

UDC 338.22

## **ANTI-CORRUPTION MEASURES: FOREIGN EXPERIENCE**

**Omirzak Sherkhan Baubekuly**

[seraomirzakb@gmail.com](mailto:seraomirzakb@gmail.com)

Status postgraduate «Eurasian National University named after L.N. Gumileva», Nur-Sultan  
Supervisor- Amerkhanova A.B.

In the old days, the word bureaucracy was associated with completely different concepts than now. Bureaucracy was about the system of control exercised by the apparatus of power. But today we give it a completely different meaning. Such as red tape, inefficiency, waste. All that is a side effect of another phenomenon - corruption. A bureaucrat becomes the "master" over those who should be in charge as a result of wide development of bureaucratic power. [1] Under such conditions corruption flourishes. Such epithets describe corruption as insidious, volatile and opaque. In his speech at the session on the occasion of the adoption of the UN Convention against Corruption, former Secretary General of the UN General Assembly K. Annan aptly compared corruption to the "social plague" to which all modern societies are exposed: "Corruption weakens democracy and the rule of law, which leads to the violation of human rights, distorts market mechanisms, worsens the quality of life of people, contributes to organized crime, terrorism and other threats to international security. This most dangerous phenomenon is present in all countries - large and small, rich and poor..."[2] The fight against corruption must acquire a systematic and structured approach due to the huge negative impact of corruption on the world economy, international relations and the principles of a democratic society. And as any systemic phenomenon, the term 'corruption' needs to be defined precisely, excluding the possibility of double-thinking. Corruption is not reduced to primitive bribery, especially in conditions of market economy, free trade and democracy. Lobbying, favouritism, protectionism, political contributions, traditions of transition of political leaders and state officials to the posts of presidents of corporations and private

firms, investment of commercial structures at the expense of the state budget, transfer of state property to joint stock companies, use of connections of criminal communities - all these are covert forms of corruption. The forms of corruption are by their nature quite diverse: from corruption in the higher echelons of power to corruption in show business.

It is obvious that there is a need for a speedy legislative settlement of the fight against corruption and the adoption of relevant laws and regulations. Despite this, there is no real progress in this matter. The complete lack of national experience may be the reason for this. In order to make up for this shortcoming, we should turn to the experience of those for whom our current problems are as longstanding an inevitability with long historical traditions. Having analyzed the largest anti-corruption campaigns, we can draw up our own anti-corruption plan. Italy, Georgia, Singapore are some of the brightest examples of how successful anti-corruption measures can be applied.

By the early 1990s, corruption in Italy had confused the entire state system and triggered a political crisis. In Italy, parties had real power, so entrepreneurs bought themselves protection by funding politicians. Strong corruption links between business and officials became commonplace. The closer the connections became, the more opportunities appeared for the impure businessmen: government orders, important contracts, internal secret information. The bribery market was undermined by a bribe paid by Mario Chiesa, director of a retirement home in Milan. From the director of the nursing home, a string was pulled to the big Italian politicians. Thus the operation "Clean Hands" launched became one of the most significant in the history of the fight against corruption.[3] Convicted corrupt officials received not only prison sentences, they were subjected to well-known measures in the USSR - confiscation of property. State institutions were placed in expropriated houses: hospitals, courts, police stations. The money of the corrupt officials was directed to social sphere and agriculture. The main role in the fight against corruption was played in Italy: the existence of a democratic system, which means that no one in Italy has absolute power, neither the Prime Minister nor the President; free media; consistent law enforcement agencies; and a strong and independent judiciary. It is impossible to conduct such a campaign in Kazakhstan for one reason or another. According to experts, the main reason is that Italy is a democratic country, where bureaucracy is controlled by political class. Without these conditions, a large-scale anti-corruption campaign is doomed to collapse. But some methods can still be borrowed - for example, confiscation of property, which in Italy is used against corrupt officials and mobsters. With seized money, as mentioned above, Italians are raising the economy.

Another anti-corruption model, which is rightly one of the most successful. After gaining independence in 1965, Singapore had to deal with many problems, including corruption. Its meagre budget prevented the government from conducting an expensive campaign. And the first step was to change the law. First, there was a clear and concise definition of all forms of corruption. Secondly, the Anti-Corruption Agency was given a strong mandate. Thirdly, prison sentences for bribes were increased. Later, Singapore's legislation was amended several times, for example, in 1989, confiscation of property was introduced.[4] Strict control yielded good results, and the authorities moved to the second stage of struggle - work on the quality of bureaucracy. Officials were seriously raised their salaries, which kept them from taking bribes (\$20-25 thousand per month). In the same way, the official's profession was made not only highly paid, but also respected. The Anti-Corruption Agency is responsible for this. Recruitment of future officials takes place back in school. Thus, the official apparatus was gradually renewed with properly trained and educated personnel, many of whom joined the agency.

Today, Singapore's bureaucracy is considered one of the most efficient in the world. And the highest paid - officials earn higher wages than their peers in the United States.

The Singaporean authorities have made great strides in dealing with officials. Meritocracy is an excellent quality to adopt. However, it may take decades to select and educate the best graduates, as Singapore's experience confirms. For Kazakhstan, it is also necessary to create a "core class". The Singaporean authorities themselves molded a class of honest bureaucrats and now trust them quietly. And who can our state rely on?

The Georgian model may seem to be no less bright. A bright innovation is transparency in the literal sense of the word. The building of the Georgian Interior Ministry in Tbilisi looks like a big glass wave. Inside there are huge windows from floor to ceiling. There are no curtains or blinds. All police stations look just as transparent and open. The most famous reform is the MIA reform. There has been a large-scale reduction of the Ministry's staff in Georgia, no duplication of functions. If there were signs of a crime, one of the officers handed over materials to the prosecutor's office, initiated criminal cases, regardless of rank and shoulder straps. The penalties were toughened. For example, a police officer, if he simply refused a bribe offered, would lose his job because he had to arrest the bribe-giver. But intimidating people and tightening control only led to fear, not respect, although as such grassroots corruption has certainly been eradicated. But there is still corruption at the highest levels of government.

Is it possible to apply this model in Kazakhstani society? The whole system was practically built anew. There was a very strict internal and external control. Steps have been taken which are quite difficult to take in Kazakhstan due to the size of the country. Although it is not even about size, climate, culture, religion or anything else. Reforms in Georgia were made possible by political will. I dare to say that there is no such will in Kazakhstan, where stability and peaceful sky above the head are so highly valued. Neither the issue of territory, nor the issue of people is key.

Corruption in Kazakhstan is closely linked to the processes of uncontrolled "initial accumulation" of capital and almost anarchic formation of bureaucratic capitalism, in which many representatives of the supreme authority and a significant part of the country's law enforcement structures are involved. This is the main obstacle to the successful fight against corruption. Anticorruption strategies should vary according to the degree of defeat. This is why when we look at the anti-corruption policies of Singapore, Italy and Georgia, we are faced with such a variety of mechanisms to influence corruption. Analysis of three successful anti-corruption measures is necessary to identify areas in which certain experience of foreign legislation could be transferred to Kazakhstani soil. As a result, we have gained an understanding of the basics of an advanced national anti-corruption strategy, which needs to be developed in Russia:

Firstly, it is the strong political will of the top leadership of the state to fight corruption and the unified state policy formed on its basis, which includes a set of measures of state, political, economic, social and legal nature.

Secondly, organized social control by civil society over the entire system of public administration (a climate of transparency is a prerequisite for this) and the possibility of prosecuting offenders within this framework.

Third, strict accountability of persons vested with authority to a truly independent body monitoring the purity of the activities of civil servants, as well as the authority vested with the power to bring to justice officials regardless of their position in the hierarchical structure of power.

Fourth, ensuring compliance with the principle of equality before the law. Even top-level officials and their family members should be prosecuted in case of a corruption crime.

Fifth, active involvement of the media in covering corruption-related events.

Sixth, propaganda among the population about the harm caused by corruption.

These provisions constitute the foundation for a successful national anti-corruption policy.

In addition, another factor that is particularly worrying is the corrupt nature of laws. Experienced researchers show that an underdeveloped system of punishment for corruption is the main reason for the large-scale spread of corruption in many countries. At the same time, we should not forget that the level of corruption rarely depends on the severity of punishment: "the inevitability of punishment and the fear of an official that he may be punished is much more important than the very fact of cruelty".[5] We should consider the possibility of creating "expert councils" - specialized structures that would allow assessing socio-economic, financial and other projects from the point of view of their impact on the development process and growth of corruption.

We should not forget that there is no universal vaccine against corruption. It is different for each country and the government should develop it independently based on local legislation,

mentality, traditions, etc. It is necessary to look for a national way of fighting corruption, and foreign experience can only be taken into account. It is impossible to imagine that an investigator in Kazakhstan, like any Italian Antonio Di Pietro, on the basis of evidence, could initiate a large-scale operation against corruption, following the example of "Clean Hands" with the accusation of tens of thousands of people. As for the Georgian experience, such harsh measures, based on severe punishment, are too similar to the totalitarian regime that Kazakhstan has just experienced and is unlikely to accept positively. The only aspect that should be considered in all countries is the development of civil consciousness. The society with developed self-consciousness can control both bureaucracy and power.

### **Literature**

1. Boldyrev, Yu. Yu. Russia and corruption: who is who? / Yu. Yu. Boldyrev, M.A. Krasnov // «Computer Science for Democracy». M., 1998. URL: [http://www.indem.ru/indemfond/indfp2\\_r.html](http://www.indem.ru/indemfond/indfp2_r.html).
2. Tenth UN Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders. (Vienna, Austria, April 10–17, 2000): Sat doc / ed. A. G. Volevodz. M.: Jurmitinform, 2001. p.360.
3. Alexander Berkov. Operation Clean Hands in Italy. From foreign experience in the fight against corruption. The Observer, No. 2 (265) 2012. ISSN 2074-2975
4. OECD. Specialised Anti-Corruption Institutions: Review of Models OECD Publishing, 2009. P.43
5. Repetskaya, A. L. Transnational corruption: concept and measures // Organized crime and corruption. URL: <http://law.edu.ru/doc/document.asp?docID=1224509>.