

**DEMOCRACY  
METAMORPHOSES**

Investigation of the economic, social, cultural and historical background of the first, ancient form of democracy shows that the ancient social system being a closed type of society was exposed to entropy and functioned at the level of uncertainty. Any progressive development is impossible in the closed system.

In this system there existed tribal, slave-owning and capitalistic modes of production. Early forms of commodity-money relations that existed in ancient Greece in the prosperity phase of the Maritime Union influenced the above-mentioned modes of production. Accordingly there were different forms of governance: tyranny, oligarchy, monarchy, politics, democracy.

In Athens – «the mother of democracy» – the democratic form of government was established owing to legislative reforms (by Solon, Cleisthenes, Pericles), high cultural level and a number of socio-economic factors. In particular trade development led to economic rise of Athens and this affected the population structure of the state. Increased the political heft of the so-called «Middle class» – merchants and craftsmen interested in legal protection of their interests. At public gatherings they got the right to determine the fate of the state, its internal and external policies. Democratic principles and collective leadership replaced the aristocratic power. Such principles as «Liberty of speech», «Equality of all before the law», «Equality in public employment» were the main ones at public gatherings. This laid the foundation for political rights of citizens.

The ancient form of democracy was far from being perfect, it was quite contradictory and was not «people's rule» in the full sense of the word. An important element of the first forms of democracy was that the elected officials in Athens did not wield much power and authority. Immature legal principles, imprecise division, and often confusion of legislative and executive branches of government led to the fact that at public gatherings demagogues could reject any law for personal or group advantages through the art of persuasion.

In general it was a flexible, dynamic, capable of evolutionary change form of government, and this form devoid of dogmatism met the requirements of time. Aristotle with his negative attitude to the democratic form of government because of its legal base imperfection, repeatedly stated its inherent sustaining power and ability to resist social cataclysms and external threats. He identified

five types of democracy. According to Aristotle freedom and equality being the most important features of democracy hadn't been developed properly in Antiquity and participation of citizens in government had been limited. The Thinker, convinced of the law domination in the state system does not correlate these interconnected and interdependent phenomena but merely points to their importance in public life [1].

There is a grain of truth in the sharply negative assessment of democratic governance given by Plato who was an ideologue of slave owning system. He points to the fact that in terms of imperfect democracy the principle of enforcement of majority by minority can come true and he defends the position according to which a person must be a citizen, guided by moral principles and therefore a person should relate his own interests with those of the majority.

During the formation of the capitalist economic system two concepts have been developed – «state of law» and «rule of law», modern democracy is impossible to exist without these concepts. A new task has been introduced – the relationship of an individual and the state. The slogan of individual freedom has been put forward and substantiated, and the state is considered to be a guarantor of freedom.

A new type of politics characterized by T. Hobbes as «struggle of all against all» has been formed, where the leading role in the field of public relations is given to the state. Power in the city is established through the voluntary exclusion of the rights and property of citizens in favor of a central body, the effect of which is based on electivity and accountability.

Theoretical foundations of modern constitutional democracy were formed in Modern age period. The theory of democracy in Modern age was developed by enlighteners of Europe and New World – J.J. Rousseau, John Locke, Montesquieu, D. Hume, Kant, B. Franklin. The idea that everyone is equal and everyone should be involved in policy decisions has been widely proved and substantiated. Natural right theory worked out by J. J. Rousseau and John Locke contributed to the development of democratic institutions, the formulation of the power legitimacy problem, separation of legislative, executive and judicial branches of government.

An important point in the development of democracy theory was substantiation of human rights, including the right to life, property and freedom, all being dialectically interconnected.

In the era of Modern Age thinkers gave grounds to the basic categories of the democracy theory – «freedom», «equality», «brotherhood», «civil

society». However they are interpreted rather abstractly and reviewed under the doctrine of «common good» and «general will.»

The idea put forward by Hobbes that freedom and necessity are reconcilable and interconnected did not get significant theoretical foundation in the democratic theory of Modern Age: the thinker interpreted «freedom» restrictively, as an absence of external obstacles. According to Hobbes conditions to achieve this kind of «freedom» was the existence of the state, law and social contract (general will).

Justifying the necessity to separate the three branches of government as a guarantor of freedom Montesquieu applies to an abstract notion of the «common good».

In general the idea of democracy itself in early and mid Modern Age was far from real political processes. According to ancient tradition democracy was interpreted only as a universal participation of citizens in public decision making. Such a restrictive understanding of democracy was apparently due to the fact that the process of its formation required a long time, accumulation of experience and detailed understanding of the new realities.

In XVII-XVIII centuries the basic concepts of this form of government were introduced and developed. The basic principles of classical liberalism democracy (according to Hobbes) were focused on the equality of people in respect to natural rights, the rationale for the rights and autonomy of an individual, separation of the three branches of government. The liberal model of democracy is to protect the social rights of citizens, without encouraging political activity of an individual.

The collectivist model of democracy (according to J. Rousseau) is based on the concept of the social contract. It mainly protects interests of society as a whole by delegating to protect citizens' basic rights. Executive power belongs to the government and legislative power remains in the hands of people and is carried out through a referendum.

Liberals make decisions concerning problems of individual freedom. Liberalism is closely connected with the democratic movement of Modern Age. Liberalization as a rule precedes political democratization. Liberals are involved in expanding citizens' rights, development of regulations to protect individuals and social groups from arbitrary or unlawful actions of the state. Democratization means formation and involvement of democratic institutions in political process, practical application of democratic rules and procedures.

Beyond a doubt that confrontation of two branches in the first half of Modern Age – democratic

and liberal – has contributed to the theoretical justification of the classical theory of democracy, formation of party movement, which became a basis of representational democracy. At this period democratic ideals, values, principles and methods were looked upon from some other point of view. The above-mentioned confrontation paved the way for blending the theory and practice of democratic construction.

However liberals of XIX century as well as the Enlightenment of XVIII century discussing the problem of freedom meant an abstract «citizen», an abstract positive forms of government. «Founding Fathers» of American democracy succeeded in overcoming this approach.

An important contribution of America in the theory and practice of democracy of Modern Age was the development of check and balances system that ensures disaggregation and devolution of political power. As a general term, checks and balances system has two meanings – federalism and separation of powers. Federalism in contrast to the centralized system of government allows citizens to take greater part in governing the state.

Liberal-democratic ideas and humanistic ideals of Modern Age are forming and developing together with Western capitalism. Regulations and forms of civilized social life are developing during the formation of a mixed capitalist economy with diverse ownership forms. A particular individual becomes a subject of historical development. There is a civil society. Economic freedom rights, social justice and social protection – all this becomes possible. Equal members of society being aware of their interests gradually learn how to relate personal interests with the interests of society and the state.

Thus in Modern Age people laid foundations of a political system in which democratic laws prevail, state of law is forming, human rights are implemented up to the international recognized standards. In Modern Age in the heart of the democratic issues was the question of the public will and democratic goods. But this question has not been resolved neither theoretically nor practically. But at the same period conditions for solving this question were created, tasks were defined, foundation of modern democracy was laid. However proclamation of universal equality, freedom, humanistic and liberal-democratic ideals was mostly of formal nature, institutional set-up was not applied in all democratic spheres and above-mentioned ideals were not actually implemented in real life. The percentage of people involved in politics remained so small that

free government in this period could be nothing but an oligarchy within democracy.

Investigating the evolution of the Kazakhs' spiritual culture in the context of the paradigm of the steppe democracy one can see that the «heavenly» basis of the Kazakhs' world view is mythology. This world view has a symbolic character, which is clearly evident in all their surroundings – for example in the housing (a yurt) and in the ethnonym «Kazakh» itself.

Elements of steppe democracy and the foundations of the feudal Kazakh Khanate were far from the paradigm of culture and morality described by Kant in the theory of «Moral Autonomy». According to the doctrine of the founder of German classical philosophy an individual feeling of responsibility can be formed only on condition of existence of a common legal culture and civil society in a state. However both Kazakh legislators and German humanist interpret human values similarly though introducing social ideals of different formational levels.

As it usually happens in the world history when one era changes another there are energetic, educated, motivated people who can understand current changes and can benefit to people. Such people appeared on the Kazakh land at the end of XIX – the beginning of XX centuries. They were representatives of progressive Kazakh intelligentsia. They encouraged people under the slogan «Come to your senses, Kazakh!» trying to remind people of their native culture origin, national, civic self-identity.

One good example is the activities of members of the National Democratic Party Alash, who started a program of bourgeois liberal-democratic reforms in Kazakhstan on the eve of the October Revolution. The program has been quite progressive, it was ahead of that time. Emphasis was placed in the program quite correct: introduction of private property institution, including land; presidential form of government by universal electoral law, the system of checks and separation of powers. All this couldn't be implemented taking into account that Soviet system was far from democracy.

Members of the National Democratic Party Alash failed due to external factors to implement bourgeois-democratic reforms, but they were carried out when Kazakhstan became an independent and sovereign state.

The transition from the steppe to the modern democracy in Kazakhstan has specific features. It was carried out in stages, after the priority tasks were implemented. In the early stages the republic

adopted the two constitutions, a new electoral system. It was a transformation of the political system «from above», under the direct control of the state, with a predominance of authoritarianism elements. All this reduced the level of young parliamentary democracy, but contributed to political and social stability in the country. This circumstance as well as the historical and colonial heritage (excessive centralization of power, lack of development of political institutions, associations and public interest groups, etc.) complicated the formation of mature democracy in Kazakhstan. World practice shows that new democracies as a rule are at first a mixed mode by nature, where there are elements of the old system, authoritarianism and democracy. Kazakhstan is not an exception.

The transition to the second stage of democratization was possible only after a series of small liberal reforms in the political and economic spheres, which were not always consistent and were of vague nature. Nevertheless these reforms have contributed to the gradual eradication of authoritarianism elements, reducing the role of the state and increasing the importance of non-governmental organizations and the establishment of civil society.

The third stage of democratization involves the following: holding of regular elections, presence of the opposition, recognition and activation of public associations and political parties, decentralization of power, separation of powers, strengthening the role of Parliament, institutionalization of democracy, building the rule of law, pluralism of ownership, including ownership of land, division of power and fund, distribution of powers to local level. It means applying to both vertical and horizontal democracy.

The third phase began in December 1997, when N. A. Nazarbayev defined a new strategy of government – the transition from rigid centralization to decentralization of authority, devolution of power to the regions. Evolution of the political system is still initiated «from above». As for the formation of democracy «from below» at this stage of reform relevant socio-economic conditions hadn't been adequate yet.

A specific feature of the transition period in Kazakhstan was a charismatic leader – the President N. A. Nazarbayev, his undoubted merit consists in carrying out political reforms at the early stages of democratization.

A distinctive feature of the social and economic transformation is the fact that the most important achievement of the Republic for its independence period and perhaps its main strategic advantage

in this period was high educational level of citizens, intellectual wealth of the country. This factor provides an opportunity for the nation to be competitive in the XXI century in the professional field.

In the course of the democratization in all spheres of public life there is a convergence of two global systems of values – European and Oriental. All this takes place in the living space of the CIS, EEU, the Republic of Kazakhstan in particular. And this is perhaps the most important aim of democracy although not yet manifested in full. National thinking at the present stage of society development is replaced by continental, integrational-combining thinking which adequately corresponds to multi-cultural, multi-ethnic mentality of Kazakh people. In this way syncretism, fragmentation of national consciousness being characteristic features of the period of struggle for national identity were waded through. Although this wading is possible when Kazakh people are aware of their national and cultural identity.

The further democratization of Kazakhstan should contribute to improving the quality of education, scientific and technological progress, finding its niche in the international division of labor. It is also a good way of raising economic well-being of people, maintenance and enhancement of life standards and values, political stability, integrity and good governance on the part of the authorities. As these issues are being decided in society it is time to move from formal processes of democracy to democracy as a way of life. Democracy as a way of life is a genuine, mature democracy. It involves creating the necessary economic, political, social, cultural values and conditions. These conditions should determine the direction and stability of the socio-political system of Kazakhstan society. Within this system it is necessary to create a new state-integrative national ideology, to form a new outlook, to overcome obsolete traditions from the Soviet past; one should be aware of the necessity to resist political extremism on ethnic and religious basis. Deepening of democratization should lead to reduction in property stratification and increasing population activity, to its social mobility, adaptation to the market, the approval of national, civil identity.

A number of current models of democracy is rapidly growing. Each model has its advantages and disadvantages. However a common problem is that none of these modern forms of government in the conditions of accelerated transformation and modernization of public life can not solve their vital problems: growth of terrorism and crime,

widespread corruption, violation of the law, external and internal threats.

This makes people be doubtful in the social myth that democracy is an ideal, best form of government that fully protects interests of citizens. In the XXI century people talk about «three waves of democracy» (Huntington), «swept» through socio-historical space of Europe. There are fears that even with the appearance of the «fourth wave» (model) of democracy it is possible to come back in view of mentioned circumstances to the authoritarian (the so-called enlightened) form of government. It is realistic and logical as suggested by most researchers. This pattern should primarily take place in the countries where internal and external threats to regime are most acute.

«The chief architect» of China's reform Deng Xiaoping at the XIII Congress of the Communist Party of China (October 25, 1987) proposed to divide ideology and vital tasks of Chinese economy modernization. In the 1980s this phrase became an unofficial motto under which pragmatic economic reforms were carried out – introduction of market elements, authorization of private ownership by production means, creation of free economic zones, etc. The fact that Communist Party was the country's leadership did not prevent China from becoming the world's second largest economy. It has its own democracy with its Chinese specific character. Here as in the case with culture there is no co-measurement in culture as well as there is no co-measurement in democratic. Like all cultures all democracies are incommensurable and unique. As Winston Churchill once said: the UK has no permanent friends, but it has permanent interests. That's why concept of democracy is often substituted by geopolitics; in other words they say: «We want to bring democracy», but it is really a question of geopolitical interests.

Democracy is a part of ideology. Democracy (at procedural and institutional level) is one of possible forms of political rule, it has actively been evolving for more than two and a half millenniums. Democracy's considerable age («patriarchy») shows that there is originally a mechanism of self-regulation in it. Democracy influences the mechanism of political system of society: gradual improvement of the three branches of government – legislative, executive and judicial; existence of checks and balances to get rid of negative effects of government (such as rights of minorities and rights of the majority, for example); focus on the rule of law and guarantee of fundamental values – freedom and equality. Democracy survived longer than

other forms of political rule because of: diversity of this form of government, correspondence to its expectancies (of an individual, masses and the elites), and its organically inherent ability to mimicry.

The reasons for this phenomenon are those grounds that «generated» it:

- Nationhood existence (which needs to be managed);

- The need of people to protect the basic values – freedom and equality (the meaning and essence of freedom and equality are variative, depending on several factors);

- Predominance of private property (in its advanced form – slave, feudal or capitalist) over other kinds;

- A high level of spiritual and moral culture components.

- Presence in society of internal and external «challenges», and forces that promote this very imperfect, but the most flexible form of government.

At the level of democracy which is considered to be an ideology, way of thinking, the leading countries of Eurasian Economic Union – Russia and Kazakhstan – developed over the years their own strategy, an algorithm of social modernization, which allowed them to maintain their own culture, to learn experience and achievements of the world, and not to lose their own identity, «their face». In other words, having arisen in different corners of the world democracy being in the process of its transformation becomes part of the national ideology.

In terms of synergetics, which studies the formation of order from chaos, here works the law of mutual attraction and repulsion of particles and heterogeneous systems. In the inorganic world, it means a shift of mass and energy, but in social systems and political doctrines it is perception and processing of information. Thus in the twentieth century information became both field of action and instrument of manipulation of people's minds by Western technologists, information became some kind of a «protection document» from destructive claims of Western civilization to world hegemony in all spheres of public life.

It can be compared to the «three-faced» Janus. In Roman mythology two-faced Janus is known as a god of the sky and sunlight, which was identified with Chaos by Ovid. Janus was the Roman symbol of the beginning and the end of time, he was responsible for internal and external communications, «ways and transitions» from one state to another.

The Third Person of Janus is the ability to incorporate incompatible contradictions, to find the right solution in critical situation. This «third way»

is a symbol embedded in the culture of some former Soviet republics, the ability to find a «way out» – the way of China, Japan and other countries in Southeast Asia. To build a society with traditional collective type of culture and with elements of representative democracy is considered to be a political and ideological myth by the West.

In all concepts of the world order starting with the mythology there is an idea of the spring of life «Gods transform chaos into cosmos» (order). It means to create a single whole, all parts of this whole are interconnected by a string (gunas, ropes, and in our time – torsion fields). Ancient people indicated even the number of these connections. In the «Vedas» in particular they say about three basic gunas and more than 80 combinations.

From the perspective of modern social concepts ideology plays the role of one guna. Ideology is the main means of domination and social power in the contemporary world. In industrial civilization ideology replaced religion; modern political strategists use it to implement some hidden meanings in people's minds, «without violating the borders of an evident meaning». This is some kind of «evident – improbable» in social life: in politics the main meanings are concealed and social myths and the programs veil these meanings.

Formally all are equal before the law in the West. But as to property politically equal citizens are not equal. Wealth inequality and stratification – the main sources of social tension – create non-equilibrium state of the whole system. Social balance is maintained and governed by political power. These are basics of political science and political economy. Adam Smith, the founder of the British classical political economy, warned that the main role of the state in civil society reduced itself to protect property, to protect the rich from the poor.

The entire structure of Western-style representative democracy rests on the leading role of the so-called «Two-thirds» – conscious and active citizens, i. e. those who are interested in protecting their possessions. But decisions are also made by a minority of votes.

Many Western researchers have long been speaking explicitly of the form of democracy which is widely advertised and described but does not exist. This is a myth which aim is to convince people that they had made a wise choice as to the form of government – «for people, for the public good». The difference between tyranny (or authoritarianism) and democratic government is that modern democracy manipulates the public conscience whereas a tyrant commands – Western researchers say.

R. Merton, one of the most famous American sociologists of the twentieth century, P. Sorokin's disciple and follower, explores the social structure and the ways people adapt to political realities. Assessing the US domestic politics, Merton says that whoever controls opinions and beliefs in our society resorts less to physical violence and more to indoctrination of people. Mass media function as a tool of intimidation and violence. Mass media attack people ideologically and psychologically.

The famous English political scientist and historian of the twentieth century S. Parkinson, the author of the book «The Evolution of Political Thought», justified the 4 basic forms of government – monarchy, oligarchy, democracy, dictatorship. Having analyzed the great amount of factual material on the evolution of political thinking Parkinson showed that during a life cycle of different civilizations a number of political institutions and forms of government changed and crashed; one form of government replaced another and so on. Parkinson anticipated political disputes on this subject in Britain in 90s.

People call him modern and brilliant – French philosopher S. Moscovici is a world-famous scholar, the author of the theory of social representations. Studying people's behavior Moscovici indicates differences between the East authoritarian forms of government and the West authoritarian forms of government, these forms of government according to the philosopher replace modern democracy almost everywhere. In the West – he says – authorities don't control means of production so much whereas education and mass media, intellectual production are under a great control. This is due to political necessity. And in the East – much attention is still paid to the development of productive forces and means of production.

And no democratic «mechanisms» provide freedom to people; Moscovici concludes: «State absolutism is possible in democracies, as in the most extreme of the monarchy. Such is the bourgeois democracy, with its formal absolutism of the the principle of democracy. Instincts and skills of absolutism passed into democracy, they dominate in all democratic revolutions».

Redistribution of influence areas, distribution of global wealth (resources) is accompanied by rising social tensions. Professor of Paris School of Economics T. Piketty collected and systematized data of the European countries, Japan and the United States for 200 years period. He had a goal – to find ways to correct the social system when the system is beyond the limits of «social inequality». Statistics

given in his book «Capital in the XXI century» fully fits Marx's theory presented by him in «Capital». According to Piketty social inequality at the beginning of the twentieth century in these countries (European countries, Japan and the United States) reached its peak: 10% of the rich controlled 45% of national income. And the main source of income of the wealthy families of Europe was capital gains. Europe lived producing almost nothing and wealthy citizens lived on rent.

The economic crisis and two world wars reduced stratification, both in the USA and Europe entrepreneurs replace a person of independent means. But gradually the ratio rich – poor returned to previous levels, moreover, it was worse than before.

Piketty says that this is largely due to the fact that modern society has not developed a «soft» (not crisis, not military) adjustment mechanism for governmental system. And it carries a serious threat to the entire world society.

The well-known political analyst and scholar A. A. Zinoviev gives a negative assessment to both Western-style democracy and culture. He writes: the Western ideology and propaganda harshly criticizing government corruption in communist countries conceals the fact that Western countries are in the same situation as communist countries. It is no mere chance that the convergence theory of J. Galbraith and R. Aron was originated here. Communism and capitalism are extreme manifestation and the highest level of such notion as the «West». And people should gain experience and strength to overcome such phenomena as Westernism. In fact a Western man is an individualist. His principle is to work for himself and to treat others as a part of surroundings and a means of existence [2].

Summing up all these studies we can conclude that in the world apparently an objective process of negation and self-negation of capitalism and of bourgeois values is going on; other – hybrid models of economic and political governance are being searched for. It is commonly accompanied by transformation of the public consciousness. Public consciousness is formed not only under the influence of modern mass media technologies, ideological pressure and «brainwashing» by politicians. In the context of endless systemic crises in the Western world one can observe a retreat from the democratic model of government, which was long before predicted by theorists and politicians.

These problems affected the post-Soviet countries too. But since democratic modernization here was carried out within a different type of culture,

based not on individualism but on collectivism and community perception of the world, people become aware of the importance of their own culture and invaluable experience of management accumulated over the centuries.

At the boundary of the XX-XXI centuries in the former Soviet Union a new spiritual and moral culture started to take shape. The culture was developing absorbing traditions and values, religious component, socio-cultural and political elements. In contrast to an impersonal mass Western culture with its aggressive business focused on commercial success at any price, ideas of collective values were propagated in the post-Soviet countries as the vaccination and protection from extreme individualism.

In the post-Soviet republics new models of governance (closely connected with the national culture) are tested, countries develop and form their own model of governance. The basis of Kazakhstan's model of political regime for example is presidential-parliamentary form of government. The emphasis is on the enlightened authoritarianism as an effective in these conditions and centuries proven management model.

Analyzing the contemporary post-Soviet society, A.V.Lukin – the political scientist, doctor of philosophy and historical sciences, director of the Center for Scientific Research of East Asian and SCO (Shanghai Cooperation Organization), emphasizes that post-Soviet society grew out of political culture and political system of the late Soviet period. It borrowed and develops the system, but without centralized power of the Communist Party and state ideology. He writes that Russian political system, being formed in 90s, is characterized by a system of clans and cabals. In economic policy of post-Soviet Russia there are much more traditional features than novelty [3].

Reborn «yasak» (tribute paid off in furs) for contributing countries becomes so-called «brain drain» – migration of the best «human material» and labor. And slowly degrading, devoid of people society becomes easily manageable. Political scientist, chief editor of «However, Eurasia» S.Uralov describes these processes, [4]. The world systemic crisis led East and West countries to the third «hybrid» world war. It has already broken out. But the war began «behind the scenes», when a wave of velvet and colored revolutions swept over many countries; when a wave of refugees swept over Europe instead of invading troops.

Recent events show that any long smoldering war will break out one day. In this war Russia has already

had promising western partners – France, England and «a little bit late» the United States of America.

Not only Kazakhstan and Russia but Greece, Grand Dame Europe and the former Soviet Union as a whole strive to better understand origins and basic values of national cultures essential for peoples.

It is time to understand that the extreme individualism of people, corporations, party formations, states, chiefs and leaders, their arrogant belief in their own destiny as «Higher force for good, freedom, equality» and as a result aloofness from people is a demoniacal temptation, mentioned by talented poets and writers «on both sides of democracy.» This temptation remains attractive for both ordinary mortals and for the powerful.

The global market dictates its own laws: in the developing countries the «new democracy» of second and third waves always and everywhere is aimed at the execution of order for patron – countries. They become economic colonies and blind executors of their «benefactors'» political objectives.

Instead of «blossoming diversity» cultural capital gradually introduces common values, common standards, common ideology to the world. And having achieved striking results in this way it penetrates into banking, financial and economic spheres of «patronized» countries. As the global hegemon it prepares a launching ground for capturing the domestic market.

Export and overt expansion of unified models of governance in the modern world is one of the ways of the third, so-called «Hybrid» World War for world domination and the construction of a «new order». «Dictated» democracies in the Third World countries play the role of the Trojan horse. Squarable national elite betraying interests of people is involved in a non-advertised seizure of the territories and lands by international corporations. All this leads to managerial crisis and degradation of the social system.

The world is constantly changing. What will the world be like in future? – it depends on us.

#### References

- 1 Kumanetsky K. Cultural History of Ancient Greece and Rome. – M., 1990.
- 2 Zinoviev A.A. West. The phenomenon of Westernism. – M., 2003.
- 3 Lukin A.V., Lukin P.V. To understand Russia: the post-Soviet political culture and national history. – M., 2015.
- 4 Uralov S. Two capitals: how Russia is involved in the war by economy. – SPb.: «Peter», 2015.