

## Social and Cultural Transformation of Sovereign Kazakhstan

M.Sh. Hasanov, G.G. Nuryшева, V.F. Petrova, A.S. Syrgakbaeva and B.A. Dzhaambaeva  
Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Al-Farabi St. 71, Almaty, Russia

---

**Abstract:** The study considers the features of social and cultural Kazakh society transformation during the transition from totalitarianism to democracy. On the basis of this analysis revealed that this transformation is an organic part of the natural historical process of traditional societies transformation into modern forms of organization and development in the global democratical wave. The study is dedicated to studying of the new socio-political and socio-cultural changes that have emerged in Kazakh society as a result of the sovereignty approval, market economy, jural state, open society standards and values, Eurasian civilizational guides.

**Key words:** Sociality, culture, transformation, eurasianism, civilization, society

---

### INTRODUCTION

Issues of socio-cultural transformation of Kazakhstan and its place in modern world have become actual, since the soviet collapse. Then ex-Soviet republics declared their independence and sovereignty and hold a course for the democracy transformation and market economy. Democracy and market economy were considered not only as vectors and sense of society socio-cultural transformation but also as instruments of opposition to totalitarianism, bureaucracy, anarchy, state monopoly.

#### **The beginning of open democratic society for nation:**

December 16, 1990; the most significant event happened in Kazakhstan history. On this day the Supreme Council of Kazakhstan XXII convocation adopted the Declaration of State Sovereignty. A year later, Nursultan Nazarbayev signed a decree on the state sovereignty of Kazakhstan and from that time the country became independent. Therefore, the Independence Day of Kazakhstan became the main holiday for its citizens. Two years later the strategy of further formation and development of Kazakhstan as a sovereign state was developed and adopted.

These legislative acts consolidated the independence and sovereignty of our republic and served as a legal basis for the building of open democratic society with mixed economy. At the same time, democracy and market economy were considered not only as direction and nature of social and cultural society transformation but also as instruments of opposition to such negative phenomena as totalitarianism, bureaucracy, anarchy, state monopoly. It was the beginning of Kazakhstan advance towards democracy, law and market (Petrova, 1990).

At the ground of this transformation a basis liberalism postulate laid-the inalienable right to life, freedom and property. Private property was considered as the basis of human economic freedom and its necessary self-realization condition. Therefore, the transition from planned economy to market was primarily focused on the creation of conditions for democracy institutionalization. In its turn democratic state had to ensure the realization and proper functioning of market relations and free competition (Mises, 2001).

European historical experience indicates that democracy as a government form creates optimal conditions for human economic freedom. This experience convinced the more people's participation in government decision-making is, the higher "degree" of their freedom, equality and justice is. Such ideas of humanistic democracy norms were based on human nature knowledge, its rationality and morality. This socio-cultural democracy component played a significant role in the modernization of Kazakhstan socio-cultural system during the transition period. It involved not only mandatory procedural democratic governance ruleabidance but also the freedom of speech, assembly, activity type selection, the rule of law, society openness and a number of other democratic procedures (Berlin, 2001).

But at the first market economy transition stage in our country no economic or social bases were created for the political system democratization. It turned out, that all the expectations of a "democratic miracle" are only a post-perestroika period myth. Moreover, in Kazakhstanians' mass consciousness the idea of democracy was initially vague, an amorphous picture of perfect bright future. Kazakhstan is not an exception among the "young democracies" of the third wave that

are characterized by “sliding” phenomenon: the disappointment in their own expectations by facing with social problems caused by the systemic crisis of all social life aspects. At the early democratic development stages in Kazakhstan a symbiosis of democracy and market myths formed. Promises of democracy and market were perceived by masses as the most effective means of economic problems solving and Western living standards achieving. The idealization of these myths in the mass consciousness lasted until the early 90-ies of the last century until the destructive social consequences of the first shock economic reforms began to come out.

However, in process of overcoming of these crisis events political and legal culture increased and the role of democracy and market in social sphere modernization was gradually demythologized in Kazakh society. This process was directly related to the socio-political changes that occurred during the years of republic sovereignty and independence. During that time, Kazakhstanians have not only perceived new living standards propagated by Western ideologists and their own elite, political pluralism but also have maximally adapted to them. The understanding that expected future is largely depends on the citizens’ activity has come.

Active masses involvement in the new socio-political living conditions began with a radical review and rejection of Marxist ideology stereotypes, communist morality norms and atheism. They were replaced by new, corresponding to the official country orientation values peace, order, stability, progress, freedom, equality and legal security. The abilities of management, decision-making, executing and negotiating were demand. Communist and national traditional collectivist moralities were gradually replaced by individualism. In the new reality activity, sense of purpose, busyness, promptitude in obeying began to be appreciated. The list of values can be extended and can be reduced to capacious formula tested by historical experience of countries passed the initial capitalism stage “Word and Deed”. Collectivist and traditional moral values composing the foundation of Eurasians social consciousness were yet not demand at this stage of social transformation.

Democratic values of Kazakhstan transitional period can be seen as a part of a so-called modern global democratic wave (Huntington, 2003). This transitional to market and democracy stage presupposes competitive democracy, market economy, welfare state and mass consumption. An integral element of such transition is liberal reforms. They were primarily aimed at delegitimization of the classic right and post-communist authoritarianism to protect citizens social rights, expand

political freedoms, strength public control by executive power, establish productive dialog between the government and the opposition and make deliberate choice of civilizational development.

The 1994 was a defining year for Kazakhstan socio-cultural transformation. Speaking to the teaching staff and students of Lomonosov Moscow State University, Nursultan Nazarbayev proved the concept of the Eurasian Union. On this occasion, famous Russian scientist Dugin noted that the President of huge independent state made an official declaration of Eurasian doctrine as a historical imperative as universal appeal, as an invitation not only to idea but also to act, to the concrete Eurasian project realization.

According to Dugin, it was a turning point in Eurasianism history: projects began to embody and “the system of intuitions, generalizations and philosophical theories began to implemented in concrete life” (Dugin, 2004).

From the beginning the new concept of Eurasianism was developed as meaningful, extremely loaded with concrete sense, philosophy and as strategy and geopolitical platform. It satisfied the time requirements. The necessity of the Eurasian Union creation was discussed way back in 20-30s of XX century. “Classical Eurasians”-N.S. Trubetskoy, P.N. Savitsky and G.V. Vernadsky-hoped to gradually transform the Soviet Union into the Eurasian Union by replacing communist ideology by Eurasian (Savitsky, 1997). However, historical prerequisites for their project realization are not yet ripe.

Nazarbayev’s integrational initiative has mobilized the efforts of the CIS for creating a single area-peace, security, economic prosperity, spiritual and cultural unity. It correspond to common expectations and had not only political but also economic grounding. In 1994 the President of Kazakhstan Nazarbayev addressed to all heads of CIS document of historical significance “Project of the formation of the Eurasian Union of States”. From that moment it became possible to talk about the transformation of eurasianism from pure theory into concrete political practice. The Project supposed to unite all ex-Soviet republics into a single economic space with the conservation of their political sovereignty which caused a strong resonance in the minds of political elites and CIS population (Eurasian, 2002).

Kazakh scientist-Professor Vidova said that Nazarbaev faster than anyone realized: to become a prosperous country, first of all integration within the CIS, an internal market for manufactured goods are needed. Nazarbayev’s idea of Eurasian Union was an important

step towards the integration of former Soviet republics. She points out that, when the idea of Eurasian Union was proclaimed, Nursultan Nazarbayev advocated the economic union, a project of which was developed in Kazakhstan. It provided the conclusion of the Custom Union, the Monetary Union, the creation of common economic space, agreement of external economic policy, emphasized the necessity of observing the legislation customs, currency, tax. But the idea of Eurasian Union creation, she says, even by those who hadn't fully understood was rightly perceived as "global and unexpected". But not because of that Eurasian ideas were first announced in Kazakhstan (Vidova, 2014).

The idea of Eurasian Union formation contained cultural and civilizational component which acted as a kind of "ideological kernel" of integrational project, expressing in practice qualitatively new interpretation of the content and meaning of Eurasian study in relation to the realities of multipolar world.

Perhaps the "conceptual" crisis of the CIS, that hadn't defined its strategic mission, played its role in the awareness of the need for new approaches to the integration. Such a mission by definition couldn't be a simple mechanical "divorce" of post-Soviet states or their "amorphous" and purposeless co-existence. The new concept of Eurasianism settled on intuitive understanding of the need to preserve the constructive unity potential that continued and continues to bind the countries and peoples of the Union.

The Message of President Nursultan Nazarbayev to the people of Kazakhstan dated 14 December 2012 became an important stage of socio-cultural country development. It announced the key vectors of long-term "Kazakhstan-2050" development. They outlined new priorities in socio-cultural society development: socio-economic expediency angle-wise new pragmatic economic policy based on the principles of profitability, refund of investment and competitiveness should be hold.

Social policy new principles should be based on social guarantees and personal responsibility of each person. Kazakhstan democracy further development should be conducted by management decentralization and staged introduction of akims election (Akim is the head of akimat-regional administration, the Republican significance or the capital cities, regional districts and rural districts of the area), a representative of the President and the Government of the Republic) formation of Kazakhstan new patriotism should become the fundamental basis of multi-ethnic and polyconfessional society success.

In Japan, South Korea, Taiwan long transitional periods, when the pluralistic elements of local cultural traditions developed and became strengthened under cultural and political influence of European liberalism, took precedence of democratic regimes establishment. At the beginning socio-political transformation of Southeast Asian countries strictly followed the recipes of "modernization by the West". However, attempts to replace communal collectivism and solidarity by autonomous subject individualism inculcating Western standards and life values in the framework of Eastern culture failed. The foundation of these "failures" was radical differences between Eastern and Western mentality, freedom ideas, human rights, work ethics, society moral basis. Thus, Western work ethics based on Protestantism dogmas, Eastern-on the Confucian (traditional and family) values. In these countries the specifics of social, economic, political transformation were greatly influenced by traditionalist cultural type that absorbed the new trends, while remaining faithful to its basic settings. Southeastern Asian democracy model is characterized by borrowing Western technology and rejection of Western standards and life values. This experience shows that in the process of socio-political transformation tradition and innovation elements can be successfully combined (Karel'ova and Chugrov, 2009). Now such processes take place also in the West. Western society social evolution increasingly relies on moral values-from the traditional (in Western interpretation) to socialistic.

Despite a number of things in common, in many aspects democratic transition in the framework of Kazakhstan socio-cultural development differs not only from "classic" Southern European and Latin America transitions from authoritarianism to democracy but also from similar processes in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, South-East Asia. So, being born during Kazakh post-communist transformation new socio-cultural reality carried complex fusion of partially overcome and partially converted traditions of the past. For us, the reliance on traditional values is a necessary condition for the preservation and development of socio-political stability, strengthening the secular organization of social life in the conditions of increasing religion politization.

We shouldn't forget that in world history in the course of socio-political transformations socialism and liberalism ideas get more spread, new democratic and totalitarian doctrines based on abstractly interpreted freedom, rights and justice principles, occur. Over time, socialist ideas (as however, any other "ist") degenerate into totalitarianism and Caesarism and liberal democracy ideas degenerate into goal-seeking policy of Western

values imposition to world community as universal values, detraction of non-Western civilizations national cultures self-worth (Fukuyama, 2004). Consequently, there isn't and can't be in principle "ideal", suitable for development different-staged communities single democracy model. To the society democratization each country goes its own way.

For the successful Kazakh society socio-cultural transformation it was important to save the uniqueness and self-sufficiency of ethnic national cultures, national unity, create political parties coalition and to support civil organizations and social movement.

In the current wave of democratization vector and character of Kazakhstan socio-political transformation are aimed at sustainable development in the conditions of highly modernized countries global dictation. Kazakhstan further democratization is focused on the creation of an effective state, civil society, democratic living principles formation based on the revival of the best traditions and values of the past spiritual national culture, strengthening of opposition to political extremism on national and religious grounds. And it doesn't contradict the whole previous history of Kazakh civilization formation.

## **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**The search of national identity:** Modern global challenges actualized the problem of national identity (Huntington, 2004). Kazakh society, that entered the path of capitalist development and democratization, in the conditions of widespread economic decline, social tension, interests polarization, the old value system collapse, faced with a problem of self-identification of each member and state as a whole, further actions algorithm selection.

Under the identity is commonly understood a kind of stable community of individual, socio-cultural, national and civilizational parameters allowing to answer the questions "Who I am" and "Who We are". But, here researchers views don't always coincide in detail. Russian scientist Lysak says that "the problem of identity in globalization era involves, above the all, personal identity that is formation of stable beliefs about person themselves as a society member and cultural identity that can cause a sense of self-identity allowing to determine national place in the transnational space" (Lysak, 2010). More or less received in socio-cultural development past decade the answers to the eternal questions "Who is to blame?" and "What should we do?", Kazakh public consciousness focused on the questions "who I am" and "who We are". The answers to them should be given by each person individually and society as a whole. But at

the same time, this problem requires a proper scientific and theoretical study and adequate choice of modernization process methodology (Lapin, 2015). The theoretical and methodological issues are puzzled out with the reliance on our own and world historical experience. It would be a mistake not to use the prior experience of the leading countries and at the same time it's impossible to come off own roots as the temptation is great to go the traditional path and get "reg" response, putting at the forefront the national idea, adapted to the new realities and they as is known are always transient.

Justifying the actual national problem, Kazakh scientists and policy practitioners appealed to the market economy transition experience of different regions Southern Europe, Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe. Initially they mostly held radical political transformations, effective democracy institutes were created. Then-social reforms with the purpose of ensuring effective economic redistribution, creating mass social base of socio-political society transformation. At the final stage, deep structural economy transformations were held, i.e., the modern social market formed.

In other words, modernization began with a consistent political democratization, then effective democratic institutes were built and fixed and only after that economic transformations started, so-called "economic society" was created. At this stage initially the social guarantees system and intermediary institutes between the state and market were formed and then painful economic reforms were conducted. Consistent political democratization in the transitional society helped the painless economic modernization realization. But we shouldn't forget that in cultural and value framework in most transitional societies of "the third wave" democratization was held not by mass introduction of democratic values but the presence of some basic elements of democratic values: the Constitution adoption, expression of economic and political interests through the mechanism of representative and direct democracy, etc. In this scenario, hasty election introduction without the preliminary work on political and economic liberalization would be not only useless but also dangerous.

These countries experience has shown that by socio-cultural development in market conditions a very fine line between nationwide and national ideas exist, passing which the people risk to slide into the abyss of nationalism-the phenomenon more destructive than constructive. For such a multiethnic country as Kazakhstan the development of "Kazakh" national idea and its active embodiment on which some extremely patriotic Kazakhs insist, could turn into tension increasing and destructive processes in already unstable transitional society.

National ideas and problems are as old as the world. And the fact that modern researches at the new level continue this tradition, putting forward the idea of integrative ideology as opposed to narrow national, underlines the continuity of their intentions to find in political country life objective directions that will help the unity of society caught at the joint of two cultures Western and Eastern. The idea of integration, traditions mutual respect, beliefs, cultures of multiethnic society is leading in the transitional period. It corresponds to the mentality of post-Soviet republic people and organically complements the system of democratic values without detracting of national identity.

From a historical point of view democratization of social relations is a natural phenomenon for all nations since the days of early state construction. As any other process, it involves certain risks but also self-regulation mechanisms. In our time, the most effective organization of political life is one with observed consensus of social activity all subjects interests. With the democratization of public life spheres in Kazakhstan and Eurasian economic space the convergence of two global value systems-European and Oriental-comes. And, it is perhaps the most important, although not yet fully manifested, democracy purpose.

At this society becoming stage national thinking is accompanied with continental, integrational-combining one. And it corresponds to multi-cultural, polyethnic mentality of Eurasian subcontinent citizens. During the integration the limitations of purely national consciousness which is specific for the periods of the struggle for the national independence is overcome. The aspiration for revival of original culture and self-identity is natural for Eurasian peoples. Over the past two centuries Kazakhstan was greatly influenced by Russian and European cultures. But despite the different ways of life and confession, Russian and Kazakh are close in spirit to each other. They are united by special world perception, the universalism of thought, inner freedom and peace mission. But, it is vitally important for Eurasians to develop, understand and approve their own value system. This was being done by several generations of Eurasians.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

To find points of coincidence the differences are determined. In XX century famous German philosopher Schubart (2000) studying after N. Danilevsky, O. Spengler, N. Trubetskoy problems of Eurasianism, published his "Europe And The Soul Of The East". Considered the main stages of world history development, he came to

conclusion that Western modern man is a man of "Promethean culture"-atheistic and technocratic. He gradually "loses harmonious balance, cease to be a hero, doesn't seek austerity" (Schubart, 2000). Rising (Eurasian) culture combines the best features of previous eras. It tends to the superpeaceful existence. This is, in particular, by Schubart-Slavic culture and Eurasian in whole.

But what will happen to Europe and Asia in the future? According to German philosopher, there will be three important factors: geographical, religious and cultural. He formulates the law of two determinants defining human history as a whole: it is "constant land power and variable aeonic archetypes power", (i.e., first forms of thinking types) (Schubart, 2000).

Analyzing "aeonic archetypes", Schubart concludes that Anglo-Saxons, for example, tend to "insular thinking" they seek for success, benefits and production. Spiritually Englishman is liberal and trader by vocation. In dealing with others he is polite but his goal today is profit, tomorrow-the power, the day after tomorrow-the world domination.

In general the West tends to target thinking. Western man is methodical, dynamic, inclined to analytics. He can be a good specialist but he lives by the principle of war of all against all". His personal interests are in the highest flight, time is money for him. And so he bends to philistinism and atheism.

Eastern culture in general is different-it is eschatological as if raised above the commonness, so far as it focuses on time finitude. Eurasian, if we apply Schubart's methodology is universal, inner free and doesn't seek the world dominance. He seemed to be "playing with the world" and himself a part of this world. And so he is friendly, cheerful and complimentary. A whole cascade of emotions is common to him. He easily gets used to foreign culture and brings it under.

Eurasian universalism has gnoseological and geopolitical nature. Its gnoseological origins in super rational worldview and special sense of time. Time is not money for Eurasian, he has every moment "inscribed" into eternity. It is cosmic worldview (Karakozova and Khasanov, 2014). And, so Eurasian easily overcomes the limits-under any conditions of his existence he is at "home", in his place.

From the geopolitical standpoint (according to Schubart) any Eurasian is an Imperial. He thinks in terms of large spaces and continents (Schubart, 2000). It is native for him to aspire to free diversity sealed not by the force but common interests and complementary.

Intersected, narrow, separated Europe is brought under a different spirit of landscape, rather than Asia with

its vast of endless plains. Due to its conditions and forces Europe aims at a different human type, rather than the East.

There is a certain regularity that all great religions came from Asia and none from Europe. Only once in Europe the culture determined by religion appeared-in the Gothic era but it hit a resistance and criticism.

The problem of East and West is first of all a question of soul, Schubart notes. And, it is to merge Eastern and Western regions soul streams into each other for co creation.

We should pay tribute to German philosopher as far back as 50s of the last century, he predicted a conflict of two cultures. Today this dilemma speaks to mankind in a new, perhaps, final shape: as the contradiction between Russia and Europe. Schubart warned that “between Eastern and Western mood reconciliation is teething which should become a cultural destiny of future generations” (Schubart, 2000).

The Kazakhstan as a young transitional Eurasian state, appeared at the joint not of two but three cultures. Firstly, it is young polycultural and polyethnic society and according to this it can't be graded to “pure” Asian state; secondly, there are strong traditionalist moods supported by the dominant religious form Islam. This means the dominance of group patriotism, family, parents and seniors values in the public mind. In regards to the power motifs of emotional dependency, custody, the ban on the spread at her aggression prevail. Oriental ethics doesn't allow expression of any individual feelings that don't coincide with the adjusted norms. But, it is far from blind obedience to authority structures. Kazakh people are inner freedom as before their ancestors were.

Finally, thirdly, there is already a strong influence of Western values, in virtue of the close interpenetration of Kazakh, Russian and European cultures. Since, Ciocan Valikhanov and Abay times these trends have been living and finding more and more response in Kazakhs hearts. Susceptibility and independence along with complementary are determining feature of these people.

Since, XVII century holistic nature of Eurasian society culture was strongly modified and influenced by Western world. Taking into account a number of facts, the effect of which appeared in the last decades (growth of industrial production, the acquisition of independence, the introduction of private property, democratic institutions, etc.), this tendency becomes dominant. And this, as any other speeded up modification is fraught with destruction of interpersonal relations fixed system, the transformation of customs and behavior rules, sharp social stratifications, the emergence of new social groups (strata) and other social changes.

At the present stage of socio-cultural development Kazakhstan doesn't need a single, rigidly determined ideology and even state idea “deflated from above” by ideologists. But it needs, on the one hand, self-identity (in historical, cultural and economic terms) that is one of the fundamental prerequisites for the formation of a new state and on the other hand, accurately developed social strategy (what the purpose is, what we are building). And, of course, it needs economic strategy of crisis exit without which no ideology has a meaning.

The official response to these time challenges was given in President's messages. At the present stage formation of young democracy the primary task of scientists is historiosophical phased grounding of norms and values that can consolidate the society and development of methods for their implementation.

The process of social society structure changing is not yet completed. In place of the former microsocial relations the new haven't formed. Nothing gets yet final, completed character. All forces are absorbed by searching and developing new niches for economic and social survival. In such situation, forcing and lack of attention to ideological problems from social scientists are fraught with unpredictable consequences for the society already suffered from social experiments.

At the joint of eras, in critical moments the single multi-level idea, as a rule, inhales a program of action for the next decades to consolidate society, integrate its forces for “spurt across the abyss”. There are a lot of examples in world history. The most famous is American experience of gradual ideological society consolidation.

Busy with looking for a national formula for success, the Americans have put forward in the first half of the XIX century ideological concept which is attractive for every citizen. It was now known worldwide triad: “American exceptionalism-American Dream-The predestination of future achievements. “ But the successful development of a ideas set is not enough to bring them to life. The next step in the democratic modification was fixation of these ideas in legal papers, that is creation of legal framework in which they can be fulfilled. Only after that final upgrade was carried out by joint efforts-civil society and the state. The key to success here became adequately formulated, corresponding to the stage of society value development, consistency and focus on the program. Of course, any experience, taken in the “pure form”, will not replace our own. However, ignoring it is equal to extend our own way.

The success of socio-political Kazakh society transformation can help ensure careful preservation of the uniqueness and self-sufficiency of national cultures of ethnoses living in the country, the state support of

national unity, creation a coalition of political parties, support for civil organizations and society movements. Shortly, the unity of purpose and interests of civil society and the state.

The specifics of our society the transition to a market economy and democratic modifications consists in creation of conditions for the activity, individual autonomy based on national cultural traditions. The revival and development of spiritual culture can help the formation of new mentality, collective consciousness and archetypes thinking.

Recently, a request for a national identity is conditioned also by new social realities, independence and sovereignty becoming of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Awareness of self-identity should consolidate the people of Kazakhstan and help him to successfully overcome the new challenges of our time. They include: accelerating “compression”) of historical time; global demographic challenge; global threats to national identity and food security; an acute shortage of water; global energy challenge; reduction of natural resources; “Third industrial revolution”; global social instability; crisis of humanitarian values of European and Eurasian civilization; the threat of a new “redivision of the world”.

Awareness and overcoming of these modern problems are the most important task of our time. They can be successfully overcome by the people on the basis of such consolidating values as new Kazakh patriotism, equality of all citizens and the unity of the people (Kirabayev *et al.*, 2002).

“New Kazakh patriotism” is closed to “the good old patriotism” of any nation which has its own history. It is, first of all, the pride for country and its achievements; love for the Homeland, in which every citizen is guaranteed a high quality of life, safety, equal opportunities and prospects. In other words, it is vitally important values and priorities that are able to unite modern Kazakh society out of ethnic differences.

An important element in the socio-cultural development of society is the creation of equal rights and equal opportunities. For their implementation it needs peace and quiet in Kazakh land. Ancestors’ covenants require that Kazakhs must become the real masters of their land-hospitable, welcoming, generous, tolerant, assiduous and live in peace and harmony against any attempts of “ethnic division”. People need unity, harmony, tolerance and patience. These values establish the foundation of the national idea and encourages the search for a national, civic identity.

**Summary:** The process of sovereignty and independence of Kazakhstan is closely connected with the construction

of an open democratic society with a mixed economy; Institutionalization of democracy in Kazakhstan has opened the opportunity for free economic competition of business entities of different ownership forms.

During the years of sovereignty and independence of Kazakhstan there is an active process of formation of legal state and civil society; relying on the experience of social and cultural development of other countries, Kazakhstan holds society transformation in transitional period based on the principle of “First-the economy, then-politics”. Here, every step of the political reforms linked to the level of economic development, because the process of political liberalization in the country is strictly sequential; Civilizational landmark of Kazakhstan is a Eurasian path; our country has made a great contribution to the creation of the Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU); the basis for the development of society is the Strategy “Kazakhstan-2050” within the framework of the Global Forecast of Civilizations Development till 2050 the international community developed by the United Nations.

The national idea of all Kazakhstan home is a multi level home idea “Mangelek el” (Eternal country) which justifies economic, political and spiritual foundation of the country, guaranteeing its stability, tolerance, equality of all before the law. Thus creating conditions for the formation of civic identity of Kazakhstan.

## CONCLUSION

Successfully completed the transitional period, Kazakhstan is focused on the future. It is associated with the successful implementation of the “people’s reform” which should guarantee the prosperity for future generations in years to come. This is the way to the number of 30 competitive countries of the world.

Those reforms include democratic security-the rule of law; protection of the inalienable rights of citizens; guarantees of social freedoms, as well as the construction of a common future of the nation; transparent and accountable state.

These plans are described in the “Hundred concrete steps” in which it is talked primarily about the formation of civic identity and unity of Kazakh society. Thus, the specificity and nature of socio-cultural transformation of society are defined by the Development Strategy “Kazakhstan-2050”, the patriotic act “Mangelek El” (Eternal country), “Plan of the Nation”, “Hundred concrete steps for implementation of the 5 institutional reforms.” They compose the main anti-crisis strategy of Kazakhstan: growth, reforms and development.

### **AKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

This research is done with grant support by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

### **REFERENCES**

- Berlin, I., 2001. *Philosophy of Freedom*. New Literature Reviv, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 448.
- Dugin, A.G., 2004. *The Eurasian Mission of Nursultan Nazarbayev*. Eurasia Publisher, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 288.
- Fukuyama, F., 2004. *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. Publishing House ACT, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 730.
- Huntington, S., 2003. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. ROSSPEN Publisher, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 368.
- Huntington, S., 2004. *Who Are We? The Challenges to Americas National Identity*. Publishing House ACT, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 635.
- Karakozova, Z.K. and Khasanov, 2014. *Space of the Kazakh Culture*. Evero Publisher, Almaty, Kazakhstan, Pages: 104.
- Karelova, L.B. and S.V. Chugrov, 2009. *Globalization: Japanese Interpretation of Sociocultural Processes*. Problems of Philosophy Publisher, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 113.
- Kirabayev, N.S., A.V. Semushkin and S.A. Nizhnikov, 2002. *Eurasian Idea and the Present City*. Publishing House of PFUR, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 271.
- Lapin, N.I., 2015. *Actual Theoretical-Methodological Aspects of Russian Modernization Studies*. Science Publisher, Moscow, Russia.
- Lysak, I.V., 2010. *The Problem Of Preservation Of Cultural Identity in Conditions of Globalization, Humanitarian and Socio-Economic Science*. Science Publisher, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 95.
- Mises, L., 2001. *Liberalism In Classical Tradition: The Lane with English*. Economy Publisher, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 139.
- Petrova, V.F., 1990. *Democracy of the Post-Totalitarian World: History and Present*. Atamura Publisher, Almaty, Russia, Pages: 224.
- Savitsky, P.N., 1997. *Continent Eurasia*. Science Publisher, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 464.
- Schubart, V., 2000. *Europe and The Soul of the East. The Russian Idea*, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 443.
- Vidova, O., 2014. *Nursultan Nazarbayev: Portrait of the Person and Politician*. Science Publisher, Moscow, Russia, Pages: