

SOVIET POWER AND HIDDEN POLICY OF NEOCOLONIALISM AND TOTALITARIANISM

Alima M. Auanassova, Erkesh K. Nurpeisov, Kamilla M. Auanassova, Gani M. Karasayev, Bolat S. Zhumagulov
Institute of State History Committee of Science, Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Kazakhstan
Astana University „Miras”, Kazakhstan
Kazakh National Pedagogical University named after Abai, Kazakhstan

Abstract: *Study of the Soviet power is a rather relevant task, because it allows revealing the details of its history, which were unknown before. The objective of the paper is in characterizing the Soviet power and the hidden policy of both neocolonialism and totalitarianism. As a result, it has been stated that before the Soviets of different levels were formed, the party had been able to accumulate the experience of organizational work, had created viable structures based on strict discipline and absolute objection of the subordinate organizations to the superior bodies. This experience was transferred to the activities of the Soviets. It has been defined that the party acted as an external force over the society and the state, which caused the loss by the U. S. S. R. of its sovereignty and its transformation into the weapon of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The directives and recommendations of the party, despite their unlawful character, had a special force to make follow them.*

Keywords: revolution, Soviets, socialist state, partocracy, pseudo-democratic rights, party establishment.

Two revolutions, bourgeois-democratic and proletarian, that stroke Russia during 1917, changed its political system, having overthrown the Tsar's rule. But judging by the subsequent actions of the Provisional Government and the Soviet power, they were aimed at maintaining its geopolitical status as empire. It is the origin of the reason why the idea of great powerness occupying the minds of both revolutionaries and counter-revolutionaries is so viable.

The historical facts clearly evidence that there was no dissolution of the Russian Empire and the change of the political system had not led to the decolonization. Neocolonialism, the seedlings of which were not always seen among the chaos of political slogans before and after the revolution, was gaining power. Many ethnical outskirts of Tsarists Russia looking forward to get the state independence, were brought into the fold of Russia over a short period by the motives of strengthening the proletarian unity. And those, who were not able to claim their independence, particularly, Kazakhstan, remained in the Russian Soviet

Federated Socialistic Republic as its administrative and territorial units ruled by the revolutionary committees.

The program of the Bolshevik party implied new way of development of Russia, free from the tsar authorities, considered as the exploiters of the working people. People needed a new state power model of victorious proletariat, capable of eliminating the class-specific supremacy and building the classless society, creating the conditions for withering-away of the state in general and transfer to the communist self-government. The task was set, but there were no theoretical bases for its solution. Due to the methodology of the class-specific approach, the doctrines of state preceding Marxism were not taken into account. General theoretical doctrines of states by Plato, Socrates and Hegel did not meet the requirement for building the state of proletarian dictatorship, because of their prevailing humanist content and universal provisions. And the theory concerning state problems described in the works by J. Locke, Ch. Montesquieu and T. Hobbes was also impossible to be laid as a basis of socialistic state, according to the leaders of the proletariat, because it was devoted to the problems of organization of feudal states at the stage of their replacement by the bourgeois states.

Having faced the need of state building at the vast territory of the former Russian Empire, the party took on the solution of this tremendous task, which is called, just-in-time. There were no in-depth studies of socialistic type of state. Works by Lenin „Concerning State” and „State and Revolution” represent neither special theoretical or practical value, because they deal with the origin of state in general, with establishment of proletarian dictatorship in the form of the Soviets instead of bourgeois parliamentarism, with withering-away of the state and transfer to the communist social self-government. The thesis solution of the fundamental problems of state building, including the issues of withering-away, evidence the naïve or amateur attitude towards them on the eve of the October Revolution.

Development of the State Power Model

There were also no real examples of building of a socialistic state. In the conditions of this theoretical and practical vacuum the party had to build the model of new statehood. Its free maneuver in this space was limited by the slogans framing the vacuum, which were the Bolsheviks' promises, such as: „*Factories and Plants are to Working People*”, „*Land is to*

Peasants”, right for national self-determination, state power is to the Soviets, victory of the Proletarian Revolution all over the world.

With such a background the Bolsheviks introduced a specific model of state power in the territory of the former Russian Empire, having subsequently become the Soviet Union. It did not fit any of the known and effective political systems. Neither monarchy, nor presidential or parliamentary republics satisfied the Bolsheviks. As a counter to it Lenin suggested the idea of the Soviets as the most democratic form of true sovereignty of the people. Being blinded by the methodology of the class-specific approach, he saw here only the weapon for suppression of the subordinate class in all the pre-socialist states. Their social functions, the functions of national protection, legal regulation of social, especially, civil relations, were not considered. Lenin saw the entire state mechanism only as the weapon for protection of the superior classes. It is the reason of his disrespect towards state institutions, which successfully managed the tasks of governing the social processes for centuries. Lenin, in particular, underlined many times, that bourgeois parliamentarism with its principle of power division, was a step backwards in comparison with the originated form of state in the form of the republic of Soviets. Expressing his negative attitude towards Parliament, Lenin wrote that Parliament was a French-originated word meaning „to talk”. So, he underlined that parliament was a „talkfest”, while the real power was in the hands of the executives.¹

It seemed to a neophyte reader or listener, that the really new socialist society could not be governed by such a toothless authority occupied by talks.

Instead of parliamentarism Lenin suggested a brand new political system discovered by him, which was the Republic of Soviets. As envisioned by the author, the Soviets had been meant to become the „working corporation”, i. e. adopting laws and simultaneously organizing their execution. Therewith, the system of the Soviets had been meant to have penetrated the society from the bottom upwards, beginning with the peasants and ending with the nationwide level. Therewith, the Soviets had been supposed to independently form their accountable and subordinate executive authorities. Ideally it had been supposed to be. But de facto everything took a different path.

¹ V. I. Lenin, *Complete Set of Works*, Moscow, T. 50, 1950, p. 46.

Activities of the Party on Leadership of the Country

The party started to totally rule the country, having become closely occupied by the tasks of state regulation of the society, solution of economic tasks and national defense, which were not peculiar to it. Therewith, it fully organized and controlled the activities of the state authorities. As it became stronger, the party of the Bolsheviks openly interrupting into the activities of the government authorities, pointed out at what decisions and when were to be made, prepared the drafts of these decisions, which were adopted unanimously, selected the candidates for the state positions that were indisputably approved etc.

This scheme was introduced in all the Union Republics and in the U. S. S. R. in general. The Soviets had different names in various historical periods: Soviets of Workers', Peasants' and Soldiers' Deputies, Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies, but from the end of the 1970s-Soviets of People's Deputies. But it did not change their essence, and the Lenin's idea, that „*even a kitchen maid may rule a state*”, appeared to be utopian and populist. The Soviets revealed their inability to independence. And then the Communist Party sprang into action. Or maybe, vice versa, activity of the Party froze the independence of the Soviets. In any case the Soviets appeared to be a pseudo-democratic curtain, behind which all the issues of stated administration were dealt by the corresponding committees of the Communist Party. These were they who organized and held the elections into the Soviets, decided upon who was to be the Chairman of the Soviet and the Chairman of its executive committee. The agenda and the resolutions drafts of the Soviet were agreed with the party committees. This way it was organized from the bottom upwards. Moreover, many authorities, especially of the low-enforcement system, were fully removed from the Soviets' sphere of influence, such as, for example, The All-Russian Extraordinary Commission for Combating Counter-Revolution, Speculation, and Sabotage, All-Union State Political Administration, People's Commissariat for Internal Affairs, Ministry of State Security, special councils, threes etc. Moreover, soon the law-enforcement authorities became subordinate only to the party establishment, which opened the way to repressions.

By the time the Soviets of different levels were formed, the party had already accumulated the experience of organizational work, had created viable structures based on strict discipline and absolute objection of the subordinate organizations to the superior bodies. In the

conditions of the revolutionary hurry, when there were no time to thoughtfully deliberate all the „pros” and „cons” in any occasion, while the sharp rivalry between the adherers and opponents of socialist reformations required taking immediate measures on creation of new statehood with the system of governing authorities, the leaders of proletariat turned their eye to the organizational structure of their party and considered it to be quite applicable for organization of state power. In the minds of the revolutionary inclined communists, the state was perceived as a temporary, historically transient institute of political life of the society and thus it was beneath excessive attention, as it was accepted in the entire civilized world. There also was another reason.

It is described by the researcher of the Lenin’s heritage R. R. Nasyrov as follows, „*The Bolsheviks Party created by Lenin during many years, was supposed to become an example of the future organization for all Russia. And Russia was really organized by the example of the Bolsheviks Party organization. All Russia, all the Russian people turned out to be subordinate to not only dictatorship of the Communist Party, its central authority, but also to the doctrine of the communist dictator. Lenin denied freedom inside of the party, and this denial of freedom was transferred to all Russia*”.² If to accept this opinion, then it appears that the administrative model for the country had been prepared long before the need in new state administration of Russia emerged.

As a result, each of these reasons separately or logically complementing each other led to the fact that the model of the interparty administrative structure was reproduced in the structure of the state authorities of Russia. As the new administrative authorities were growing, they ironically more and more lost the traits of statehood, turning into the executive appendix of the party power.

Partocracy Model of the Soviets

Transfer of the party power model into the structure of the Soviets went according to a very primitive scheme of mirror reflection. The Party Congress became the prototype of the Deputy Congress, the Central Committee of the Party-the Supreme Council and the government formed by it, the Presidium of the Central Committee (subsequently the Politburo)-the Central Executive Committee of the Supreme Council, the Republican Central Committees of the Parties-the Supreme Soviets of the Union Republics, provincial subordinate Communist Party organizations-the provincial and subordinate Soviets,

² R. R. Nasyrov, *Unknown Lenin*, Almaty, Жеті Жарғы, 1995, p. 49.

primary organizations-general meetings of labor collectives. It should be emphasized that through the Soviets the same principle of democratic centralism takes place as in the party.

The executive structures of the Communist Party organizations always had the divisions, supervising the corresponding branches of social production, public sphere and administrative bodies: departments of industry, agriculture, construction, education, medicine and national security, defense and law enforcement agencies. This system of party authorities with slight deviations was also reproduced in the executive structures of the Soviets from the bottom upwards. At the governing role of the C. P. S. U. they inevitably turned into the actual managing agencies of the party. The sovereignty of a Union republic in such conditions was almost lost, and the statehood was deprived of its main attribute-the sovereignty, i. e. the independence of a state to solve domestic and foreign issues. In these conditions nothing hindered the party power's monopoly over the entire Union of the S. S. R. from the supremacy. The state power capable of competing with the party one was not almost created. Its imitation in the form of the Soviets was miserably finished in the early 1990s.

Thus, the party authorities found a new form of realization of their power through the Soviets and their executive authorities. The Soviets did not form the real state content. They turned into the political decoration with the power of the party establishment behind the scene. The most important thing was that the Soviets, as a system of power authorities, i. e. the state, lost their independence, its supremacy at the execution of its power. The U. S. S. R. and the republics lost their sovereignty. The Constitutions stated the sovereign rights, but they belonged to the Party rather than the Soviets.

The following historical facts illustrate this well. On March, 10 1919 Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars of the R. S. F. S. R. V. Lenin asked, „*Was everything done for execution of the directive of the Central Committee regarding the measures of collecting the food supplies in the Don Oblast?*”³ These are the words of the head of the state executive power. Having transferred from the party work to the state service, Lenin, however, in the structure of the administration hierarchy put the Central Committee of the Party higher than the supreme executive power authority which was the Government. On June 22, 1920 Lenin prepared „*The Draft Provision of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party of the Bolsheviks regarding the Issues of the*

³ V. I. Lenin, *Complete Set of Works*, Moscow, T. 50, 1950, p. 268.

Russian Communist Party of the Bolsheviks in Turkestan”, where he ordered to „*defeat, evict and master the kulaks as energetic as possible*”. It was the beginning. The farther in, the deeper. The Party started working out the five year and seven year plans of the national economy development. The first and then the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. began to represent the country at the international arena as the leader of the country, rather than party, as well as to sign the international contracts. From the legal perspective it was nonsense.

Actual partocracy in the U. S. S. R. was concealed with the facade of so-called Soviet Power. The slogan „*All Power to the Soviets*” was diluted, but reserved for the ideological purposes. There was another prerevolutionary slogan of the party with the same sad background „*Factories to the Workers*”-„*Lands to the Peasants*”. Actually the factories, land and other means of production took the form of the state property, which were completely managed by the Party. The workers by themselves turned out to be employees. The owner changed-instead of the entrepreneurs the property belonged and was handled by the Party Soviet establishment. The peasants were provided with the land for a very short time. Afterwards at collectivization it was turned into the state property with subsequent transfer to the collective farms in perpetuity. Due to the complete elimination of the collective farms these lease relations were terminated as well.

Thus, bad consequences of the adventurous Lenin’s idea of the Soviets became the heritage of all men, but ideologically they were not subject to criticism.

Directives and Prohibitions of the Party

The ugly symbiosis of the party and the state put on a semblance of state activity based on the principle of the democratic centralism made up in the Soviet Union. According to it, the subordinate Soviets were subjected to the superior, so their executive bodies also were in the same vertical subjection. But the executive authorities were also subjected to the Soviet elected them and thus were twice subordinate. Adoption of the administrative decisions was complicated by the need of agreement through the vertical (superior body) and horizontal (Soviets) subjection. This situation was complicated by the interruption of the Party.⁴ It resulted in triple subjection of the subordinate executive and

⁴ M. Edele, „The Right to be Helped: Deviance, Entitlement, and the Soviet Moral Order”, in *The Soviet and Post-Soviet Review*, year XLIV, no. 3, 2017, pp. 28-33.

administrative bodies. It caused the increase in bureaucracy, paper work, bureaucratism and low effectiveness of the administrative activities. This was the general picture for all the Soviet republics, because none of them had a right to establish another political system. And Kazakhstan was not an exception here.

The Soviets of all the levels according to the laws applicable those times were recognized as sovereign owners in their territories and authorized representatives of the people's interests. While actually the Soviets could take care of their electorate's interests only to the extent allowed by the Party authorities. Even at the level of the Union republics such care could take place only by agreement of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of a republic or C. C. C. P. S. U. Meanwhile, neither Constitution nor other regulative legal acts of the Soviet period implied the obligation of the Soviets and their executive bodies to agree the realization of their authorities with the party organizations from the bottom upwards, and to take their recommendations, directives and other resolutions to compulsory execution. There were hidden party normative regulators, which dominated over the Constitution and laws by the power of their unlawful commitment. The ruling role of the C. P. S. U. claimed by the Constitution opened a wide respective for distribution of the unlawful state activities' regulating methods competing with the laws.

As early as in January 1920 J. Stalin stated that „*our Soviet or other mass organizations solve no important political or organizational problem without governing directions of the Party*”.⁵

These methods of unspoken regulation were especially actively used at selection and placement of employees in the Soviet authorities as well as heads of the enterprises and institutions. Depending on level and status their positions were included into the establishment of the corresponding party organization (Central Committee, regional committee, city committee, and district committee). They either recommended or approved the appointment to a position of some or another candidate. This procedure seeming something secondary, recommended, at the first glance, *de facto* always ended by the legal documenting of the decision taken by the party organization. Dismissal of such a candidate went according to the same procedure. The hidden party regulator acted relentlessly: there was never and could not be a case of refusal.

⁵ J. V. Stalin, *Issues of Leninism*, Moscow, Goskomizdat, 1945, p. 126.

The same thing took place in the sphere of artistic, scientific creation and freedom of expression. The undesirable, from the perspective of the party, artistic and scientific works were prohibited by the state authorities responsible for censorship. The undesirable alternative statements became the subject of precise inspection and prohibition by the state security agencies. Totalitarianism, criticized now as a negative political system, was actually political totalitarianism, because the state in its sense of the word did not almost exist in the U. S. S. R.

The State pressed by the Party

Apparently in order to hide this glaring fact in the history of the first socialistic state, the party convinced the masses in the idea of its constructive government by the Soviet state. The world experience of previous centuries as well as of the modernity shows that state is the only sovereign subject governing the society that does not allow some direct governance by itself, by the superior organization. The only exception is the theoretic states, e. g. Vatican, governed by the God with his divine commandments, according to the idea of its creators.

But the Party cannot reach the level of God due to its earth human origin. That is why it cannot be the absolute truth. Then what is the reason for it to flout such an achievement in the sphere of administration of a country's social life as state?

From this point of view, the words of the Chairman of the U. S. S. R. Supreme Council Presidium N. V. Podgorny at the 23rd Congress sounded ridiculous and obsequious: „*Further strengthening of the Soviets' party authority is the base for new rise in the activities of the representative bodies of our people, and essential for gradual strengthening of the Soviet State*”.

It is difficult to define what more is there: just the lack in understanding of the sovereign role of a state in the social life or conviction in the productive power of the Communist Party, where he belonged to, or just his talkfest. The position of the leader of the state collective head in the form of the Supreme Council appeared to be weaker than the position of a simple member of the C. P. S. U. And his assurances, that „*the political line chosen by the 23rd Congress will become the core for the work of the party and the state, the basis for the activities of the Councils of Workers' Deputies*” is nothing else, but the rejection of sovereignty of the state. The sense of sovereignty is in the fact that its bearer (state) performs the supreme power in the country depending on nobody. And

if this sovereignty is ruled by someone, then it is already not a sovereign, but a subordinate institute.

Open admission of the ruling party was a forced statement of the fact that there was a totalitarian supremacy of the Party over the society and its institutions. But the process of its legitimization was very slow. It happened in 1997, when the Constitution accepted the ruling role of the C. P. S. U. in the Soviet Society. Besides, the mechanisms for implementation of this role were created by the Party and were not made public to the fullest extent. Among them is the establishment approach to the selection of the employees in the Soviet authorities and administration in so-called national economy that we mentioned above.

Joint Regulations of the Party and the Soviet Authorities

Another invention of the C. P. S. U. became the practice of adopting joint regulations of the party and Soviet authorities. For the civilized legal and political systems this normative innovation was the top of detracting one of the main functions of a state—the legislative prerogative. This is exclusive authority of the state and its bodies.⁶ Joint regulations are the acts having no legal force, because here the rules of legislative technology are gravely violated. If parties as any public organizations and the state have the same interests, then they may conclude an agreement regarding them in the form of memorandum, covenant or treaty etc., stipulating mutual rights and obligations on achievement of a socially significant goal. Such memorandums are widely used in the modern world, especially in the periods of escalation of the situation in the country. So, for example, as early as in the period of independence the city administrations (akimaty) of the Kazakhstani regions concluded a treaty with the entrepreneurs and their associations regarding the prices and maintaining employment in the conditions of the imminent world crisis.

Joint regulations have a doubtful legal value, because they openly impinge on sovereign rights of the state. From the political point of view they could be a backup in case some republic or a Soviet refuses to execute a directive of the party against expectations. It happens because it is easier to force some leader to sign a joint regulation, than to force a resistant collective authority to execute the directive of the party.

⁶ Hugh Ridley, „Colonial Society and European Totalitarianism”, in *Journal of European Studies*, no. III, 1973, pp. 147-159.

De facto unlawful replacement of the Soviets by the power party required making the events taking place in the state construction legally decent. Therefore the Constitution stipulated pseudo-democratic rights on the state power belonging to „*the workers of the city, aul and village represented by the Council of the Workers' Deputies*” (Art. 3), on voluntary association of the Kazakh S. S. R. with other republics into a single Union (Art. 13), on keeping „*the fullest amount of their sovereign rights, though limited by the Constitution of the U. S. S. R.*” (Art. 13), and the rights to free exit from the composition of the Federation (Art. 15).⁷

Bureaucracy in the State Decision-Making

The party bureaucracy, following the parallel course with the Soviet officialdom, made their decisions be adopted through it, and the responsibility for them was fully borne by the Soviets. The Party was beyond the legal procedures of acceptance and execution of the decisions and thus could not be brought to responsibility. Such a paradoxical situation emerged, when the state authorities entitled to make decisions „*de facto cannot be responsible for their unacceptance and nonobservance, because the decisions were made not by them. While the party authorities that actually decide everything, legally bear no responsibility, because they have no right to make the corresponding decisions*”.⁸

The known politician of the 1990s, People's Deputy A. A. Sobchak ironically but aptly reflected the essence of the partocracy, being right saying that the party authorities „*do everything: from appointment of the hierarchs to distribution of deficit commodities by the lists*”.⁸

The state authorities established on the basis of the Constitution were not filled with the content of true state power. The party, when implementing its selection policy and placement of the Soviet and executive employees at the production enterprises, widely practicing the principle of appointing the employees for state authorities among the establishment, not stipulated by the Constitution, turned the state authorities into its executive authorities. Thus, de jure the Soviet power de facto became the power of the Communist Party. The Republic of the Soviets as political system turned into the unitary partocracy.

⁷ Constitution of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic, Almaty, Art. 3, 13, 15, 1978, Access Mode: https://online.zakon.kz/Document/?doc_id=1027292 (accessed on 08.13.2017).

⁸ A. A. Sobchak, *Formation of New Political System: Power, Party and Law. Law and Power*, Moscow, Progress, 1993, pp. 145-146.

Hegemony of the Party over the state authorities, social organizations and society in general gradually became so evident, that inside of the country and at the international arena this symbiosis contradicting to the international-legal and national-legal principles of the state power organization was impossible to conceal. Therefore a decision was made to legalize what could not be concealed. It was the point when the sadly remembered article in the Constitution of the Kazakh S. S. R. appeared in 1978, which was the literal summary of Article 6 of the U. S. S. R. Constitution 1977 concerning the ruling role of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The Communist Party as the Ruling and Guiding Power of the Soviet Society

The evidence of gross violation of democratic principles of the sovereign state and society with the multi-party system institutions, freedom of social associations was the fact that the Communist Party was the ruling and guiding power of the Soviet society. Although the historical experience of all the peoples reaching the state level of development shows that the state is this power. It is its main function. If it is not able to perform its main task, then the state becomes overthrown, destroyed, eliminated and should be replaced by another state capable of performing the tasks that the previous one failed to perform.⁹ It may be called the natural-historic and objectively caused course of the political development of a state. Despite this, in the U. S. S. R. upon its origination, the unnatural and anti-historical voluntarist course for monopolistic supremacy over the state structure was chosen, resulted in the devastating dissolution of social and state system, formed by the party. The C. P. S. U. is claimed by the Constitution to be not only „*a ruling and guiding power*”, it constitutionally and actually becomes „*the core of the state and social organizations*” (Art. 6). While any core, as known, is the main defining element of any structured system. In these conditions to raise the issue of restoration of the Kazakh statehood is considered as „*politically incorrect*”. The Soviet Union contained the Kazakh S. S. R., was claimed to be „*the state of the whole people, expressing the*

⁹ R. Geenens, „Sovereignty as Autonomy”, in *Law and Philosophy*, year V, no. 36, 2017, pp. 495-524.

will and the interests of the workers, peasants and intelligentsia, workers of all nations and nationalities” (Art. 1).¹⁰

Such situation was formed not only in Kazakhstan, but also in the other Union Republics. The C. P. S. U. managed to keep the territory of the Russian Empire in its previous configuration, but with those colonial territorial increments taking place before the tsarism was overthrown. But a new element in the empire policy emerged. The position of motherland instead of Tsarist Russia was occupied by the top-party establishment. In the new historical conditions Russia itself, the same as the other republics of the former tsar’s outskirts, turned into the colony in the empire policy of the C. P. S. U. The legitimate form of this precisely concealed policy was the pseudo-democratic Soviet Federation, where Russia took the equal position alongside with the former policies. While de facto the Soviet Federation in the form of the U. S. S. R. turned out to be a rigidly centralized hierarchical structure, managed by the Party. Almost complete identity of the executive apparatus of the Party and the Soviets, set in advance, perfectly fitted for the widespread implementation of the C. P. S. U. governing role towards the Soviets and society in general. In this conditions Kazakhstan actually turned into an administrative-territorial unit, the territory and resources of which were used by consideration of the C. P. S. U.

Based on the aforesaid and also considering a series of other circumstances, one should note that the U. S. S. R., having actually lost its sovereignty, stopped being a state in the true sense of this word, and became the apparatus weapon of the omnipotent C. P. S. U. at that time. So, the dissolution of the U. S. S. R. caused the crash of the entire executive vertical, dealt a devastating blow to the omnipotence of the C. P. S. U., which was exactly provided with its executive vertical. The Communist Party of the U. S. S. R. dissolved, and the communist parties of some former union republics emerged at its wreckages existed rather by inertia, having neither distinct ideology nor influence on the power and society, and the main thing, having no administrative levers in the form of the Soviet government authorities.

Absolute domination of the political party should be differentiated from the activities of the ruling party. The party is considered to be ruling, when it constitutes the majority in the legislative body of a state—the Parliament. At the same time, the electorate (i. e. the citizens of the state) votes for election of some or another party’s representatives to be

¹⁰ Constitution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Moscow, 1977, Access Mode: <http://www.hist.msu.ru/ER/Etext/cnst1977.htm> (accessed on 08.15.2017).

the parliament officials, included into the party list.¹¹ Having come through the alternative elections, the party accumulated the majority of the votes, forms the ruling party faction in the parliament. The party settings, solutions and recommendations contribute to formation of the ruling party's position, on the basis of which the legislative provisions and the resolution drafts are formed. They become the matter of discussion and decision-making in the parliament. In case of their approval by the Parliament the will and position of the party becomes legitimized. This way the possibility of the ruling party dictatorship is eliminated.

At absolute domination of a party it acts as an external force standing over the society and state and governing them.¹² Unlawful compulsion is an infringement on the sovereignty of the state and disrupts its independence. Besides, according to the experience of the C. P. S. U. we know that the party used such powerful leverage on the activities of the state structure as primary organizations of the party, uniting all the communists according to their place of work. And they, having been enchained by the rigid party discipline, consistently conducted the course of the party, being at their own places, even if it contradicted to the laws and interests of the state.

Conclusion

Thus the entire history of the U. S. S. R. from its origin to the dissolution evidences that the main attribute of state-the sovereignty, while decorating the facades of the Union Republics, turned into the political declaration having no real content. Besides, the implementation of the sovereignty of Kazakhstan was impossible due to the legislation, having documented the activities of the union and union-republican ministries. In Kazakhstan of the Soviet period 80% of the territory and about 90% of the social production was under their jurisdiction.

Unfortunately, the statehood lost by the Kazakhs in the middle of the 18th century against the people's expectations, was not recovered after the October Revolution 1917. Not recognized officially, but actual partocracy, limited neither by the law nor by the state or the opposition parties, existed in Kazakhstan in the form of the Soviet state till December 1991.

¹¹ V. N. Ivanov, M. M. Nazarov, E.A. Kublitskaya, „Social Tension versus Social Situation”, in *Bulletin of the Russian Academy of Sciences*, year V, no. 87, 2017, pp. 432-438.

¹² B. K.Asanov, S. E. Kim, *Turkestan in 1917*, Almaty, 2009, p. 163.

There could be no other way. The Communist Party, obsessed with the idea of the victory of the proletarian revolution all over the world, considered that the issues of national state importance were not very significant in the forthcoming processes of internalization of the international relations, steadily moving towards the classless and thus stateless society all over the globe. According to the ideas of the Communist Party the national boundaries, including the state boundaries, should be eliminated. But as this strategic task could be solved after a long time and required creation of the corresponding political and socioeconomic conditions, the policy of the party was aimed at their creation. Due to this fact, the economic priority became the approval of the socialist property for the means and results of the production, narrowed to rejection of private and supremacy of the public, i.e. state property. Expropriation and collectivization were the main instruments for implementation of this policy. The monopolistic party having total control over the state administration structures created by it had been supposed to be the forceful levers in the sphere of political administration of the society. And it actually happened.

To solve these truly grandiose tasks and to make them attractive for the world community, it required a large country, such as the Russian Empire, which occupied 1/6 of the world's land surface. Therefore overthrow of tsarism was not to be accompanied by dissolution of the empire's territory. The national policy of the U. S. S. R. (and the latter to a greater extent (if not totally) was defined by J. V. Stalin from 1917) though in some way covertly, but nevertheless quite actively stood for maintenance of „*one and undivided Russia*”.

