конфликтология. - М., 2008.
7. Кравченко А.И. Основы социологии и политологии. - М., 2008.
8. Политическая конкуренция и партийное строительство в постсоветских государствах: общее и особенное. - А., 2008.
9. Политическая конфликтология /под ред. С. Ланцова. - СПб., 2008.
10. Политология/под ред. В.А. Ачкасова. - М., 2008.
11. Политология /под ред. Г.Н. Смирнова. - А., 2008.
12. Политология/под ред. А.А. Радугина. - М, «Библионика», 2008.
13. Предупреждение терроризма в Казахстане.- А., 2008.
14. Пугачев В.П. Введение в политологию. - М., «Кнорус », 2010 (Электронный учебник)
15. Раздыков С. Основы политологии. - А.: «Фолиант», 2008.
16. Современные демократические преобразования в РК/под ред. Б.К. Султанова. - А., 2008.
17. Oxford Dictionary of Politics: political science. 2008.
18. Druckman, James; Green, Donald; Kuklinski, James et al., eds. (2011). Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Political Science. New York: Cambridge University Press.
19. Lowell, A. Lawrence. 1910. "The Physiology of Politics." American Political Science Review 4: 1-15.
20. Political Science in Russia: Institutionalization of the Discipline and Development of the Professional Community. 2009
21. Foucault, Michel, Power/Knowledge, Pantheon Books, New York, 2007.
22. Pip Jones "Introducing Social Theory," Polity Press, Cambridge, 2008, p. 93.
23. Hohfeld, Wesley. Some Fundamental Legal Conceptions as Applied in Legal Reasoning, 23 Yale Law Journal 16 (2009).
24. Hohfeld, Wesley Newcomb. Fundamental Legal Conceptions as Applied in Judicial Reasoning, Yale University Press (1946). The article appeared earlier at 26 Yale Law Journal 710 (2010).
25. Hohfeld, Wesley. Fundamental Legal Conceptions. Arthur Corbin, ed. (Westport, Conn., Greenwood Press (2011).
26. Thomson, Judith Jarvis. The Realm of Rights, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts (2008).

Contents

Introduction.....	3
Lecture 1. Political science subject.....	4
Lecture 2. Power. Political power and political system.....	7
Lecture 3. Civil society and rule of law.....	13
Lecture 4. Democracy. Modern concepts and political practice. Civil society and constitutional state.....	16
Lecture 5. Personality and policy. Place of the person in political life.....	21
Lecture 6. Formation of statehood of independent Kazakhstan. Political system and its development.....	26
Lecture 7. Political parties of Kazakhstan. The rights and freedoms of the person in RK.....	33
Lecture 8. National policy in RK. The Republic of Kazakhstan – the subject of the international relations.....	40
References.....	44

Raigul Bakitjanovna Kaparova

POLITICAL SCIENCE

Synopsis of the lectures
for all specialities

Editor

Specialist for standardization N.K. Moldabekova

Signed to print
Edition 300 copies.
Size 2,9 ed. pub. p.

Format 60x84 1/16
Typographical paper №1
Order price 1450 tg.

The copiers office
Non-profit JSC
“Almaty University of Power Engineering and Telecommunications”
050013, Almaty, Baitursynov st, 126