

Command-Administrative System in Kazakhstan in the Postwar Period: The Characteristic and Features of the Functioning

Fatima Kozybakova

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, 140000, Almaty, Al-Farabi av., 71

Abstract: In the early twentieth century, economic role of government has become so significant that the first half of the last century went down in history as the era of state-monopoly capitalism. Her practice has pushed the idea of "state socialism"-an attempt to use economic power of the state to accelerate the socialist transformation of society. Development of this idea has led to the emergence of a command economy. The purpose of this article is to trace the historical background of the command-administrative system in the postwar period and to characterize the specificity of this system, as well as to consider the basic features and contradictions of the command-administrative system.

Key words: Kazakhstan • Totalitarianism • War communism • The command-administrative system

INTRODUCTION

Denoting the Soviet state as a totalitarian state, political scientists isolated the most essential characteristics of its characteristics-totalitarian rule.

Back in the 1950's, researchers largest totalitarianism X. Arendt, K. Friedrich, Zbigniew Brzezinski identified the following parameters of a totalitarian regime: the leader, the ideology, the state party, the state monopoly on weapons, communications, terrorist secret police and state control over the economy. Today these characteristics are called syndrome K. Friedrich and Zbigniew Brzezinski and the analysis of totalitarian regimes referred to as "static concept of totalitarianism" [1].

Totalitarian state, monopolizing all spheres of human life, destroys all freedom, including economic freedom. Soviet-style totalitarianism destroyed the economy as an independent public subsystem. Totalitarian Soviet regime was replaced by a system of bureaucratic market production and distribution, creating a hard-centralized, policy-planned economy with the immanent control system.

Describing the system of economic management in the USSR in the post-war years (1946-1954), researchers often use the term "command-administrative system". In terms of foreign historiography "administrative

system", "command economy", etc. used since the late 1960's years.

In Russia, the number of publications of the second half 1980-1990 economists indicate priority G.X. Popov run into circulation concept of "administrative system" [2].

From this period in Russian and Kazakh historiography, this category included both qualitative vertical determinant of socio-economic relations in Soviet society.

At the heart of the administrative system is a simple ratio of administrative subordination. Administrative subordination similar to the military, since trace him, or rather transferred to another, much wider scope, where violence is not in principle is a mandatory attribute. According to some researchers, the specificity of the administrative system in that it is based on the principles of rational organization [3].

In the early XX century, Max Weber, summarizing the experience of large corporations and government, formulated the basic principles of rational organization or rational bureaucracy.

- First, the division of labor, a clear separation of functions. Specialty components of the system increases the efficiency of each link in the system has administrative responsibility.

- Secondly, the unity of command. Unity of command to determine to whom the given link is administratively responsible for the tasks assigned to it.
- Third, the hierarchical structure. Kohl this concept is designated as a system-this is the order, respectively, due to the correct systematic arrangement of parts a particular relationship. And the order of the parts derived from the principle of unity of command is designated as a strict hierarchy. Multi-stage hierarchy of such relations in many cases is the most effective instrument of communication and coordination.
- Fourthly, the formalism. Clearly separated and distributed functions are performed in accordance with an equally clear rules and regulations. This ensures consistency and predictable action facilitates the planning and control.
- Fifth, the system of sanctions and rewards. Organization based on the administrative subordination, needs a solid discipline, which is supported by certain stimuli.

Similar systems are functioning at the immanent principles, Weber calls bureaucracy "human machine". "Bureaucratic management means rule by means of knowledge and this is its specific-rational character" [4]. Like any machine, she herself has no program, being formally rational structure. Program can set a political leader, putting this machine in the service of political values?. Depending on the selected program or system to serve the evolution of society, or contributed to its stagnation.

According to the economist E.G. Yasin administrative system-this is a big business, built on sound principles and covers the whole country, the whole of society in which the lines of administrative subordination go from top to bottom, from the government to the workplace [5].

Effectiveness of the principles of rational organization was seen for a long time and the basis for the functioning of all the armies and the state apparatus. However, the economics of their use has long been limited.

Background Command-administrative System and its Essence: During the period of "war communism" formed the so-called "military-communist" structure in managing the economy. Its basis is comprised of three dominant-nationalization, centralization and policy

planning, they became clearly determine the orientation of the state in economic policy [6]. As part of this policy (the policy of "war communism") to bid on the complete blocking of the market, commodity-money relations, the substitution of economic institutions and non-economic incentives directive-distribution system.

In the military-communist system already present elements of the future administrative-command system, although apart from the nationalized industries and transport, were large sectors of the economy, which the State did not comply (for example, numerically dominant agriculture). They had no administrative control and military and political methods.

In the crisis of 1920, the Soviet government was forced to withdraw from the military and communist methods of economic management. In the new economic policy, although to a limited extent, the market mechanism has been restored. But since the mid 1920, the market economy has become completely displaced directive- planned, centralized economy, which became the core of the regulation of the command-administrative system. Was restored military- communist system in a slightly different, tailored to the conditions of peace, form. This variation was the command-administrative system, the basis of which amounted to the same three dominant-nationalization, centralization and policy planning [7].

Command-administrative system, retaining some elements of the administrative system had a number of significant differences from it:

- Firstly, the system was not built simply on man management and concentration on complete and unlimited power in the same hands. And for its retention was necessary administrative system, which itself requires a unity of command.
- Secondly, if the administrative system means domination through knowledge, the command-administrative system does not require any special knowledge of its officials. The main selection criterion becomes professional competence, not the level, depth of knowledge and intelligence, not a creative approach to problem solving and the ability to clearly and, most importantly, implicitly perform top-down prescription. Initiative, creativity, individuality becomes vice, is recruitment-elements of the system rather docile than capable. And if you can, you can at all, not cramped morality.
- Third, a mandatory element of the system become a creature. Protectionist attitude permeates the entire hierarchical structure.

Of course, these features are not only about the essence Defines command-administrative system, but they are, in our opinion, the priority and are exoteric and destructive.

Command-administrative methods of management of the economy continued to operate in the postwar period and led the country to the global economic crisis [8].

European sovietologists characterizing the 1940-1980 years in the USSR noted : "It is particularly devastating is the fact that under the communist system, people have forgotten how to think economic categories. Therein lies one of the reasons why the position of the Communist economy usually embellish. Economic performance and other statistics on socialist economic systems distort their true condition. In these systems, there was no economic thinking nor normal money, they almost did not produce consumer goods, the more competitive and tough economy rejected autonomy in relation to the policy of " [9].

Development of Administrative-Command System in the Postwar Period: In the postwar period (1946-1954 years) belief in the effectiveness of the economy gained hyper centralized quality more stable ideological constants. A severe consequences of World War II led to the formation of the post-war syndrome sacrifice.

Ideological machine strenuously inculcated in the minds of the masses the idea of the need to exercise during the difficult postwar years, labor heroism, patriotic enthusiasm, enhance mobilization capabilities in extreme war years. The society was fixed concept of "maximum casualties" in the name of the country and in peacetime. State doomed his people to the incredible tension forces at half-starved existence, seeing only in this way out of the crisis recovery period. Find reserves a different order, the system was unable to.

Agro industrial space of Kazakhstan in 1946-1954 years possessed a number of characteristics of social and economic order:

- Republic had one of the highest potentials for further development of the USSR (vast, underdeveloped area, the presence of the richest mineral deposits, cheap labor, which grew significantly during the war years (thanks to evacuation) skilled workers and technical personnel).
- Significant and annually increasing acreage of crops and low average yields;

- The predominance of heavy industry in the structure of industry and the high degree of militarization, weak diversification of industry;
- Extensive and resource-intensive nature of the economy;
- Increased capacity in the social sphere, increasing the educational, qualification Kazakhs in the postwar decade. So, if in 1939 there were only 1,000 people to 60 people, with higher, incomplete higher, middle and lower secondary education, by 1959, the figure was 238 [10].

The agricultural sector of the economy of Kazakhstan in 1940, there have been significant changes associated with the management structure. In 1939 was reorganized in agricultural management has changed the internal structure of the People's Commissariat of the USSR and the People's Commissariat of Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic, which became based not on a sectoral basis and on production and the territorial principle (was created four regional industrial control).

In the postwar years, a trend towards expansion of agricultural administration both at the center and in the field.

Reorganization of the central administrative organizations, concerned only the managerial staff, they did not change the methods of management principles subordinate ministries, enterprises and institutions. Administrative apparatus was divorced from production.

Considering the main parameters of economic development during the study period is necessary to note certain dynamics of economic processes, although agriculture is in a state of collapse.

Sown area in the whole of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic (for the period of the Great Patriotic War) by 1945, compared with 1940, decreased from 6808, six thousand to 6,039,900 hectares [11].

Acute problem of country food (especially bread) led to an invariant, extensive solution. In December 1946, the Council of Ministers adopted a decree "On the extension of acreage and increase grain yields of spring wheat, especially in the eastern regions of the USSR" [12]. And since the end of 1940 beginning of 1950 is a notable growth acreage. In 1950 within the framework of extensification of agricultural production acreage in Kazakhstan increased by 1 mln.600 thousand hectares and reached 7854, 3 thousand hectares and over the next years, the annual increase in acreage was compared with the previous rate of 5-10%". In 1954 a large-scale virgin company, where the dynamics of area was more significant.

Average cereal yield in 1950 was 7.9 tons per hectare even exceeded performance in 1928 (9, 2 tons per hectare) and in 1955 the average yield dropped to 2.9 tons per hectare [13].

At least in a difficult situation and a traditional branch of agriculture-livestock.

In 1928, based on statistical compilations total livestock population (excluding camels) was 31 718 heads in 1946-16 177 heads in 1950-24 129 heads, 1954-29480 heads, i.e. By 1954, total livestock herd has not reached the performance of 1928. The main types of animal agriculture of Kazakhstan failed to restore the number of cattle in 1928. Only sheep because of their greater biological fertility rate was overcome in 1928 [14].

In the decade after the war clearly tracked downward trend and consolidation of collective farms and increase the number of farms. If in 1945 the number of state farms was 6758, then in 1956-2712 and the number of state farms, respectively 194 and 628. And if the creation of state farms on newly reclaimed lands for large capital investments should be regarded as fully justified, then the transformation of collective farms into state farms only because co-operative ownership of the theory of building communism is flawed and incomplete, not contribute to the development of socialism, has brought enormous damage, leading to division peasants village, destroying cell eternal peasant family labor. This trend as the dominant and stored during years 1960-1980 [15].

In the recovery period all the mechanisms of the command-administrative system, methods of pumping equipment from the village have become more sophisticated. In respect of rural residents increased extra-economic coercion methods, retained, as in the years of war, natural supply of meat, milk, eggs and other products for public (non-equivalent) prices. Despite the crisis in the agricultural sector, the government continued to alienate a significant portion of agricultural products from the farms.

In the 1940-1950 years necessarily available on grain procurement reached 50 percent or more relative to gross harvest. Moreover, government procurement prices for agricultural products was so low that, for example, in grain production reimburse only one eighth of the cost and the livestock and less.

Lots of different taxes (direct and indirect), forced distribution system of state loans, etc. worsened an already difficult, the critical state of rural residents. In addition, farmers had no passports and were recorded at the lists, which were conducted village councils.

This deprives them of free movement, change of residence, legally tied to a farm, giving their work feudal character, peasants did not rely holidays, pensions, allowances.

CONCLUSION

In the 1940's and 1950's, Kazakhstan was one of the largest parts of the military-industrial complex of the USSR. In many cities of Kazakhstan functioned large factories specializing in military production. Along with the deployment of a broad infrastructure of military-industrial production in Kazakhstan in this period began construction of a nuclear test site near Semipalatinsk, rocket-in the Balkhash region and later-the Baikonur cosmodrome.

Addressing one of the largest producers of cotton, wool, raw hides, the republic had very inadequate share in the Union production of cotton and woolen fabrics, leather footwear.

In general, the development of industry in the period under review dominates extensive. Legislative unscientific planning, the use of the primacy of economic growth-gross output acted as major destructive elements in the industrial development of Kazakhstan.

REFERENCES

1. Machkuv, E., 2000. Conversion of communist totalitarianism and post-communist system transformation: problems, concepts, periodization // Polis, 4: 39.
2. Yasin, E., 2003. A Treatise on the administrative system // Do not you dare to command! From the administrative command to economic methods of management. Moscow.
3. Collins, K., 2003. The Political Role of Clans in Central Asia, Comparative Politics, 35(2): 171-190.
4. Melvin, N., 2004. Authoritarian Pathways in Central Asia: A Comparison of Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic and Uzbekistan. In Y. Ro'i, (ed.). Democracy and Pluralism in Central Eurasia. Cummings Center Series. London: Frank Cass, pp: 127-128.
5. Gaidenko, P. and J.L. Davydov, 1991. History and rationality. Moscow, pp: 82.
6. Abylhozhin, J.B., 1997. Essays on the socio-economic history of the twentieth century Kazakhstan. Almaty.
7. Trevisani, T., 2007. After the Kolkhoz: Rural Elites in Competition. Central Asian Survey, 26(1): 85-104.

8. Pashkun, D., 2003. Structure and Practice of the State Administration in Uzbekistan. Discussion Paper 27. Budapest: Open Society Institute.
9. Libman, A., 2008. The Economic Role of Public Administration in Central Asia: Decentralization and Hybrid Political Regime. MPRA Paper No. 10940. Available at http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/10940/1/MPRA_paper_10940.pdf (last accessed 15 May 2011).
10. Kazakhstan national economy, 1968. Statistical compilation. Moscow, pp: 315.
11. Gleason, G., 1995. Corruption, Decolonization and Development in Central Asia. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 3(2): 38-47.
12. Decisions of the Party and the government on economic matters, 1968. Moscow. Tom, 3: 368.
13. Kazakhstan national economy. Static compilation, 1968. Almaty. s, pp: 138-139.
14. Collins, K., 2006. *Clan Politics and Regime Transition in Central Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
15. Koval, V.I., 1990. Braking mechanisms and socio-economic development of Kazakhstan in 70-80 years // *About the past for the future*. Almaty.