

**SOCIAL AND CULTURAL
DEVELOPMENT OF
KAZAKHSTAN AND
ITS PLACE IN MODERN
WORLD (Part I)****Introduction**

Issues of Kazakhstan cultural and social development became particularly relevant after the Soviet Union breakup. All of the ex-Soviet republics did not only declare their independence and sovereignty, and headed for replacement of totalitarianism by democracy and planned economy by market. Democracy and market economy were not only considered as vectors and social and cultural society transformation characters, but also as instruments opposing negative phenomena such as totalitarianism, bureaucracy, anarchy, a state monopoly. It was republic promotion towards democracy, rights and market, i.e., modern society. At the fundament of this promotion was the basic liberalistic postulate – the idea of innate, inalienable life, freedom and property rights. Private property is the basis of human freedom and it is a necessary condition for self-realization. Because of it the transition from planned economy to market economy was called to create conditions for approval and institutionalization of democracy. In its turn, democratic state had to guarantee the existence and proper market relations functioning and free competition. Historical European experience tells that democracy creates optimal conditions for economic freedom. This experience convinced that people bigger participation in government decision-making would contribute to their freedom, equality and justice. Such democracy notions based on certain human nature knowledge, rationality and democratic values. This social and cultural democracy dimension gets special importance in the transitional society. This democracy dimension involves not only democratic governance, but also strengthening of freedom of speech, assemblies, activity type selection, the rule of law, society openness etc.

During the sovereignty and independence years in the post-Soviet republics the great social and cultural transformations have happened. Kazakhstan entered the fundamental social and cultural changes age, the changes covering all areas of public life, firstly, social relations and culture and its interaction.

The democratization process of our society must take place in accordance with the traditions and principles of Western democracy,

leading South-East Asian states and multiethnic, polyconfessional Kazakhstan.

Theoretical basis: Vector issues and orientation character of social and cultural transiting society changes can be studied using a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches: classical and post-classical (alternative). Classical approaches are formational, civilizational, social and cultural, structural and functional.

The most common among these methods is stage-formational method. On its base Marx singled out the rising development stages: from personal dependence through personal independence with stuff addiction to free individuality of universally developed man. Accordant with it Marx defined five social and economic formations of world historical process: 1) tribal 2) ancient 3) feudal 4) bourgeois 5) the future communist form of common property. Marx formational approach allows considering society structure as system and its phases, that, on the one hand, will be obligatory for all nations, and on the other hand, every society will have a similar structure at the each phase [1].

This approach has its advantages and disadvantages. Possible to agree with N.S. Rozov, that its powerful feature is comprehension ability of world historical social evolution invariants, technological and social progress, changes irreversibility, development levels ratio. The weak point of stage-formational approach is well known from civilizational and humanitarian paradigms supporters' critics. The main and almost generally accepted thesis is that. European history is not the center and not the typical pattern of phases layers (stages, formations) movement for the rest of world history, but, on the contrary, European history itself is a very specific phenomenon».

Not only N.S. Rozov, but also the most of philosophers recognize now, that the theory of social and economic formations is Western European phenomenon that is not able to explain many realities in present conditions and so doesn't fulfill its heuristic function.

Firstly, they rightly pointed out, that the formations theory originally founded on postulates taken as true prooflessly. It is a progress as main form of movement and formation as main spreading progress method; formation as a rigid sequence stagement; homogeneity of formations composition; the primacy of material production; relations of production as society basis; «class» is the basic society unit and history subject.

Secondly, none of these basic theoretical points prescribed to the formation theory basement is

currently certain. The fact is that the social and economic formations theory is based on theoretical conclusions of the mid XIX century. For this reason, it can't explain many contradictions: the progress zones existence in common with backward, stagnation and deadlocks zones; state transformation – by any way – into the important factor of social relations of productions; class transfiguration and modification; the emergence of a new value hierarchy with human values priority over class values [2].

Daniel Bell's stage approach and his concept of post-industrial society are creative development of Rostow's Stages of Economic Growth. As is known, the English scientist distinguished five society development stages:

Traditional Society

Pre Conditions to Take Off

Take Off Stage

Drive to Maturity Stage

Age of High Mass Consumption Stage

According to him, these stages characterize the traditional society transition into industrial by tool evolution.

Bell sees the difference between the post-industrial society and industrial in following: service economy creation, scientific and technical experts dominance, the central role of theoretical scientific knowledge as a source of innovation and community policy-making, the ability of self-sustaining technological growth, new «intellectual» technology creation. Through analysis of these new economy features he came to the conclusion, that the transition from industrial to post-industrial stage is outlined with predominance not of the production sector, but of service sector in economy.

Bell gives detailed critique of Marx's formational society approach in the preface of 1999 book edition. He supposes, that his stadial approach is at odds Marx formation approach on a number of points:

1) The codification of theoretical knowledge. Marx is one of the firsts to realize the important role of science in world transformation. Particularly he welcomed the first electricity using attempts in the industry. Giving crucial importance to technology, he didn't understand (and perhaps could not understand) the role of theoretical knowledge, though he highly appreciated the theory role in general. In the twentieth century technological progress was determined by such areas of fundamental science as the quantum theory (including the idea of light as discrete quanta of physical fields), the theory of relativity, the physics of solids, while in the

nineteenth century technology development went largely empirical;

2) Knowledge as the source of value. Marx relied on the labor theory of value in that labor was considered not only as a production function component, i.e., capital and labor ratio, but as mean of creating surplus value appropriated by capitalist as a result of the power inequality in the market. If the value source is only the labor, the workers replacement by machines leads to proletariat exploitation enforcement by capitalist in order to extract more surplus value, or expand the scale of production to maintain the necessary level of absolute income even in falling profit rate.

Nowadays knowledge is increasingly becoming the value source creating the value in two ways. First of all, it is achieved by the capital savings. The replacement of workers by machines leads not only to labor savings, but also investments savings, as each next capital unit is more efficient and more productive, than previous one, and per output unit it's required less cost. If we talk about the production in terms of add value, new products creation, production volumes increasing, cost savings – all of that is a consequence of knowledge application in the post-industrial economy;

3) The transformation of workforce professional composition. Following the classics of economics Marx distinguished productive and unproductive labor. As productive labor he thought the material production, that creates value, in contrast to services, that were «paid» by productive labor. However, in the post-industrial economy the direct (but not always measurable) productivity growth factor is often services extension. Along with this the fastestly developing service branches are health, education, social and professional services. However it's clear, that the better the workers' health and the higher their education level, the more productive their work;

4) New social structure. Historically in the most Western countries social status defined by private property. The proletariat had no property, and a worker could sell only the labor. In its turn, in the bureaucracies the privileged position was occupied by high-ranked politicians. In the post-industrial society social status depends on personal education level. In the most society types all these three criteria co-exist in a variety of proportions, however, exactly the education increasingly becomes an essential condition for high social status obtaining [3].

Basing on social dynamic Sorokin conducts deep analysis of the social and cultural phenomena generic structure. It allows him to understand society

as the unity of culture and sociality, that formed and transformed in the course of human vital activity. Explaining his point, Sorokin says: «Social and cultural cooperation structure ... has three aspects inseparable from each other: 1) personality as a subject of interaction; 2) society as a complex of interacting individuals with its social and cultural relations and processes, and 3) culture as a complex of importance, values and norms, that owned by individuals, and set of carriers, that objectify, socialize and reveal these concerns... Non of the undividable triad members (personality, society and culture) can't exist without the other two». Focusing on the interaction as social and cultural phenomena generic model, Sorokin notes continuous historical process convertibility. According to him, certain forms of social organization constantly arise in the society: certain production forms, family forms, political systems. They live, develop and eventually are replaced by new ones [4].

On the basis of social and cultural approach Durkheim shows, that these particular social organization forms characterize transitions from mechanical solidarity (by similarities) to organic solidarity. His study of «collective consciousness» based on organic solidarity associated with a known psychoanalysis problem «collective unconscious». In Herder's and German romanticists works and in Hegelian philosophy of history ethnopsychology founders aimed to see in the «spirit» the most complete organic solidarity realization, that, in their view, is «folk». Researches of society science radically changed Romanticism school notions about reality «collective consciousness». Like his predecessors in this matter – ethnopsychologists, Durkheim recognized this specific reality, interpreting by «collective consciousness» «a set of beliefs and feelings common to the average members of the same society build a certain system, that has its own life». However, for Durkheim, unlike for ethnopsychologists, the fact of «collective» (or «common») consciousness isn't a sign of advanced superindividual synthesis, but of a certain society «type», that native to archaic stages of its evolution. Basing his phase classification of social evolution on «solidarity», the French scientist contrasted, as it's known, archaic societies, united within themselves by «mechanical solidarity», and modern societies, that discrepant by «organic solidarity» (caused by the labor division phenomenon) [5].

It's possible that transition of synchronous (ideal-typical) matrix of traditional society features, that outlined by Durkheim, into the diachronic historical process perspective will cause

methodological doubt. Opponents may ask how lawful this procedure is. The objections of this kind can be answered in two ways. On the one hand – an obvious truism, that the heuristic potential of any innovative concept isn't measured only in particular implications fulfilled by its author. By the way, Aron pointed it out in connection with the question. He thought, that Durkheim considered it possible to place the various well-known in society history in one line for difficulty degree, starting with monomeric and concluding with double difficulty polymeric. This theory is extremely important, of course, not in Durkheim sociology context, but as a project of some uncompleted social science form». On the other hand, proving the relevance of Durkheim matrix (this kind of social archaic «fourfold root») for social and cultural transformation analysis is possible [6]. To do this, relationship between basic components of social archaic and «internal» (systemic) historical determinants must be earnestly demonstrated. Appealing to psychoanalysis in connection with modernization theme and closely adjoining national and cultural identity problems is inevitable for two reasons. «The stronger state of mind is, – Durkheim writes, – the more it resists anything that might weaken it; the more certain it is, the less space it leaves for changes. So it is possible to foresee, that progress of labor division will be the slower and harder, the more energy and distinctness common consciousness will have». In Durkheim's opinion, «specialization is not the only possible outcome of the struggle for existence».

By using Durkheim sociological theory the possibility of studying social and cultural transformations of transitional society and changes in citizens' public consciousness relationship, as well as existing ideological and utopian elements in their minds, appears.

On the structural and functional approach basis Parsons considered structural changes in society as progressive evolution to upper systemic levels, that express value of freedom, historical process rationalization. In obedience to American sociologist, it's possible to distinguish such process groups that build liberalization. He comprises into these groups the process of differentiation of basic societal and functional structures as relatively independent: lifesupporting (economics), spirit integrating (culture), status differentiating (social structure), power adjustable (policy). In addition to that, the scientist includes genesis and inclusion in transforming system of new components providing its integration: civil society norms affirmation or, exactly, societal community (each citizen's

rights and obligations, citizens' participation in state structures forming provision, etc.). It also includes market system establishment, production industrialization, administrative structures rationalization (bureaucracy growth); political parties, trade unions and other mass citizen self-organization forms appearance and legitimization. According to him, liberalization must express the growth of new components in the system, that disintegrating it on new grounds. It is a deep human alienation from life and work conditions, globalization of military and political confrontation among different society types, including the threat of mankind self-destruction, environmental dangers growth and environmental degradation [7].

In civilization approach certain forms frame the vector and nature of social and cultural transformations direction were studied by Spengler, Toynbee, Eurasians.

For example, a priori cultural method of social and cultural society transformation research was developed by Oswald Spengler. Prominent German scientist skeptically interprets the decline of modern European culture and its philosophical conceptualization. He didn't share the traditional approach to European historical periodization spreading on the ancient world, the Middle Ages, etc. Such history division he called pointless «Eurocentric Ptolemaic system», because in fact, in his opinion, mankind history composes of independent cultures plurality. In his version, world history is a common biography of cultures, that consistently pass the stages of birth, virility, maturity, oldness and death.

Delimitating concepts of culture and civilization, Spengler thinks, that culture is generated by folk groups with common «nation» worldfeeling, in which immanent national idea influence visibly peers. In his opinion, in early period «high» culture is characterized by availability of nobility and clergy. Its first stage (feudalism) is defined by peasant spirit, the second stage is characterized by feudal union transition to the estates of the realm, the closing stage is specified by national idea maturation and state forming. Pursuant to Spengler, the culture becomes the civilization passing through these stages of historical ascension. With coming of civilization social structuring of the «fourth estate» formless masses happens in big cities. In subsequence social and political society organization democratic and totalitarian forms establish, that eventually degenerate into dominance and Caesarism. According to Spengler, at the end of civilization organism of folks turns into amorphous

mass and becomes a «victim» of other folks with decay. It returns the nations to the early existence state, alienation from world [8].

To a certain extent this idea is clarified by S.L. Frank, that the Slavophiles and Spengler noticed in difference between civilization and culture a distinction and even an opposite among spiritual creativity, depth and intensity of spiritual life, on the one hand, and external power accumulation, dead tools, on the other hand.

Danilevsky in his book «Russia and Europe» cultivates organic theory of cultural and historical types, that are self-contained and because of it smashed the mankind unity forever. It puts forward the thesis, that national culture develops immanently and in interaction with other cultures. But at the same time the evolution of national culture, according to this theory, must occur on the basis of its own, avoiding strong influence from other culture or by its achievement creative conversion. In Danilevsky's opinion, under these conditions it's possible to form strong cultural tradition, unique in its originality [9].

The theory of cultural multiplicity and heterogeneity implies the rejection of Eurocentric cultural and historic progress ideas. It eliminates the substitution of one culture by another. This Danilevsky's theory shows the danger of so-called «common to all mankind values» imposition, because values always have concrete historical character. In this case he uses the concept of universal values within the meaning of Western society values.

This cultural polyphony, Russian geopolitical position determines its specific historical path. In this connection, N.S. Trubetskoy points, that Russian culture always has to look in different directions, waste its strength on diverse cultural elements harmonization, seek out appropriate for each other elements from piles of values of two cultures. As it's seen, the study of Eurasianism can be called the concept of historical and cultural originality. According to Trubetskoy, only veritable self-knowledge will show the person (or people) its real place in the world. He believes, that only original national culture is the true, and only it fits ethical, aesthetic and utilitarian requirements set by any culture [9].

Uncurling Trubetskoy's methodology, Savitsky proclaims the existence of special Eurasian-Russian culture and its specific subject as symphonic individuality. He believes, that hazy cultural self-knowledge of Slavophiles is poor, however «we respect them as the most congenial for us. But we vigorously reject the existence of Occidentophilism,

i.e., rejecting the originality and existence of our culture. We are ashamed for Russian people, that get know about Russian culture existence from German Spengler». Dismissing sly efforts of occidentophilistic spirit, that infected also the Slavophiles, to dissolve Eurasian-Russian culture problem into dimly study of tribal kinship, it was necessary for Savitsky to polemically underline «Turan elements» and he, rejecting pseudo scientific mechanical approach, offers unity and originality, integrity of culture, its own quality. He thinks, that culture hatches and develops as organic total, so it immediately («convergent») manifests in political and socio-economic forms, everyday life, ethnic type and geographic features of the territory [10].

L.N. Gumilev develops and brings to conclusion a pan-Eurasian idea that ethnically Great Russians and Russians are not only a branch of the Eastern Slavs, but also a special ethnic group formed on the basis of Turkic and Slavic merger. In this basis he believes, that Great Russian civilization was formed on the ground of Forests and Steppe Union, the combination of which makes historical essence of Russia, prejudging nature of its culture, civilization, ideology, political destiny.

Following Spengler and Toynbee, he singles out the cycles of civilization and cultures, as well appropriate ethnoses. In his view, ethnic and cultural formations of nation, state, religious communities are like living organisms at all. They pass periods of birth, adolescence, adulthood and aging, and then they disappear or turn into so-called «Relics».

Principally new in the approach of the Last Eurasian is that society growth is considered as becoming of socio-natural unity with which adequate perception of specific cultural and historic space of each nation is possible. By this approach in the cultural and historical evolution of any land studying the concept «topogenesis» is used. He believes, that Eurasia is sterling «topogenesis», fat, richest land of ethnogenesis and cultural genesis. In this connection, Gumilev fairly notes: «Characteristic Eurasianism and ideological feature in general is interdependence of all theoretical elements. The complex of nations that feel «common cultural and historic traditions» has autarkic economy at certain topogenesis». Therefore, we must learn to see world history not in unipolar version «The West and the rest», but in multipolar, and besides Northern and Eastern Eurasia are of special interest, because they are alternative to the West source of the most important planetary civilization processes [11].

All these classical and nonclassical methods and theories can be included in social and cultural

approach arsenal. It involves understanding of society as unity of sociality and culture built as a human activity result. Evidence in favor of such statement is more than enough. So culture is total spiritual experience of mankind. All that people created is included in concept cultural content. As a product of human activity culture is secondary, artificial living environment, i.e., the inorganic body of the organic man. This environment includes language, system of values, traditions, beliefs, customs, social psychology, people mentality and social life organization. The indissoluble link with the life testifies to the social character of culture. The social nature of culture conditioned by that culture is created and changed by people in the process of using. Culture always expresses accumulation, continuity and generalization of mankind social experience of life. In this context culture is presented as a mode of being of socium, as a public property people inherit and hand down from generation to generation. In its turn, social life has cultural character. Public relations have cultural content. The world of culture is values world. Values are that significant and holy for human and social communities. They are certain spiritual bandages, foundations and guides helping people to survive life difficulties, order social reality and give meaning to human life. Ultimately, values are for man and social benefit. It means that culture appears as content and purpose of historical process, as set of social consciousness forms, manners of human activity, means of human formation and development.

In other words, social and cultural approach allows to understand society as the unity of culture and sociality built during human activity. By culture is understood a plurality of human activity methods and results (material and spiritual – ideas, values, norms, patterns, etc.), and by sociality is understood a set of each person's relationships or any other social subject with other subjects – economical, social, ideological, political relations formed during activity.

The specifics of social and cultural approach is that it takes into account such human existence aspects as the ratio type of man and society, cultural character, sociality type. They are interrelated and influence each other as important components of human communities.

Social and cultural approach isn't opposed to the other approaches, and integrates them. As already noted, it unities civilization, formation, sociodynamic, sociological methods into one integrity. Civilization approach as the largest grasps stable components of human history

(anthropological, ethnical, cultural). Formation approach focuses on the more volatile (social, personal) structures. Sociological approach indicates the diachronic moments of historical process. Synthesizing them, socio-cultural approach reveals stability and variability pairing in the relationship of individuality and society, culture and sociality. Social and cultural approach may be concretized as idea of society as holistic socio-cultural system and it's possible to clearly understand problems of social and cultural transformations. In schematic form they can be expressed in the following principles.

The activity philosophic principle performs as a principle of active human in deflection of socio-cultural phenomena. As initial principle it focuses on biological, social and cultural human aspects and its structural elements as a subject of action. At the same time action of subject is understood as component of interaction with other subjects that have importance for them and carry out certain functions in relation to all other interaction subjects. Thus, the principle of Homo activus is a human interaction principle as the simplest socio-cultural phenomenon.

The principle of culture and sociality interaction indicates the presence of these two measurements in any society. It implies a constant interaction and mutual influence of these two measurements that can't be come to and output from each other.

The principle of anthroposocial compliance allows to reveal compatibility of personal and behavioral characteristics of human as a society member and other characteristics of this society, particularly the cultural and social unity. It is society spheres in which compatibility between people must be achieved. This principle indicates that in «traditionalist society» human characteristics must match with formed societal structures. They limit or close social field of activity of the people that violate traditions. In «liberal or modern society» it expands the field of human activity to change the already formed, but not appropriate for their increased needs and abilities.

The principle of social and cultural balance implies a equilibrium of cultural and social components as a condition for the stability of society. It means that functions, structures and processes of society must be aimed at provision of balanced satisfaction of conflicting needs, values, activity subjects interests.

The principle of symmetry and mutual reversibility as a form of philosophical principle manifestation of social processes denial indicates that every process expressing the society dynamics as whole system has a certain direction. Oppositly

directed (symmetric, companion) process corresponds its denial. It means that by transition of process from one stage to another it may convert into its opposite. In this case integration turns into reintegration and back, and symmetrical process twoness has functional nature. In other words, one of paired processes ensures the reproduction of relevant structures, and another causes their changing in society [12].

Relying on these principles, according to Lapin, it's possible to imagine society as big self-sufficient socio-cultural system that arises and changes as a result of active transformational subjects' interaction. Social and cultural system functions and structures provide balanced satisfaction of multiform needs, values and interests of activity subjects, their movable balance is fulfilled by a plurality of societal processes. Society type is clarified by anthropo-societal accordance type, structure and dynamic are determined by socio-cultural balance parameters, reproducing (traditional) or changing (innovational) process prevalence. Social and cultural society changes occur as elevation of needs and abilities of transformational subjects.

The integrity of social and cultural system is provide by a plurality of complementary functions, societal and functional structures and processes. These functions include material and economic people's life support, their cultural and spiritual integration, social and status differentiation, power and political regulation. First these functions appear as something syncretic, but gradually with their complexity they start to differentiate from each other. Units of subjects interaction that fulfill the functions institutionalize as a form of relevant societal and functional structures and processes. At social phsycology level system integrity finds its expression in «We-consciousness» of people and in their actions consistency as transforming society members.

Results: socio-philosophical analysis of vector and character of the direction of transitional society social and cultural changes presupposes correct definition of modernization and transformation, traditional and modern society, the meaning and significance of which are explicit by us on the basis of phenomena comparative analysis presented in a variety of studies, theories and concepts of society development, macrohistorical social ontology paradigms. The semantic meaning of modernization and transitional society don't fully reflect the essence, vector and character of occurring in the transitional society social and cultural processes direction. As a general concept modernization

expresses progressive social, political, cultural and intellectual transformations. The modernization concept turns into transformation concept that more clearly reflects the essential changes of society social nature, its social institutions, social strata and the socio-cultural transformations main stream. Dialectical and logical approach allows to consider these concepts as genus species categories during displaying the transition of traditional (the ancient, archaic) society in modern (post-modern). At such interpretation of these concept relevance it's possible to define adequately the initial parameters of transitional society social and cultural transformation in world-historical process.

Social and cultural society changes process in terms of the transition to democracy begins with the proclamation of liberty, equality and fraternity ideals, as well as natural inalienable human rights as necessary conditions for spiritual and physical abilities development. However, the emergence of market relations and democratization processes has drastically changed the value foundations of human and contributed to his release from the group and autonomy, individual freedom begins to be raised in the absolute. The philosophy of success on the basis of rational human behavior in market relations system forms ethic of individualism, makes a human a one-dimensional and economic being and increasingly alienates him from the nature, society, the issues of overcoming their social effects get reflected in the philosophy of liberalism and socialism, the idea of progress as foundation of linearly progressive human development.

Social and cultural changes in transitional society study shows that «wild» market creates neither economic nor social basis for political democracy and it is only mythologeme of post-perestroika period in post-Soviet republics. Mythologemes of democracy and market in the beginning were perceived by people as the most effective means of solving economic problems and Western prosperity level achivement idealization of what lasted in mass consiousness until the early 90-ies. After the destructive social consequence of the first shocking economic reforms in the post-Soviet area the process of social consiousness demythologizing with regard to democracy and market gradually began and people's political and legal culture started to raise.

South-East Asian social and cultural transformation experience shows that attempts of replacement collectivism and solidarity by individualism and competitiveness, borrowing Western standarts of life and life values were unsuccessful because of cardinal differences in

the people mentality, their fundamentally different concepts of freedom, human rights, society moral security, market opposition, types and traditions of work ethic.

At the present democratization stage the vector and character of transitional society socio-cultural changes direction must facilitate its stable development, democratic life mode and social market formation, the management of others with their consent, the recognition of freedom and equality of people to express their thoughts and individual opportunities disclosure. At the same time the emergence of middle class foundations as a new values and orientations carrier contributes to formation of a new integrative state-national ideology, worldview evolution, rationalization, attitudes and value preferences liberalization occur, outdated traditions from the Soviet past are gradually overcome, and understanding of necessity for counteraction the political extremism on ethic and religious basis comes. In traditional society social and cultural changes process special attention should be given to activity establishment, individual autonomy based on national cultural traditions, because revival and development of spiritual national culture promote socio-historical people community awareness, mentality formation, collective self-awareness and thinking archetypes. Uniqueness and self-sufficiency preservation is necessary to strengthen national unity, creation of strong state, political parties large coalition, social movements.

Existence of effective state and national identity is an important condition and prerequisite of any consolidated democracy. The paper notes that there is still a traditional administrative method of political and economic reforms that preserves and deepens the rift between the government and society. New government approach for reforms in post-Soviet republics continues by inertia to be a traditional apparatus administration is actually up to date. Clearly, that it induces the growing split between the authorities and public, that it's dangerous for democratic transition social and cultural changes, because it causes the growth of political frustration and indifference, discrediting the authorities and political leaders, avoiding public interests in favor of private. However, even administrative reforms have positive aspects, as a kind of personal life privatization that replaces traditional statism

appraising an individual under the character of a subordinate part of the state. From the democratic point of view, the goal of democracy building quite justified ignorance of certain democratic procedures. Moreover, after a certain amount of time, democrats began to consider these procedures as reforms opponents' instrument that must be uncompromisingly fought.

An additional stability factor of consolidated democracy is external environment that creates for it favorable or unfavorable international context. Currently, creation of such international context took place, that makes favorable conditions for the transition from authoritarian to more democratic government forms. The peculiarity of social and cultural changes in post-Soviet republics can be represented as the transition from «mobilized participation authoritarianism» to «competitive oligarchy» meaning a kind of elitist government at which the formal institutes of democracy are used in non-democratic purposes. In other words, in these republics effective mechanisms of democratic control over the authorities actions don't shape yet, although new types of socio-economic organizations overall weight increases.

Social and cultural transformation is complex, mainly evolutionary society transformation as socio-cultural system and concrete historical form. The complexity of the transformation assumes that the transformational process covers all main system structures and processes, course and outcome of which crucially depend on mass social groups actions.

The analysis allows to state that by virtue of democratization of all social life spheres on the living space of the CIS, particularly, the Republic of Kazakhstan, the convergence of two global world value systems – European and Oriental, occurs. And it is perhaps the most important, although not yet fully manifested, democracy mission. At the modern stage of society development national separating thinking is replaced by continental integration – uniting, that most adequately corresponds multi-cultural, multi-ethnic mentality of Kazakhstan people. Thereby syncretism, fragmentation of purely national consciousness, that were distinctive for national identity struggle period, are overcome. However this bridging is possible after the completion of national and cultural identity awareness by people of Kazakhstan.

(To be continued)

References

- 1 Marks K., Engel's F. Soch., t. 13. – S.8.
- 2 Rozov N.S. Struktura sotsial'noy ontologii: na puti k sintezu makroistoricheskikh paradigm // Voprosy filosofii. – 2000, №2. – S. 3-21/
- 3 Bell D. Gryadushcheye postindustrial'noye obshchestvo. Opyt sotsial'nogo prognozirovaniya. – M.; 1999. – 345 s.
- 4 Sorokin P. Rodovaya struktura sotsiokul'turnykh yavleniy // Chelovek. Tsivilizatsiya. Obshchestvo. – M.: 1992.
- 5 Dyurkgeym E. O razdelenii obshchestvennogo truda. Metod sotsiologii. – M.: 1991. – 576 s.
- 6 Aron R. Demokratiya i totalitarizm. – M.: 1993. – 262 s.
- 7 Parsons T. Sistema sovremennykh obshchestv. – M.: 1997. – 310 s.
- 8 Shpengler O. Zakat Yevropy. Ocherki mifologii mirovoy istorii. – M.: 1994. – S.487.
- 9 Danilevskiy N.YA. Rossiya i Yevropa. – SPb.: 1985. – 629 s.
- 10 Trubetskoy N.S. Yevropa i chelovechestvo. – Sofiya, 1920. – S.65.
- 11 Savitskiy P.N. Kontinent Yevraziya. M.: 1997. – 464 s.
- 12 Gumilev L.N. Zametki poslednego yevraziytsa // Yevraziya. – 2001. № 3-4. – S. 5-23.