

Mechanisms of Political Authority Legitimation in Republic of Kazakhstan

Lyazat Matakbaeva

Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Dostyk Ave. 13, 050010, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Abstract: The problem of political authority legitimation is pressing for the whole former Soviet Union. This problem is connected with the fact that modernization processes of new independent states provided the search of their own development model, creation of institutions, which could support the internal unity of a country, internal legitimacy of government agencies. The study of problems of the government legitimacy in respect to the former Soviet Union has just started, that's why the criteria, mechanisms and levels of legitimacy are in the process of formation. This article represents and analyses main forms and mechanisms of political authority legitimation in present-day Kazakhstan. Legitimation cannot be given for ever, even the greatest social assistance can be lost if it isn't being constantly confirmed by new achievements. Wielder of power tries to strengthen its legitimacy; for this purpose it uses mechanisms of political authority legitimation, which is a complex functional system that includes wielder, object, conditions, principals, means and methods taken together, which allow to perform the procedure of political authority legitimation. All the components of the mechanisms are interrelated, each performing its function, which provides the functioning of the whole system. The article pays attention to the necessity of constant legitimation performance in ideological, structural and personal senses. Mechanisms and forms of political authority legitimation in Kazakhstan have not been yet investigated.

[Matakbaeva L. **Mechanisms of Political Authority Legitimation in Republic of Kazakhstan.** *Life Sci J* 2013;10(12s):510-517] (ISSN:1097-8135). <http://www.lifesciencesite.com>. 85

Keywords: Modernization, non-western countries, legitimation mechanisms, inner legitimation, self-legitimation.

1. Introduction. Mechanisms of political authority legitimation are an integral part of the problem of political authority legitimation. The urgency of this investigation can be explained by the following moments. Firstly, significant changes, connected with the attainment of the sovereignty, led to the extreme shifts both in political system and social consciousness, having destroyed a lot of traditional approaches and stereotypes. Secondly, the influence of forced methods on general public on the part of the governing groups was decreased during the process of social life politicization. It led to the increasing of the role of political and ideological mechanisms of social relations regulation. The analysis of the problem of political authority legitimation in respect to the present-day Kazakhstan has just started, attaining the deflection in formation of the Kazakhstani political government institutions. Today to the legitimation processes such approaches are applied, which could provide further development of social-economic and political-cultural changes. At that the previous rendering of democracy - institutional (embodiment of the principle of separation of powers and corresponding rules of making decisions), axiological (stable system of values), operational (authority legitimation by means of election) - turned out to be insufficient for interpretation of new reality, which is taking place in Kazakhstan. The widespread opinion on the fact that launching of the market mechanisms and fixing the economic relationships between regions can solve all

the problems becomes history. History has a lot of examples of the fact that market relations themselves are not the heal-all for solving national problem. Thus, the highest level of industrial development in Canada doesn't release from splash of Quebecois separatism, which was threatening the unity of the country during the last decades. And that is not the only example. The so-called "colour revolutions" which have taken part in the former Soviet Union at the beginning of the twentieth century, showed that this threat cannot be underestimated.

The problems of authority legitimation are relatively recently a major focus of interest of scientists and specialists. The specific group of problems have been changing depending on circumstances and time. In the early modern period English philosopher John Locke advocated in his works for the recognition of the authority by the society as a "constructible" technology of effective demonstration in the spirit of "optimal leadership", and as the system of evaluation criteria for government agencies, which is built by the society, as acceptable and tolerant. The problem of correlation of civil society and the state as a bearer of authority were considered in the work "The Philosophy of Right" by Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel [1,2].

The theoretical generalization of the legitimacy problem was presented in the most complete form by the German sociologist Max Weber [3]. He managed to interpret different sources of authority legitimation in a creative way. One of his

achievements is one of the most interesting and popular in the present time attempt to build up the typology of power domination depending on the type of activity, characteristic for the specific society in the specific time.

Modern forms, mechanisms and procedure of legitimation are considered as a process of formation of specific set of legitimacy social norms and rules, which define the context of modern existence of authority and cooperation of governing agencies, complex binding of specific philosophic, ethical, judicial and political actions. As the result, legitimation and legitimacy are at the junction of several investigation fields. These or that aspects of the problem under investigation were considered in the works by H. Ardent, R. Strauss, J. Habermas, S. Lipset, F. Fukuyama [4,5,6,7,8].

The events of 2003-2005, 2010 which have taken part in Georgia, Ukraine and Kyrgyzstan, known as "colour revolutions" have provided the activation of political discourse on legitimacy problems, appearance of the works, which are application politological investigations [9]. The problem of political legitimation mechanisms is not the subject of self-study in foreign investigations. A lot of authors study mainly the problems of legitimacy theory by M. Weber, classification of legitimacy. The Polish scientist Y. Gaida [10] paid attention to the political legitimacy mechanisms. There are examples of referring to the classification by Russian scientists. The political legitimation hasn't been yet considered in Kazakhstani political science. The absence of conceptual studies of political legitimation mechanisms makes it difficult to implement a qualitative politological analysis.

The goal of the research is the complex investigation of the main forms and mechanisms of political authority legitimation in present-day Kazakhstan.

2. Investigation techniques:

Methods of investigation: monographic investigation, desk research and traditional document analysis.

Experimental basis for the investigation were the following sources:

1. Desk research or traditional document analysis. Within the scope of this technique the analysis of different documents was carried out. The used documents can be divided (according to their type) into following three groups:

a. Regulatory legal acts of the Republic of Kazakhstan, which regulate the activity of political institutions

b. Politological aspect of the problem was created on the basis of particular examples and

situations, which were being discussed in the printed press of the republic and in the speeches of the state's leaders.

c. Statistical data printed in public media allowed to draw some general conclusions on establishing strategies of legitimation of main political forces.

3. The main part

There are a lot of mechanisms, with the help of which a wielder of power tries to legitimize itself. Different documents are being issued: decrees, orders, legislative acts, new constitutions are being adopted, referenda and elections are being held. With the help of these means a new authority implements the process of its legitimation, i.e. gaining the support and credibility of people.

The analysis of political situation in the Republic of Kazakhstan shows that the political power legitimation in Kazakhstan is carried out with the help of psychological, percipatorical, technocratic and technological mechanisms. Legitimation can be considered both as an element of political system and as a specific technology, that is the process of acknowledgement, justification and approval of political authority rights for making political decisions and actions. Let us analyse the above mentioned mechanisms.

Along with the human will to power there exists his consent to submission. "This sociopsychological feature of a human is very close to the bases of legitimacy, as the submission of a human and nation is almost always connected with asserting of the submission conditions before authority" [11].

In Kazakhstan there are no stable traditions of relationships between an individual and authority, society and state. Generally, moral-ethical principles and norms of interrelationships between a human and power agencies, but not judicial norms were dominant. For Kazakhstan it is possible to apply the remark by F. Fukuyama on the fact that «for the effective work of democracy and capitalism institutions they should co-exist with the definite premodern cultural principles, which provide their proper functioning. Law, agreement, economic efficiency are necessary but insufficient for being the basis of stability and well-being of post-industrial societies. One can add to them such concepts as rules of reciprocity, moral obligations, duty to the society and credibility which is based on traditions and customs but not on the rational intentions. In modern society all these concepts are not anachronisms but necessary conditions for its successful development" [12]. Political authority legitimation in the Republic of Kazakhstan is subjected to the dichotomy of the

modern and the traditional. In these regard Russian researchers Lukin A.V., Shkel S.N. mention the fact of re-traditionalization of Kazakhstani state, which, to their mind, went too far during the post-Soviet period. The revival of clannishness and tribal consciousness both among the elite and on the mass level creates objective suppositions for the scenario of transformation of Kazakhstan political regime towards the sultanate and public legitimation of nobility and patronymy in the form of monarchy [13, 14]. In this regard it should be mentioned that implementation of any reforms without clan support in the society, which is not consolidated enough and is separated along the boundaries of tribal identity, is of equal value to its near defeat. Clans provide the mechanisms of internal support of candidate to the authority, and the privileges, given to them, are a sort of pay back for this support and a temporary base for strengthening the power. The president N. A. Nazarbaev, speaking about the role of tribal system of the Kazakhs, writes: "The dictated external institutions in the form of colonial and then soviet authority didn't meet the internal national needs. The system of tribal relations performed this function. It managed to take hold of the entire nation - on the level of the biggest subdivisions - zhuzhes, on the regional level - subdivisions inside zhuzhes and on the local level - own clan, family and own place "I" as the descendant of the seven predecessors... Today tribal identification is an inertial phenomenon of the previous stage of ethno-genetic development of Kazakh nation... But the task of the nation is to make this inertness serve the consolidation of our nation" [15]. Great institutional transformations are slow; they are the result of historical changes which modify individual behaviour. Informal norms are changing gradually; they are less sensitive to the conscious efforts of human. Such norms create the legitimate basis for operation of the law. Thus, when the question is the legitimacy of reforms, a social-cultural factor is very important. A great deal of traditions (mainly negative), including the political ones, have lie deep in collective unconscious, which makes the process of political transformation still more difficult; in this process the change of traditional and patriarchal political culture, which is characteristic for most of post-Soviet states, including Kazakhstan, is very important.

The development of the post-Soviet Kazakhstan can be characterised by the following general parameters of social development: "commitment to the new with account of traditions, using traditions as suppositions for modernization, secular organization of social life, which doesn't exclude the value of religion and mythology in spiritual life, meaning of emphasized personality

together with the use of existing forms of collectivity, combination of world outlook and instrumental values, democratic character of the power, which acknowledges the authority in politics, effective manufacture with the limit of growth border, combining psychological characteristics of a traditional human-being and modern society, effective use of science while implementing traditional and valuable legitimation of social choice" [16]. Thus, it refers to the deep roots of paternalistic, statist political culture, which gravitates toward the powerful state authority.

It should be noted that on the East the authority of the power is based on the power of the authority of a person. It is impossible to imagine parliaments and other political institutions of the East without the personal orientation and personification of the power. The image of a political leader is of great importance among the psychological mechanisms of political legitimation. Today new conditions of formation and functioning of power are formed, and exhibition of legitimacy have changed. Under the conditions of spreading of market relations on the political sphere and the increasing alienation of this sphere from average citizen, manners and images become more and more important participants of the process of social identity construction, both internal and external legitimation. Once achieved level of legitimacy cannot remain on the same level as the law. The level of legitimacy changes depending on the change of conditions, level of credibility and support of people. Retention factor of authority's credibility index is the president. He remains the main centre of public expectations and credibility. The president delegates his resource of credibility to the parliament in realisation of anti-crisis programme and provides the growth in popularity of executive authority. Further development of social sentiment depends greatly upon the proper work of the parliament. Here exist some problems. As the result of activity of government bodies and individual officials the process of state authority legitimation in Kazakhstan are very flexible, they are characterised by elevations and depressions, instantaneous movements. At the same time measures on state authority legitimation need new efforts, it cannot be ensured by short pre-election "breakthroughs", legitimation should be constantly nourished by fresh "juice".

The main subject of social-economic changes in Kazakhstan is the state. In transition society, having statised economy, private property institutions and their political representatives in the name of parties are not formed, the role of the state is very important. This is connected with the absence of the necessary social and economic reforming

suppositions in the person of civil society and proprietary classes, their institutions and infrastructure. In contradiction from political authority, state authority is performed in specific procedure forms, means and methods characteristic for the state. On behalf of the state it is performed, first of all, by authority bodies and officials, empowered for this by the constitution. At the same time the state obtains strictly centralized government when the monopoly for political authority in the country belongs to its central elite and regional and local elite obtains the role of the guide to the centre of the policy. During the process of reformation the state in the person of the central authority adopt a role of ideological centre of reforms and command head quarter of their implementation. The further confirmation of market relations increases regulatory functions of the state. The state solves a number of strategic problems with the help of actual participation in economic processes. The economic system, which is oriented only on market and which have no other control mechanisms, cannot provide harmonious development. "Holy faith" in infinite possibilities of the invisible hand of market gives place to the understanding of role of state in the economy management, where there should be clear rules of game. It should be noticed that there is an explanation for that.

The demise of the Soviet Union didn't cause the control loss in main spheres of social life in Kazakhstan. The processes of sovereignization, which appeared and developed during the period of restructuring, contributed to the fact that commanding elite in the centre and at the local level as well as the country was more oriented to the nation's leadership than to the weakening power structures of the Union centre. There was no break of power during the change of statesmanship in Kazakhstan; commanding elite in the centre and at the local level saved their lineup, and this contributed to the succession and evolution of building up new statesmanship and government institutions. The analysis shows that casting in the structure of state itself as the core of political system becomes obvious. Government agencies are built on the basis of the strict hierarchy and assignment of the heads of inferior agencies by higher-level agencies. The authors of two-volume collection "Evolution of political system of Kazakhstan" underline that "the degree of legitimacy of political transformation, which was initiated by the authority, is a factor that influence the final result. There hardly can be the legitimacy of reforms under the conditions of low level of political system support, which should adequately estimate real possibilities, potential and specific of social organism under transformation"

[17]. The peculiarities of civil society formation in Kazakhstan are such that during the post-Soviet period of exit from the fully stasised condition can be initiated by the state itself and depend on the state until there appears a new qualitative level. As the state develops, the influence of long-term factors, which are concentrated in political culture, historical development of political system, becomes obvious, and this influence becomes significant. The character and ideals of a culture cannot be changed immediately.

The formation of state institutions displays first of all the problem of state establishment; it is an indicator of society conditions which reveals in the work through the definition of dominant ideas of every stage. The experience of some post-Soviet states showed that the implementation of decentralized system of state government, electivity of officials of all branches didn't lead to the increase of state government effectiveness, but provided the loss of state control. In the Republic of Kazakhstan, on the contrary, the formation of centralised system, which reminds the Soviet administrative-command system, was preserved. This showed the pressure of the Soviet times; besides the particular role was played by the peculiarities of territorial specific of Kazakhstan, its area size and resettlement of people. Great area size and low population led to the isolation of some parts and regions of the country, which is worsened by the insufficiency of communication infrastructure development. This fact has led to the strict centralization of state government when lower public authority implicitly obeys higher ones. In fact, the centralized authority system unifies and binds great territory of Kazakhstan with its complex infrastructure into one state, moreover, some researcher state that "the quicker process of economic market reformation in Kazakhstan was connected with greater authority of the regime" [18].

A new model of state government in the Republic of Kazakhstan means the restructuring of the state machinery work by means of functions separation (strategical and tactical, political and administrative) between ministries and government agencies, decentralization and distribution of functional authorities between central and local government bodies, doubling of their activity, defining of budgetary and inter-budget relations as core bases of modern statesmanship, recording of possibilities and prospects of regional development, development and realisation of regional programs of economic and social development, creation of effective state machinery, consisting of modern managers, formation of "Government On-Line". Only state authority can implement all these changes, by

means of enforcement which is not only legal but in most cases legitimate.

In the Republic of Kazakhstan technocratic mechanisms are used for the purpose of political authority legitimization. In our opinion, the foreign policy initiatives of Kazakhstan are part of these mechanisms. The Republic of Kazakhstan entered into international community in tough time when a lot of parameters of interstate relations began to change. Under this conditions Kazakhstan should have taken into account main trend of international relationships in its external policy in order not to get into the line of "frozen time" once again. For Kazakhstan the choice of external policy preferences is the issue of both self-legitimation and external legitimization. The examples of self-legitimation and external legitimization of the Republic of Kazakhstan on international level are voluntary refusal of the republic from nuclear arms, the forth powerful in the world, and the support for initiative on non-proliferation of nuclear arms. The contribution to the counterterrorism, initiative of convention of Conference on Interaction and Confidence-building Measures in Asia, announced by the Head of our state on the 47th session of United Nations General Assembly in 1992.

Globalization as a modern form of international world order induced the growth of legitimacy to the subjects of modern international relationships. Political reasons of demand of globalization for legitimacy are connected with the global, international and national security. The extension of globalization raises a question of involvement of the states which are competitive and stable. Technical execution of this issue has led to the fact that main international actors force the definite type of behaviour to the countries which have just entered upon the path of democracy. There are a lot of examples of the more often enforcement of definite type of behaviour to the countries by international actors in recent years; all this is under cover of democratization, so-called "electoral legitimacy". The globalization lays down strict demands to the state, placing the state into more complex structures of international relationships, pulling out the necessity of social-economic substantiality and practical responsibility for its internal actions. Such tasks can be solved only by capable and effective, which means also professional, uncorrupted, economically sufficient state. States, which are not able to meet these new requirements, can lose their internal and external legitimacy. The analysis shows that the globalization and national state a quite compatible. Globalization doesn't eliminate national state, but suggest defining the optimal value and quality of aims and tasks, which

the state sets. The response to the external threats were strengthening of regionalism, aiming for integration, which ensured the safety within a specific region, that's why Kazakhstan is an active advocate of integration process in the former Soviet Union.

Thus, state philosophy of the policy serves as an instrument for recognition of new identity and legitimacy in Kazakhstan. Political independence can be only based on smooth-running economy, that's why the "from economy to policy" development model was chosen. The crucial role in implementation of this model is played by the state, which initiates, determines and implements modernisation processes on every stage. At the same time, the centralised system is building up a new political system. Local representative bodies and executive bodies taken together form the system of local authority in Kazakhstan. This is the horizontal component of state government in the republic, but it is now weak and depends upon the executive authority. Vertical connections and relations of executive bodies play crucial role in the political system of Kazakhstan. The executive vertical, which is the hierarchy of executive bodies, basing on absolute submission of inferior agencies to higher-level agencies and appointing their heads by the president of the state or by the akim of a higher rank, is the system of state government and one of the most important characteristic of the political system of Kazakhstan. The central core, its real leader is the president of the country, he defines the system of political roles of executive authority and its bearers.

The problem of legitimacy is often raised in connection with the fact that a lot of decisions are made under time pressure. A lot depends on the inner conditions of political institution. In our opinion the success of the reforms depends not upon the lawfulness but upon the legitimacy. That's why the problem of internal legitimacy of political institutions is of immediate interest. The culture of citizen participation cannot be formed automatically, it should be offered by the state for different social stratum in all the regions. The support of the local government in Kazakhstan has become the principal line of activity of international funds and organizations, which allocate for investigations, study and presentation of the process in mass media.

Legitimacy is determined through the normative consensus between the managings and the manageable. The use of a foreign model means the use of its values because the normal work of a new institution is possible only in this case, that's why it is impossible to copy institutions. The transfer from the national uniqueness to unified standards is long and tortuous. Every nation has its own way to democracy,

its own understandings of state structure. This means that legitimacy is divided into actual and ideal. Actual authority legitimacy displays the real, actual attitude of people to the state authority. Ideal model of authority legitimacy only point out to the form of people's credibility, which state bodies and officials are trying to get. V.I. Chirkin thinks that "the acknowledgement of the state power, the legitimacy of its actions is formed on the basis of sensorial perception, experience, and rational evaluation. It is supported not by the external characteristics (though declamatory skills of chiefs, for instance, can influence the public, which contributes to the establishment of charismatic authority), but by the internal operative motives, internal stimulus. State authority legitimacy is connected not with the issue of a law or adoption of a constitution (though it can be a part of legitimation process), but with the complex of emotions and inner affirmations of people, with understandings of different social groups on observation of social justice, human rights and their defence by the state authority and its bodies" [19].

Mechanisms of political system legitimation, based on citizen participation, are elections, which refer to the participatory mechanisms. Today it is early to state that democracy and elections have become a fundamental value of political culture in Kazakhstan. It's more likely that we can speak about the necessity of making a civil "face" to the political systems of CIS countries, which is lost by the Western countries. At the same time the elections are the mechanism, which allows setting a feed-back connection between power agencies and people, the indicator of changes, taking art in political consciousness of the society, accelerator of people activity. Political party system of the republic is on the establishment stage. The Kazakhstani society, which is becoming more and more complicated, needs to display the interests of both old and new social groups. The parties form the basis of the civil society and become the main factors of the state development. Mobilization of people, which is implemented by political parties during the period of election, enables, though insufficiently, the formation of conditions for civil activity. However, the events of neighbouring countries show that the political participation in post-Soviet countries is shown through initiatives of numerous pressure groups - voluntary public associations, which are formed for the purpose of implementation of their own interests by means of deliberate action on the authority. A good example of participatory potential implementation can be the state of Kiev stadium during the "orange revolution". Bashing in Bishkek and Osha in 2005, which repeated in Osha in April of

2010, are also the forms of political participation. The configuration of political participation is directly connected with the type of political regime. There is an instant dependence between the process of political system democratization and diversity of the forms of political participation. In spite of all the changes, Kazakhstan has the traditions of recent Soviet period. Thus, in the sphere of political consciousness there still exist a strong conformism, which is expressed in indifference concerning the political issues, extreme tolerance and metoism, strong puerilism. The investigations of people's political preferences show that the political identification of the most of people is quite vague, uncertain, relative and contextual.

However it should be noted that recently there is active response of the society to some governmental actions in Kazakhstan. The crusade for right-hand drive cars, acts of interest holders and pledgers, clamours against driver's coupons or law rewards for demolition of buildings, legalization of squatter development in Almaty are to our mind the forms of political participation and grounds of civil society formation. It should be acknowledged that the attempt to control the distribution of participatory mechanisms, using the filtration of political participation of citizens, can be traced in Kazakhstan. Electoral law has been changing eight times; it has provided the electoral system of mixed type, when elections had been held in districts and in accordance with party lists, and proportional electoral system. In 2006 a new political party "NurOtan" was created by means of merger of the four pro-president parties. During the elections of 2004 the 7%-barrier was overcome by the four political parties. Seven political parties from 10 registered in Kazakhstan took part in the elections of 2007. Only people's-democratic party "NurOtan" managed to get into the parliament. 7 parties took part in parliamentary elections of 2011. Only three of them entered the parliament, which means that Kazakhstan has entered a new period of multiparty parliament.

Political participation is expressed in creation of new authority institutions. Institution-building takes part during the period of democratic transformations and consists in creation of new specific institutional forms able to satisfy social demands for political participation. To legitimate the state authority it is important to sign a social contract between the state authority and political parties and non-governmental organizations. Government agencies of Kazakhstan establish different boards, forums, "round tables" for the purpose of their legitimation and depending on the situation. Different ideas and programmes that take into account the opinions of a wide range of participants of civil

society, are tested, discussed and approved during the above mentioned meetings. Incredible as it may seem, the dialogue of the Government and Opposition, educates, legitimates and accommodates on psychological level different social interests and needs. Neglect of the interests of most of social groups by the authority can lead to the uncertainty in society and such forms of non-conventional participation of Opposition in political life as riots, rebellions, revolutions. This was shown by the actions of Opposition in post-Soviet Georgia, Ukraine, Kyrgyzstan. The branching network of civil society institutions contributes to the formation of stable democratic skills. Democratic intentions will be only vain dreams or negative responses to the existing social-political situation if they are not supported by regular and diverse forms of civil cooperation. And democracy cannot appear out of dreams or constant discontentment by the existing situation. The foundation of social consolidation consists of social and national forces, which have common interests in main directions of society development.

Technocratic mechanisms of legitimation mean the ability of government agencies to provide proper and effective functioning of management and economic systems. In this case the nation will agree to support the regime. In political discourse technocracy is connected with economic effectiveness. J. Habermas thinks that "under the conditions of prosperity the social credibility to the class of hegemon will be great as well as the other classes will be ready to approve its definition of social reality" [20]. J.Gaida points out the direct link between the growth in prosperity of people and legitimation of the governing political regime. He acknowledges that "metoism and loyalty in respect of the power regime can be gained with the help of increased income of people" [21]. Seymour Martin Lipset points out that in new and post-revolutionary states legitimize "is provided by the long-term success, i.e. actual achievements of the government, the degree to which they can satisfy basic needs of most of people and key government groups (for example, military and economic leaders). For most people the efficiency of governing is associated to the great extend with the achievements in economy and corresponding growth in the living standard" [22]. Summarizing the above mentioned statements we can point out the fact that the technocratic mechanisms of political legitimation allow to state a definite success of the authority in different spheres of activity. In other words technocratic legitimation is the legitimation of managing, economic, military and educational effectiveness of political system. At the same time technocratic legitimation enables the

extension of ideology of mass consumption, political indifference, which is expressed in orientation to the career, leisure and consumption. It cuts the society off from other goals and values and enables depoliticization of people. Technocratic legitimation of authority is a reliable base of system stability, if it is not connected with the true legitimacy, which is expressed in social support of values, embodying government agencies. In the case of failure of prosperity the regime is threatened by depoliticization.

Among the factors of legitimation, the legitimation in the context of authority ability to adjust the space by changing the centre location, deserve special mention. For the first time in the history Kazakhstan decided to transfer and build the capital on the basis of country's national interests. The country needed some patriotic inspiration, some heroic deed. It was connected with new realia - strengthen of independence, building-up of statesmanship, deepening of social-economic and political changes. Authority legitimation, performing together with the building of new capital, can be considered as the powerful upbuilding process, having great political and moral sense. The main reason of the transfer of the capital is the further implementation of state development prospects. The transfer of the capital raised economic activity of the whole country, revived the life of regions, made market changes more dynamic, contributed to the development of infrastructure, and created additional working places. The unexampled action of the country's government on the transfer of the capital is the instance of geopolitical legitimation, the ability to foresee further, more powerful prospects of transfer of the country. First of all, more beneficial and advantageous geographic and political conditions for delimitation of state boundary were created. Secondly, the reclamations of some external groups for northern territories of the country were reduced. Thirdly, the building of the capital became the embodiment of something that can create the unity of people in Kazakhstan. This decision was a step forward to the solving of geopolitical, ecological and economical problems of the new state.

In conclusion it should be noted that sweeping reforms are being implemented in Kazakhstan. As the result of these reforms a new society is forming in the country. This society qualitatively differs from those of Soviet times; it is functioning on the principles of political and economic pluralism. Problems arising during these transformations are complicated and unique. New objective and subjective bases for democratic legitimacy are forming and strengthening today in Kazakhstan. The above mentioned mechanisms of

political authority legitimation are the characteristic feature of inner balance of the system, accommodation of interests of different forces, flexible and advanced response to the society needs, supersession and isolation of these or that forces.

4. Conclusion

The course of democratic reforms in Kazakhstan specifies different forms and mechanisms of political authority legitimation. Political authority legitimation in Kazakhstan is being performed by means of using psychological, participatory, technocratic and technological mechanisms, inside of which we can point out the following mechanisms of political legitimation: economic legitimation, special legitimation, external legitimation. The process of legitimation has a complicated, socially determined character. All the components of the legitimation mechanism are interrelated, each performing its function, which provides the functioning of the whole system.

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Matakbaeva

Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University,
Dostyk ave. 13, 050010, Almaty, Kazakhstan

References

1. Locke J., 1988. Theses in 3 volumes. 3. Moscow, pp: 328.
2. Hegel G.W., 1990. Philosophy of the Right. Moscow, pp: 524.
3. Weber M., 1989. Rationalization and disenchanting world. Leipzig.
4. Arendt H., 1972.. On violence. Crisis of the republic. New York.
5. SttausL., 1987. What is a Political Philosophy.N.Y.
6. Lipset S.M., 1960. Politikal Man. The social Bases of politics. – N.Y.
7. Habermas I., 1975. Legitimation crisis. – Boston: Beacon Press.
8. Fukuyama F., 1995 Trust: The social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity. N.Y.
9. Karin E., 2005. Off-peak season in Central Asia: Kyrgyzstan model of change of power. News of Eurasia. 2: 195–206.
10. Opalka , K., 1991.Elements of Policy theory. Rostov-on-Don. pp:2-417.
11. Mirzoev S., 2006. Death of the Right: legitimacy in orange revolutions. Moscow: Publisher "Europe". pp: 17
12. Fukuyama F., 1995. Trust: The social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity. N.Y.
13. Lukin A.V., 2000. Democratization or Colonization? Evolution of Opinions of Western Scientists on the Changes in Russia. Political researches. 3: 61-79.
14. Shkel S.N., 2009. Post-Soviet Regime Transformations: The Republic of Kazakhstan Experience. Right and Policy. 10: 2024-2030.
15. Nazarbaev N. A., 1999. To Save Our National "I". Through the History of Almaty: Atamura, pp: 46-52.
16. Fedotova V.G., 1995. Pros and Cons of the Catch-Up Modernization Model. Modernization ad National Culture. Moscow, pp: 69.
17. Nysanbaev A., M. Mashan, Zh. Murzalin and A. Tulegulov, 2001. Evolution of Kazakhstan Political System in two volumes. Almaty. 2. pp: 55.
18. Furman D., 2004. Post-Soviet Political regime in Kazakhstan. Kazakhstan and Russia: Societies and States. Moscow. pp: 178-272.
19. Chirkin V.I., 1995. Legalization and Legitimation of State Power. State and Right. 8:66.
20. Habermas J., 1975. Legitimation crisis. Boston: Beacon Press.
21. Gaida J., 1991. Legitimation Process of Political Authority. Elements of Policy Theory. Rostov, pp: 418.
22. Lipset S.M., 1960. Politikal Man. The social Bases of politics. N.Y.

12/7/2013