

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

Discussion: At the end of last century it seemed that the question of vector and character of social development direction was finally resolved. After Soviet Union collapse self-determined republics proclaimed to transform totalitarianism into democracy and planned economy into a market. Many decided that long-lasting confrontation of two world systems was over with Soviet type of socialism defeat and the victory of Western liberal democracy. Of course, ex-Soviet republics didn't expect that in social and cultural transformational process, i.e., at the transition to democracy and market they would have to face competition and those crises events that had taken place in the economically and politically developed countries. In this regard, well-known American politician Brzezinski noted that transforming societies expectations were too high, and costs and reconstruct abilities ideas were too naive. Hence, social and cultural transformation was seen as continuous process, but in practice it was conflicting stages alternation, when one stage achievement doesn't ensure successful overcoming of next. Analyzing the experience of post-communist regimes becoming, he notes that in these countries it was hard to timely or at the same time create political conditions for economic reforms. In its turn, it led to the shock therapy, state's role strengthening in reform promoting. On this basis famous politician concludes: «Looking from today, politically and economically successful liberal democracy isn't predetermined result except maybe five of the 27 post-communist states». They are Poland, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Slovenia and Estonia.

To understand the complexities of social and cultural transformations of transitional society, i.e., the society that transits to democracy and market it's possible to use comparative approach in modernization theory to compare events in post-Soviet republics with other social and cultural transformations samples of the world community.

The transition to democracy and market in West Germany, Japan and Italy since 1945 was under the supervision and with financial support of the victorious powers. It was about «imposing», the transition under the influence from above and outside. The transformation solved simultaneously the tasks of democratization and market economy insertion. There was no time deficit. The

rise after the defeat was slow, expectations grew gradually. The old elites were partly replaced and partly used.

Current democratic wave is dated 1974, when in Portugal the dictatorship of Salazar fell. Then this wave spread to the other dictatorships in Southern Europe – Spain and Greece. This group of countries dealt with elimination of political dictatorships in societies familiar with democracy and market economy. There was a «contractual transition»: a compromise of old and new elites over the power transfer terms. Democratic reforms in most of these countries have initiated a so-called global democratic wave. The concept of global democratic wave, according to Western scholars, displays various processes of social and cultural transformations occurring in these regions of the world. They are united by attempts of transition from non-democratic government forms to more democratic, and some other factors, particularly the transition from totalitarianism (authoritarian) to democracy. Apparently, there is no need to explain that the concepts of totalitarianism and authoritarianism are concepts of the same order. Authoritarianism is a «softer» form of state dominance over society, the primacy of the executive over legislative and judicial branches.

This democratic wave embraced further and Latin America. However, the processes in Latin America are difficult to describe clearly. There are more broken transformations, repeating rolling back from dictatorship and democracy even after long periods of economic growth. One of the conditions for democratization success in Latin America is the guarantee from previously dominated layer from previous lower society layer – in a certain way, it's also «contractual transition». In countries of Southern Europe and Latin America the transformation was carried out by borrowing or creating on the basis of available institutes models some societies-samples: competitive democracy, market economy, social state and mass consumption.

By the mid 80-ies of the last century, the democratic wave reached some Asian countries, and since the second half of the 80-ies captured communist world – the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. Thus, the GDR (East Germany) developed by «directed from outside» institutions transfer. In Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic development was run by «endogenously managed institutions import». In 1991 Gorbachev's perestroika that had started five years before ended with the Soviet system and the Soviet Union collapse, and formation of 15 new

independent states hastened to proclaim themselves the «new democracies».

The current democratization wave – the third in world political history (Huntington), and according to some estimations – the fourth (Karl and Shmitter). Characterizing its features, Diamond states: «Perhaps the most striking feature of the «third wave» is how little regimes in the world (just over 20%) are left that never allowed any multi-party competition, whether it was competition of liberal, electoral or pseudo democratic level. Such a wide distribution (of multi-party competition) testifies of ideological «democracy» hegemony and peace formed after the Cold War. But at the same time – about the superficial nature of that hegemony. The world community demands from the countries of Latin America and Caribbean electoral democracy (in exchange for recognition and economic aid). As for African countries then the leading Western powers hold for them even lower criteria: the only thing they insist is the presence of opposition parties able to compete for power, even if such parties are manipulated and persecuted and deprive the victory». With the account of the democracy criteria difference its historical waves should be considered. According to recognized, almost classical, Huntington's point of view, the spread of democracy principles and procedures in its modern concept began in the USA in the early XIX century and lasted until the end of the First World War in which President Wilson came with a promise to make the world «safe for democracy». Then anti-democratic, also «wave», reaction followed – the rise of fascism in Italy, Nazism in Germany and Stalinism in the Soviet Union [13].

Western scholars associate the beginning of the second democratization wave with the victory over National Socialism in the Second World War. The victory helped restore the democracy foundations in West Germany and Italy. This democratization wave also includes Austrian democratization, the spread of democratic institutions in a number of developing countries as a result as their decolonization. The second wave lasted, according to them, about the middle of the 60-s of the last century, then came its decline classified by retroactive emergence of authoritarian regimes (Greece, the Philippines, South Korea, Nigeria, and others.).

The theory of the democratic waves shows modernization processes, but doesn't compete with the basic social sciences paradigms. It isn't identical to some of them, particularly to structural and functional analysis theories and social evolution. It simply shows that after the end of the Cold War

it's possible to see different ways of development towards similar goals than principally alternative goals of various future projects. In this situation modernization theory that in the late 70s was considered as almost dead and expresses only late capitalism ideology, currently passes through reevaluation and has further development. At the reevaluation and modernization theory development under its subject area they began to understand and take into account three things: a) the emergence of modernized societies; b) the process in which the straggler societies catch up with the societies gone ahead; c) the innovations of modernized societies. In this case, modernization theory acts as a kind of applied theory at the level of «countries and dates» abstraction.

According to most Western scholars modern democratic wave has some dissimilarities from the previous and first of all a much wider, almost global scale. However, they believe that there are only Muslim countries and a number of communist states, including China, outside its influence. Exactly the globalization of democratic impacts leads to the legitimate question if all variants of social and cultural development of society modernization are considered, when the changes occur almost simultaneously. As it's known, these socio-cultural processes take place in different and hard comparable conditions, with unequal initial data and eventline, processes functioning under different laws.

In contrast to the above-mentioned countries, in post-Soviet republics social and cultural transformations there are notable differences in the paces of ongoing processes, in elites and population ranking, in elites consensus, etc. In these republics transformation has a wider socio-cultural concept. Problems of employment structure changing, social integration, ecological burden on the environment and etc. are actual for them.

What prevents post-Soviet republics in translation into life successful transformation of the Western model? To a certain degree, its causes are clarified by Max Weber ideas of special Western development way. In other words, why are there only in the West capitalistic progress and rationalization in all spheres of society, state and culture? According to him, it's due to Protestant ethics influence on formation of bourgeois relations and its legitimization of new lifestyle, behavior type. It focused a man on hard work, frugality, prudence, self-control, self-trust, dignity, strict observation of human rights and responsibilities. Of course, Luther, Calvin, Zwingli didn't aim at the way of «capitalism spirit». They wanted to reform

the religion and the church, but their teaching deeply invaded in the sphere of out-church life, layman's consciousness and behavior, ordering him as divine commandments the things that were required by upcoming capitalist era. It turned out that «inner-worldly asceticism» preached by Protestantism was an effective committed mean of new personality education and new values. Because of this it became clear that the countries that haven't passed through the social and educational impact of something like the Reformation and Protestant ethics, aren't able to successfully develop along the path of rationality and modernization. However, Weber didn't claim that the whole thing is only in Protestant ethics. He confessed that there are also other conditions for the capitalism genesis. All of them led to the fact that Western capitalism formed naturally and historically on the base of traditional society planlessly.

However, at the present stage of historical evolution the ratio of spontaneity elements and consciousness significantly changed. Post-Soviet countries can't repeat the way of Western countries since history has no subjunctive mood. For this reason, they must pass their own special way of development. Ignoring this fact at the initial stage of social and cultural transformation caused dramatic consequences in these countries. What are the necessary conditions for the successful social and cultural society transformation at the initial stage?

As it's known, the US Intelligence Council constantly works on updating and revision of the forecast of possible scenarios in response to situation changes.

So, in consultation with independent experts from every corner of the globe in 1997 the Council prepared the report «Global trends – 2010», three years later – the report «Global trends – 2015» and in 2004 – «Contours of the Global Future: Report on «Project – 2020». The latest report formulates the concept of four prospective scenarios describing «possible worlds» on the threshold of which we can be depending on what trends prevail and how they interact with each other [14].

According to the first scenario, steady and rapid economic growth of a number of previously lagging countries, primarily China and India, is to change the globalization processes direction, which be less Westerned. In addition, the power balance in the political arena is to change: the usual dichotomy «East – West», «North – South», «developed countries – developing countries» be abolished.

It's clear that this scenario is based on the fact that South-East Asian experience has changed the view of social and cultural transformation

of transitional societies, particularly, on global processes in general. That was the case when local impacts upon global transformations were clearly marked for the first time. Once it was thought that Asia was able to upgrade just a little. Weber, in particular, saw in it hard convertible traditional society, as it has the other life standards and values. Apparently, according to some scientists, it's related to the different Asian standards. It concludes that it has unacceptable standards». For example, such attitude is specific for a debate on authoritarianism and democracy raged now in the West. In other words, there is opposition to «Western values» (liberalism, opinion pluralism, individualism, emphasis on individual rights) and «oriental values» (collectivism, patriarchy, paternalism, family headship, the guide function of the state). A new interpretation appeared: South-East Asia is a «second case of capitalist modernity» opening a new path of evolution after the West. This interpretation was, in particular, offered by Berger in the preface of the book «In Search of an East Asian Development Model» published in 1988. The foundation of the second case of modernity in contrast to the West is not the individualism, but collectivism. The literature shows family life stability, according to Berger, is Western work ethics commensurable. Family values created achievement-oriented Asian work ethic. In this values system guiding principle is the principle according to which «family» implies mutual responsibility of everybody for each welfare. Asian modernity specifics is the importance of collectivist solidarity, high prestige of education, meritocratic («rule of the best») norms and institutions producing elites. These features built, according to one of the leading US political scientists Berger, specialties of the second case of capitalist modernity and East Asian development model based on «human capital». Due to it modernization is carried out under saving of traditional important principles in socio-cultural area. Here the importance of such values, as hierarchy, duty, obligation, consensus, group loyalty, is preserved. Individual interests submission to group interests, adherence to corporatism principles, communitarianism in the relationship between the company and employees. Nowadays, however, it seems that a comparison of Japan and other countries of Southeast Asia and the West has some forced arguments. Technological similarities and a number of democratic institutions adjoin cultural specificity of this region. Modernization that could lead to «a new case of our time» is usually based on the change of its own cultural identity to Western one. There is no such change and rather achieved not

the modernity, but the competitiveness with West societies combining technological development with the preservation of traditions and enough closed local specifics. It's easy to notice that in this list features of traditional and modern societies are mixed. Thus, collectivism and solidarity are in poor agreement with the modernity principle – the emergence of an autonomous individual. In post-war Japan a liberal attempt aimed at individualism formation was done, but it didn't realize. Maybe is it – «unindividualistic version of capitalist modernity?» – asks Berger. Would it be appropriate to say, if it's a religious version of capitalist modernity? – No, – answers American researcher, – it's a new way. However, he still doesn't think that it is not already the modernization. He concludes that events in East Asia are a new model of modernization. Using the term «model» American professor creates some hope for others to use it, repeat East Asian experience. Is it possible? Berger's answer: «I believe that nobody would deny that something could be brought under from society experience different from our own, but the question is in understanding, if East Asia is able to provide a «model» for others in concept of agreed and distinct social development strategy». Note that the word «model» is already used in inverted commas, i.e., questioned. The problem is closely tied up with cultural factors role in social and economic development, these factors irremovability. Berger offers a very productive interpretation. He admits the existence of two hypotheses – «culturecentric» and «institutionalist». Following the first one, processes in Taiwan, for example, are can be explained by the fact that the People's Republic of China (PRC) is populated by Chinese, whose attitude to the world is determined by Chinese culture and Chinese social institutions. It explains through the image of Chinese culture and spirit of modern Chinese capitalism. According to Berger, institutional hypothesis is alternative. It explains these successes by results of economic policy and practice unrelated to the fact that the inhabitants of the NRC are Chinese. Under culturecentric approach NRC experience seems unique, untranslated. Under institutional approach efforts of its spread in the Arab world or in Latin America can be taken. Therefore, Berger finds the institutional approach more promising. Its borders must be taken into account by the culturecentric explanations. However, the borders relied by culture are often more important than institutional possibilities.

Culturecentric interpretation doesn't allow to talk about Taiwan sample transfer and even question the idea of a model or a sample: «It's reasonable

to assume that Arabs and Latin Americans could adapt fiscal or trade policy of Taiwan; but it's meaningless to assume that they can adapt Taiwan ethics». Which of two hypotheses prefers Berger? In contrast to majority opinion, he states that science never gives us a definite possibility. The success of Japan and Southeast Asia in general was an experience that doesn't fit the modernization theory and destroys the ideas of social science on society. This development center shift in the region from which nobody expected anything special, surprised Berger. It's known that big and, as it turned out, false hopes were layed on the Philippines that were under strong American influence. Berger, trying to understand this new reality, came to conclusion that institutional model is complicated by culturecentric interpretation. However, analysis of literature about Berger's attitude to Southeast Asian modernization experience leaves the question of cultural and social consolidation nature of transitional society open [17].

Countries in the region are at different stages of socio-cultural development. So, based on the development level, speed of economic growth and technological innovations, the average per capita income Vietnamese scientist Haya identified four «development echelons» of Southeast Asian countries. To the first he refers Japan that has the biggest in world economic and technological potential. To the second echelon he refers such new industrial countries, as South Korea, Hong Kong, Taiwan and Singapore. These countries are rapidly developing and in recent years are known as «Tigers» or «Dragons» of Asia. By the way, Republic of Kazakhstan also set a goal to become one of the 50 most developed countries of the world in coming years. If this goal is solved by the Republic, then to the «Tigers», «Dragons» of Asia the «Snow Leopard» of Eurasia will be added. Haya refers to the third echelon Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand and the Philippines, the countries are developing fast and stably. According to him, the fourth development echelon includes North Korea, China, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia.

While considering the social and cultural transformation of these countries, as special modernization cases China and Islamic fundamentalism are distinguished in literature. Zenghaas writes about the situation in China: «Society pluralism is going to further gain dynamism due to irreversible processes of economic transformation. There will be more transparency, politicaly articulated culture may appear... Maybe in the following sequence: the

monopolist party without jural sate and democracy, pluralizing monopolist party with the rudiments of jural state and democracy..., the expansion of pluralism and formation of democratic constitutional state embryonic signs; all within 15-25 years». China and those Asian countries in which the dominant ideology is Islamic fundamentalism are considered by Western scientists as an alternative to modernization, democratic and market-economic transformations in Western version. Because now there is a lively discussion on the issue of a special East Asian path of modernization which is not only equivalent to the Western one, but surpasses it and will define new century.

The leaders of Malaysia (Mahathir Mohamad), Singapore (Lee Kuan Yew) don't accept the Western model of modernization and lobby for own Asian way of discipline and integration. On the basis of this rejection in the 1990s there was a concept of «Asian values, public debate around which focused on the severest human rights problem. In contrast to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the UN in 1948, and the Vienna Declaration of 1993 reaffirms that human rights are «universal and indivisible», supporters of «Asian values» insist on the existence of the fundamental cultural differences in relation to the issues and human rights.

One of the main opponents of Singapore ex-Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew sharply speaks against Western attempts to impose the East the alien principles and norms. He says: «I've always admired those American features that make it so attractive against the communist system background... But I find a number of American system elements totally unacceptable: the spread of firearms, drugs, crime, vagrancy, lewd public behavior, shortly, decomposition of civil society. Individual rights expansion to a such level when an individual is free to behave as he wants, caused damage to society order. In the East the main goal is order provision... In the West... the idea of inviolability of human rights turned into a dogma... The idea of individual's interests and right to freedom of expression primacy are carried to extremes, but set difficulties for preserving the integrity of American society. We, the people of Asia, see it. Those who wants to have a healthy society in which young women and old women can safely walk at night, and young men are not molested by drugdealers, will not follow the American model... If every day the television shows violence and sex, it's to destroy all society» [18].

It's obvious, in contrast to the West in Asia public interests have primary importance in comparison to individual interests and rights. If personal freedom

is highly valued in the West, in the East the priority is given to the «order and harmony».

The order and harmony in society are provided through such most important «Asian values» as thrift, respect for the powerholders and absolute loyalty to the family. In summary, they envisage «unindividualistic modernization model in which the capricious demand of freedoms and rights is submitted to a broader understanding of good, and traditional and modern aren't on opposite sides.

Western democracies traditions and principles in Kazakhstan can be used with regard to its historical, social and cultural features. It was taken into account by British politician and writer Jonathan Aitken [20]. He notes that in the XXI century it's necessary to very carefully evaluate the regimes in different countries. The Western world shouldn't consider its model as perfect and impose it to others. There is parliamentary democracy in Britain, however, I will not say that it's the best in the world. We have it working well, but if it works in other countries is unknown. Very important index of regime success is the stability of the government and society. Kazakhstan has it. According to him, there is no sterling democracy in the Western concept. But we must take into account from what low level its construction began. Recently there was no democracy – by historical standarts – and now there is. There are still too many people of old formation, old ideas and habits in government. It's a serious brake. However in Kazakhstan the glass of democracy isn't half empty, but half full and continues to be filled. President Nazarbayev's merits here are obvious and can't be questioned. With such rating of him is possible to agree only in part.

Responding to reproaches of autocracy, Nazarbayev suggests to all those who speaks that there isn't enough democracy in our country, to deeply penetrate into the history and culture of Kazakhstan. «I know that we are sometimes reproached of autocracy. How is it possible to talk about autocracy, when every 4-5 years at the nation-wide vote the people elect their President, elect their Parliament at free alternative elections. We are told that we should faster move on the way of democracy that Western countries from the United States to Europe live. We perfectly understand all. Democracy is the common main way of mankind development, we'll have come there, but we always take into account that we are Asian society, we have traditions different from Western, our religious, cultural views are different, so we should move cautiously», – Nazarbayev said at the conference dedicated to the 20th anniversary of the RK Constitution. «Moreover, in contrast to

other countries there were no democracy culture, political culture over the last 300 years. That is, when they evaluate our vital activity, I'd advise our friends deeper get into the system, history, culture, traditions of Asian society», – the head of state said. He notes that if the government in the approach to the state construction had a fancy for hasty and political abstract schemes, our country would fail. «We see the example of our nearest neighbors. And the price of failure would be catastrophic», – the President concluded.

The director of Center for Public Administration and Public Policy at Carleton University, Doctor of Political Sciences, Piotr Dutkiewicz fairly notes that in the last 20 years democracy has become blurred concept in the East and West. In his opinion, «an ordinary citizen» speaking in support of democracy is guided mainly by desire for more fair redistribution of income and opportunities for access to health care, education, economic and personal security. In all these areas we watch mixed results in Eastern and Western Europe, the EU and the USA. In the West «democracy» has significant public support. But while it's perceived as a source – in addition to the fundamental freedoms – of such benefits as social security, system stability and «justice»; democracy is considered as a tool for achievement of worthy position ensured with comfortable living conditions and safety [21].

In this regard, professor notes that skepticism in post-Soviet space, Central and Eastern Europe is connected with that the democratization process in practice turned up full release, «liberalization», of a thin political and business elite layer from legal or social control. Only quite small group of people was able to use the full benefits of «democracy. So the main problem is that few people could fully use democracy benefits.

For the full using of democracy in the Republic of Kazakhstan some concrete steps are directed in the reform of accountable government formation. They are expanded opportunities for citizens to participate in decision-making, strengthening the role of community councils at the state bodies and akimats to discuss the implementation of the strategic plans and territorial development programs, budgets, reports etc.

Southeast Asian development experience has an important role in building Mangelik El. It was once thought that Asia is able to upgrade a little. Weber saw in it hard convertible traditional society, because it has different life standarts and values. Apparently, according to some scientists, it's related to different Asian standarts. It concludes that it

has unacceptable standards. For example, such an attitude is characteristic for the Western debate on authoritarianism and democracy problems. In other words, there is opposition of «Western values» (liberalism, opinion pluralism, individualism, emphasis on individual rights) and «Eastern values» (collectivism, patriarchy, paternalism, family headship, the guide function of the state).

There is controversy of individualism and collectivism in the foundation of two modern values system. The specifics of Asian modernity is the importance of collective solidarity, high prestige of education, meritocratic («rule of the best») norms and institutions producing elites. There is preservation of such values as hierarchy, duty, obligation, consensus, loyalty to the group, individual interests submission to group interests, communitarianism in the relationship between the company and employees. Leading Southeast Asian countries development experience and their values systems are of Kazakhstan interests in terms of identity and strengthening the unity of the people.

The region is dominated by the influence of Chinese culture, or more precisely, Confucianism. The famous American philosopher Tu Wei-ming identifies six basic values shared by all «Confucian» countries of Southeast Asia. These values are very close to the values mentioned by Nursultan Nazarbayev at the XXII session of the Assembly of People of Kazakhstan. At his time, Abay was called Eastern Confucius [22].

Firstly, a strong central government taking responsibility of people's welfare and stability of the society.

Secondly, customs and rituals that have extraordinary significance in the formation of public virtue and morality.

Third, a family is a basic unit of society, the chief translator of values from one generation to another.

Fourth, civil society plays the role of «dynamic mediator» between private and public social life areas.

Fifthly, education «that must become society civil religion». It defines «Confucian humanism» feature: the main purpose of education is rather «to learn how become a human» and not to be an institution created for knowledge and skills acquisition.

Sixth, quality life dependence of each member's «self-improvement» level. Such improvement means that people recognize their ethical responsibilities towards the society in comparison to personal freedom and happiness. «Self-improvement is a

source of family control, government and peace in Tianxia».

According to Tu Wei-ming, adhering to the «Confucian values» the people of Southeast Asia could «learn to think both globally and locally», ensure «the presence of traditions in modernization process». This «presence of traditions in modernization process» also takes place in in the Eurasian Economic Union.

At Moscow book launch of «The Creator. Nursultan Nazarbayev: View from Russia» [23] July 1, 2015, the Chairman of the State Duma Committee on CIS Affairs, Eurasian Integration and Ties with Compatriots Leonid Slutsky said that exactly the President of Kazakhstan has idea of the Eurasian Economic Union creating. He believes, Nursultan Nazarbayev, of course, is the patriarch of today Eurasianism. Under his leadership the Eurasian project is improving, growing. And since 1 January 2015 all we live in the era of the Eurasian Economic Union. The President of Kazakhstan is for many years to coordinate important projects that will set the shape of the Eurasian world in the XXI century.

The writer, deputy chief editor of «Rossiyskaya Gazeta» Nikolai Dolgoplov in the essay «The Ally» calls Nursultan Nazarbayev main friend of Russia. According to him, «Eurasian Union was a huge breakthrough into the future. To provide foresee is given not for everyone. Only elected has enormous gift. And such foresight Nazarbayev has. I would call all our plans and proposals by Nursultan Nazarbayev paving a new way» [24].

Offering this idea Kazakh President Nursultan Nazarbayev has also proceeded from the fact that Europe and Asia need each other. Integration between them is a movement in the right direction. The head of state underlined that «Europe needs our resources, we need their science and their technology, so we are complementary. And he is sure that the normal time comes, and the economy will live without the policy to improve the lives of people truly». He is confident in the further expansion of the Eurasian community. President Nursultan Nazarbayev believes that this is going right now. It's the idea of the Silk Road and that economic development along this path. It is unification. From the Pacific Ocean to Western Europe we are now building a highway, building a railroad. It is Europe and Asia, isn't it? We'll come to this».

Realization of Kazakh President strategic approaches and initiatives would allow the Eurasian Union to achieve full internal integration and more fully realize the potential of its foreign policy, gradually turning into one of the key factors in

ensuring the stability of the world political and economic systems. So exactly today it's necessary to discuss them in political, scientific and expert groups and then fixing as political decisions inseparably linked with the common fate of Eurasian people.

Acknowledgements: The authors express their gratitude to the colleagues of the philosophy department and University Bachelor Shaydulina Darya Rustamovna for their assistance in preparing this article for publication.

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 paradigim // 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.
- 13 Lapin N.I. Problema sotsiokul'turnoy transformatsii // Voprosy filosofii. – 2000. – № 6. – S. 3-17.
- 14 Khantington S. Tret'ya volna. Demokratizatsiya v kontse KHKH veka. – M., 2003. – 365 s.
- 15 Veber M. Nauka kak prizvaniye i professiya // Samosoznaniye yevropeyskoy kul'tury XX veka. – M., 1991. – S. 133-153.
- 16 Modernizatsiya i globalizatsiya: obrazy Rossii v XXI veke. Otv. red. V.G.Fedotova. – M.: IF RAN, 2002. – 126 s.
- 17 Berger P., Lukman T. Sotsial'noye konstruirovaniye real'nosti. – M.: Academia – Tsentr: Medium, 1995. – 147 s.
- 18 Fedotova V.G. Faktory tsennostnykh izmeneniy na Zapade i v Rossii // Voprosy filosofii. – 2005. – № 11. – S. 20.
- 19 Sotsial'nyye znaniya i sotsial'nyye izmeneniya. Otv. red. V.G. Fedotova. – M.: IF RAN, 2001. – 251 s.
- 20 Aytken Dzhonatan. Nursultan Nazarbayev i sozdaniye Kazakhstana. Perevod s ang. Pod obshchey redaktsiyey O.Suleymenova, V.Ignatenko. – M.: Khudozhestvennaya literatura. 2010. – 382 s.
- 21 Vstrecha studentov s pochetnym doktorom RUDN, professorom politicheskikh nauk, direktorom Tsentra upravleniya i gosudarstvennoy politiki Karltonskogo universiteta (Kanada) Piotrom Dutkevichem, 12 fevralya 2015 goda na temu «World Instability and Unpredictability – Reasons and Consequences» – «Nestabil'nost' i nepredskazuyemost' v mire – prichiny i posledstviya».
- 22 Tu Wei-Ming. Asian Values and the Asian Crisis: A Confucian Humanist Perspective // <http://www.ruf.rice.edu/~tnchina/commentary/tu1098.html>.
- 23 Sbornik: «Sozidatel'. Nursultan Nazarbayev: vzglyad iz Rossii». – M., 2015. – 400 s.
- 24 1 Poslaniye Prezidenta RK N.A. Nazarbayeva narodu Kazakhstana «Nurly zhol – put' v budushcheye» // Zakon kz. – 2014. – S. 3.