

ABOUT SOME CHARACTERISTICS AND PROBLEMS OF SOCIO-CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT OF KAZAKHSTAN

Abstract

The author explores the characteristics and problems of socio-cultural development of Kazakhstan, linking the need for their successful solutions to the implementation of a whole range of vital modernization tasks. The main challenges of socio-cultural development of Kazakhstan author considers and examines the following issues: 1) the «dialogue» of cultures as an effective instrument of nation-building, and 2) the type of rationality, common ground in the cultures of the major culture-forming ethnic groups in Kazakhstan, and 3) the problems of consolidation and the new identity in Kazakhstan, and 4) a new system of core values and a new understanding of the phenomenon of spirituality.

Keywords: social and cultural development, «dialogue» of cultures, polyphony of cultures, a type of rationality, ethnic identity, ethno-social organization, universalist research strategy, consolidation, new identity, spirituality.

Introduction

One of the major challenges arising from the current state of global mega society is the most important task of survival of public entities, individuals and ethnic groups living in them. This task is doubly relevant for countries such as Kazakhstan, still in the process of state building, nation-building. Our state had and has to solve simultaneously in short periods of time, given the vast number of different factors the plenty of the tasks which had been solved by most developed countries, with far greater amount of time the history had left. Today, however, the compression of time and space (globalization) seals and accelerates series of events, which also complicates the problem of state building. a «new world order» emerging in front of us, is complicating these challenges and no matter what the project will be implemented in the framework of this «order» – neo-conservative project of the «American Empire» and Obama's multilateralism project, assuming a uniform distribution of power between the U.S. and their allies, together with the project of «deepening democracy». In any case, as rightly noted by Russian political activist A. Dugin, «The U.S. and the West led to a gradual thing desovereignization of existing political units, and it is an axiom of the first Global Transition» [1].

As for the issues, problems of state building, here the complicated situation is being formed as anxiously noted by many researchers. In the first place is noted, the fact that «the resource potential of the state is being reduced, but not so the challenges facing the state» [2]. Moreover, the survival of the state, which, in the apt words of Berdyaev, exists not to make life a paradise, but more not to turn life into hell, depends on how well internally consolidated its citizens and controlled and optimized its political and social organization. Therefore, in terms of world trends development of the resource potential of states in the area of its main functions there are very important issues as: the problems of the «dialogue» of cultures, the study of rationality types, searches and, if possible, institutional forming of the identical, common grounds in the cultures of the largest ethnic groups of Kazakhstan – Kazakh and Russian, problems of consolidation and the formation of a new identity, the new basic values and spirituality.

Dialogue of Cultures in Kazakhstan as an effective tool of State building

In today's world, security of a state and its place in the international division of labor and the «new world order» depends on what the first, as far as internally consolidated its citizens, how well managed and optimized its political and social organization, which, incidentally, also depends on the internal consolidation. In such a situation, the degree of actualization imperative of mutual responsibility (particularly in the context of globalization) is very high. And as an effective instrument of state-building, the means of achieving of the national unity and national identity (as strategic goals of-State) culture serves. It is important to note that today the priority strategic area of cultural policy of majority countries the protection and promotion of national culture and heritage are declared. And, what is very important, «culture is seen as an effective tool of nation-building as a means to achieve such significant to strategic national interests of the goals as the national unity and national identity» [3]. Zbigniew Brzezinski, a former well-known representative of the American establishment, and now a prominent political scientist, in his latest works wrote that cultural excellence is underrated aspects of the US global power [4]. But this is the position of the U.S. superpower. In the situation of our multi-ethnic state, in our view, it is important to pay attention on the ethnic component of cultural problems, which can become a sore point that could destroy the country. That is why in poly-ethnic states, which include Kazakhstan «dialogue» cultures, is very important, identifying, updating and, if possible, the institutional consolidation of identical in cultures of ethnic groups whose members inhabit in one state. In Kazakhstan, the focus should be in the context of the above, especially the cultures of the two largest ethnic groups in our country – Kazakhs and Russians.

After the October Revolution, or, as they say now among some of Russia's liberal intelligentsia, after the October overturn some steps were taken to restore historical fairness, namely, the borders of Kazakhstan officially established in the Soviet Union. Later, as we know, our country has lived on USSR Constitution of 1936 and 1977 and the Constitution of 1937 (after conversion of the Kazakh Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic in 1936, into the Kazakh Soviet Republic), as well as the Constitution of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic in 1978. Although there were signs of statehood, but in fact they were formal, coincided with the attributes of the union state.

After the collapse of the Soviet Union, our country was in a rather unique historic situation where sometimes there is an acute (time trouble) need for legal consolidation of post-factum events. At the time, when in the West there is more pronounced trend (due to globalization) of formation of supranational structures, we in terms of the compression of space and time, in terms of active manifestation of trends of unification had solve problems of our own nation building. The events evolved sometimes very tight and fast. And the first governmental act was the «Declaration of State Sovereignty of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic» dated 25 October 1990. However, due to the renaming of the Kazakh SSR into the Republic of Kazakhstan 10 December 1991, it is called the «Declaration of State sovereignty of Kazakhstan». The active work of the project over the creation of the constitution started, which resulted in the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan in 1993. This tumultuous time was very interesting and lively written about in the Book of Sultan Sartaev and L. Nazarkulova «Formation of the Constitution of the RK» (2002) [5].

Generally, in the twentieth century, as we know, the geopolitical map of the world has changed dramatically: there are many new states, gained independence as a result of the national liberation struggle, the «velvet revolution», the collapse of some states into the parts and the like. A list of these new States twenty years ago has been expanded by our country by adopting the Declaration of Sovereignty. It is believed that since sovereignty (especially from a legal point of view) has found the real features, namely: the state form – presidential republic. New bodies of legislative, judicial and executive branches were formulated. However, the process of sovereignty gaining will find the actual content, including in the event that will be considered as features of the modern cultural development in general, and of the cultural development of Kazakhstan, and, accordingly, adjusted (or, if necessary, set up again) a paradigm of its own development, outlined the prospects of the cultural development of Kazakhstan. It is quite clear that the institution of the state is the means of confinement of and preservation not only the natural and physical resources to ensure the full life of the people. Institution of the state is a

means of preserving cultural identity, spiritual culture, i.e. the full cultural development, especially for people who have received the opportunity to build a separate state not long ago.

As for Kazakhstan, it, of course, has also been involved in the global process of cultural transition from the local to the integration level. But, of course, along with the general patterns observed in Kazakhstan, there are the features observed in the course of this process. The process itself began to appear in the 19th century and takes place in several stages and to this day. The first stage is associated with the development of new means of communication and is likely to start as any at all, it became difficult for the Kazakh culture, because the first time is such a massive contact of nomadic culture with Western culture through Russian culture. This is reflected, above all, in the Kazakh poetry in XIX century, which, as rightly noted by AuezhanKodar (poet, essayist, and philosopher), is called «zar-zaman» – poetry of mourning. «It was a real cry of the Kazakh people in this terrible changing world» [6].

The second stage deals with the Soviet Union, in which Kazakhstan was a member as a Union republic. This period is along with already known by negative and positive aspects. First, it is, of course, establishing of the borders of Kazakhstan, even in the Soviet Union. Incidentally, these borders are borders of a sovereign state of Kazakhstan. Second, (and, in our opinion, can not deny it), as far it is possible in a changing world objectively; policies aimed at supporting national cultures were carried out. In carrying out this policy in Kazakhstan there were heavily involved some of the best representatives of Russian culture (Brusilovsky, Yerzakovich, Zataevich etc.). On the other hand, Kazakhstan has been turned into a place of exile, not only individuals, but entire nations. It therefore particularly important is the problem of the relationship of cultures.

The same problem remains one of the most important and in the third, post-Soviet transition of Kazakhstan from the local to the level of integration in the overall development of modern culture. As Kazakhstan remains a multiethnic state in which coexist and interact cultures of a large number of different people. However, along with the well-founded fear for the loss of cultural identity of peoples, living in Kazakhstan (including the Kazakhs), there are positive aspects of cultural interaction of the peoples of Kazakhstan. As you know, in the history of mankind many of the most brilliant cultures arose at the largest possible number of the components (at first glance, even completely not compatible), with maximum openness and readiness of a borrowing. In this sense, emerging in Kazakhstan the institution of integration culture (including the culture of Kazakhs) was a culture of opportunities. And probably AuezhanKodar is right, defining Kazakh culture and philosophy as «growing», as a culture of opportunity [7].

Problems of cultural development in the post-Soviet countries (and, of course, in Kazakhstan) acquire a special character. If in Europe there are some supranational unions, the post-Soviet states, on the one hand, building a nation state model, and on the other – must adapt to globalization, which places high demands primarily to the level of development of the economy, science, education, and so on etc. However, it should be noted that in recent years in the post-Soviet space the integration trends also emerged.

As mentioned earlier, the current process of globalization everywhere cause: 1) on the one hand, the wave of nationalism, and 2) on the other hand, the role of the joint efforts of people (not necessarily the solution of some important tasks). Therefore, in our opinion, in the multi-ethnic states such as Kazakhstan, where the indigenous ethnic group is not the vast majority (in number) of the population the model of multiculturalism today criticized from all sides, but, in our opinion, has no alternative to the multi-ethnic communities and should be characterized primarily by polyphony of cultures of peoples, whose members live in the territory of modern Kazakhstan. Further, the polyphony is to be understood, I think, not only and not so much variety, but a «co-resonance», the dialogue of when each culture is «heard». This compares with a polyphonic sound so unique tool like an old Russian helmet harp, which may play an ancient bard Boyan. This tool has twenty-three strings, each of which individually sounds differently. However, the unique polyphonic sound is only when all the strings involved. The Kazakhs in ancient times also had musical instruments with a unique polyphonic sound, which is considered by many artists (music) and music critics, are virtually the same as the helmet harp [8]. Those are

kesle and zhetygen. And the name «harp» and «kesle» seems to also have a common origin. This is the question of the proximity of the elements of culture of the Russian and Kazakh peoples.

Returning to the polyphony of cultures, it should be noted that the joint beautiful «sound» of cultures is possible, in our opinion, only with the knowledge of a common fate, under which it is necessary to understand not only the past and present shared experience and a common goal – the welfare of every citizen regardless of their ethnic group.

Awareness of a common destiny should help a unifying idea, on the role of which were put forward ideas such as: 1) the idea of civil society, and 2) the Kazakh national idea, and 3) the idea of Eurasianism, and 4) the idea of «ecological restoration», etc. I think, at this stage, has the greatest potential for the idea of universal human values, due to the socio-cultural realities of modern Kazakhstan.

In today's world everyone refers himself to a particular type of culture, and it is of great importance, in the basis of every culture lies the cognitive attitudes. According to many modern scholars, each culture 'thinks' in its own way, it has «its mentality», which defines its identity, ultimately, its relation to other cultures. That is, each culture has a certain type of rationality. The concept of cultural-historical types by N.Y. Danilevsky [9].and the provisions of Spengler [10]. on the morphology of the culture at the time greatly sharpened problems of irreducibility of types of rationality underlying the different cultures. But trying to understand the culture as a distinct and not reducible to the other type of rationality lead to fatal difficulties of logical order [11]. If culture can not be reduced to one another, then grasp the rationality of another culture can only be by completely abandoning their own culture. This is a very complex issue to address which introduced the term «dialogue of cultures». For such a «dialogue» to take place in our country needs to explore common ground in the culture of the Kazakh and Russian ethnic groups. This, in turn, need to investigate types of rationality underlying these cultures. Type of rationality is determined by the cognitive relation to the world, that defines and shapes the basic cultural values, which are largely similar to those of the Kazakhs and Russians. It is worthwhile to consider these values in the context of Universalist research strategy, that is, to identify an identity in common. It should be noted that the term rationality is used in this study (as, indeed, in most of these studies) as a characteristic of intelligence and action of man, which is not the same as the «perfect» understanding of rationality. Relevance of the theme of rationality in this sense, and in the context of the characteristics of modern civilization development increases immeasurably. Subject of rationality problematizes all major areas covered by modern philosophical thinking. Relevance of the theme of rationality due to recognition of the need to return to it as an important cultural value, based on an understanding of the semantic links not only human actions and movements of the soul, but also the phenomena of nature, taken in their entirety, in their unity.

On a general basis in the major cultures of culture-forming ethnic groups in Kazakhstan

In the modern world, the individual «has» multiple «identities», among them one of the most important is ethnic identity as a form of social identity. The concept of ethnicity presupposes the existence of homogeneous, static and functional characteristics that distinguish this group from others that have different parameters of the same characteristics. Universally accepted definition of ethnicity does not exist, but is dominated by its definition as «ethno-social organism» (Y.V. Bromley) or as «biosocial organism» (L.N. Gumilev). In our view, it is more efficient to use the approach of Leo Gumilev, as there is no universally accepted definition of not only ethnic, but also the phenomenon of ethnicity. The approach of L.N. Gumilev in the context of the features of modern civilization development has an important role in maintaining the altruistic ethics of ethnic group, in which collective interests are placed above personal interests. By L.N. Gumilev, «altruists» defending ethnicity as a whole, «selfish» play it in the offspring [12]. Ethics, as you know, considering the ratio of things for granted, but must, as things are, in every age is changing. And in our country there is a change of behavioral imperatives in behavior towards individualism, which subsequently lead to the formation of a critical mass of «selfish», and thus to the destruction of an ethnic group.

To identify common grounds in the cultures of Russian and Kazakh ethnic groups we should, in our view, to consider the notion of «community» in the Russian and Kazakh ethno-social organization. Interestingly and detailed enough, the concept of «community» in Kazakh ethno-social organization was researched by historian J.O. Artykbaev in his work «The nomads of Eurasia (a kaleidoscope of centuries and millennia)» (2005) [13]. He rightly believes that the Eurasian nomadic community should be explored both the historical dynamics, and in its ethno-social parameters. History of ethno-social organization can not be visually analyzed because it is a community linked by ties of genealogy, economic, territorial, and political relations. For the analysis of ethno-social organization, by J.O. Artykbaev, it is necessary to contact a systems approach enabling adequately recreate the past. In this case, the specific events and phenomena studied in terms of reproduction of fixed connections (broadcast) to recreate the model of society. Nomadic society rests on a variety of forms of communication, which are expressed as the relationship and behavior of people, and in a series of hidden nodes of the integration character. The most important of these forms of communication, when considered in a broad sense, is ethnic, the core of which are generic and sub-ethnic relations, business, often understood as community, social, political, administrative, cultural. Many of our historians believe that the starts of a powerful union in the Kazakh ethno-social structure are the legends associated with the name of Alash – Khan. These legends simultaneously play the role of the national idea in this ethno-social organization.

The study of the concept of «community» is important in the study of ethno-social organizations like the Kazakhs and Russian, and especially to identify the common ground of cultures is the concept of «community». Such a concept was broadly introduced by scholarly researchers, economists at the beginning of XX century in the study of specific land use by Kazakhs. At that time, researchers have consistently stressed on a direct link, which took place between economic activity and gender. However, it is this relationship as a key to identify the community and its place in the ethno-social organization of the Kazakh and Russian, many researchers have questioned. The main argument in this case is as follows: in the Russian ethno-organizing community considered primarily as an economic unit, and in Kazakh – as ethnic.

In our opinion, in the context of Universalist research strategy most important is that the community in both organizations is the ethno-collective form of existence, which played a major role in the history of both ethnic groups. What is the culture of Kazakhstan today? It is represented, in our view, first of all, by the cultures of the two largest ethnic groups in our country – Kazakh and Russian. None of these cultures is dominant, since, on the one hand, there are attempts to institutionalize elements of Kazakh culture in the political system, but to secure the success of these elements is missing the real «base», as the Kazakh language at this stage is not wholly language employed for more than half of the population of Kazakhstan. On the other hand, the Russian language, with the real «base» (it is used by more than half of the population of Kazakhstan), while at the same time is not an official language.

Thus, the culture of the two largest ethnic groups in our country form a certain whole, the existence of which is due to the presence or absence of the above features by one hundred percent use (fixing) of their language. In this case, the dominant against them is the so-called Soviet culture, being displaced at the moment by Western culture.

The two largest ethnic groups in Kazakhstan – Kazakh and Russian – have their own, in our view, largely similar values. «Platonov O., enumerates the following specific to Russia and established long before the Baptism of Russia, civilizational values:

- 1) the prevalence of spiritual and moral foundations over the material, and
- 2) the collective forms of labor democracy (community, gang);
- 3) the focus on the reasonable sufficiency and self-restraint (not – greed);
- 4) the ideal of righteousness (moral) of labor;

5) the idea of the earth and of nature as God's gift to all living, and therefore, the denial of private property in the conditions of existence « [14].

If you look at the above values, we can see that almost all of them are the values of the Kazakh ethnic group. Say, in the oral folk art Kazakhs have many proverbs and sayings that highlight the importance of collective forms of existence. For example: «Zhayaudyngshangyshykhpas, zhalghyzyngunishykhpas» – «Dust is not visible on foot of a pedestrian, the voice of the lonely is not heard.» Or this: «Zhalghyzzhyripzholtapkhansha, koppenzhyripadas» – «It is better to get lost together with others than to find the way walking alone.» «Tozghankazdytoptanghankarghazheydi» – «Wandering goose is pecked by the flock of crows» [15]. In turn, the famous English scientist, professor at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London Geoffrey Hosking in his newly published book, «Russia and the Russians: History» notes that while «in the last 300 years, Russia is by far part of Europe ... some basic institutions – Asian. The same farming community and the habit of mutual responsibility» [16]. A prominent Russian ethnographer, historian L. Gumilev wrote that: «Of course, the relationship of Russian and Turkic peoples in the XIII – XVI centuries were not cloudless, but in the era of feudal fragmentation it was inevitable. Does less damage inflicted by intrastate strife among lords, such as hostility between Moscow and Tver, or strife of steppe tribes, for example, Nogais and Tatars of the Horde. However, it was a problem within a single system, a single culture, a single country. Yes, if it were otherwise, would Russian explorers with insignificant forces have been able to go through a huge Siberia and the Far East! « [17].

In general, in recent years, there are the book began published, which can be called complete investigation and which deliberately or unfocused based on extensive archival material reveals a common origin in the cultures and peoples of Turkic and Russian ethnos. That is to say, are the works of M. Aji [18] and A. Bushkova [19]. The first of these authors find Turkic roots in the culture and Russian descent. And the second finds the Russian roots of the Turks. In general, it is important in these works that there are identified the unifying moments. Therefore, such a book, in our opinion, is desirable to include in relevant educational programs.

Thus, the similarity of the civilizational values of the two main culture forming ethnic groups of Kazakhstan could be a good resource for sharing progressive movement, to build a common future.

All of the above leads to the conclusion that in Kazakhstan there is no so-called «cultural fault lines» (though I think no one doubts the ontological references this phenomenon). Here it should be noted that the potential of the cultural dialogue in Kazakhstan in conditions of incomplete transition period in the history of our country depends on a large degree of responsibility of the elites (especially political) as the vector of spiritual development, the formation and replication of the basic values of society.

Problems of consolidation and formation of new identity in Kazakhstan

In today's world, as we have noted earlier, the state still remains the main guarantor of social rights and social security for its citizens. But the challenges and demands of modern civilization development (man-singularity, post-human problems, «New World Order») may reduce the resource potential of the state in the field of its core functions. As is known, the scope of social rights and guarantees of social security is a huge potential for conflict. A reduction in capacity of the state in this area (due to the factors mentioned above) makes it even more vulnerable. Therefore it is the most important task of the survival of both the state and individuals who live in them. The existence and survival of the state and its place in the new «world order» and international division of labor depends highly on how the citizens internally consolidated, as optimized and controlled its social and political organization. This is particularly important for countries that are still in the process of building a new state, such as Kazakhstan.

Task of nation-building and consolidation of citizens of the Republic of Kazakhstan are complicated and depend, in our opinion, in the first instance, on the following facts and factors: 1) the ethnic, social and confessional heterogeneity of the population, and 2) the socio-economic wellbeing of the population, and 4) to obtain the independence of the de facto, that is not on the

rise of passionate energy, and 5) the role of elites as producers of basic values of society, and 6) the formation of new basic values. Let's examine in detail each of these factors. Kazakhstan is a multiethnic state, like many countries in the world. But if most of the major developed nations were formed on the basis, so to speak, of «cultural hegemony» of ethnic groups – «dominant», the state-forming ethnos in Kazakhstan at the time of gaining independence of our republic was not «recognized» such by a significant part of other nationalities. A natural consequence of the chosen model, imposition of Western standards and values and, above all, individualism, is the fragmentation of society into the most different in size, interests and life goals of the group. And individualism erodes both the Kazakh and Russian identity, one of the bases of which, in our opinion, is the collective forms of labor democracy. In addition to «basic», «traditional» religions in Kazakhstan, in our country there were a lot of representatives of the various religious movements, including those of a sectarian character, which also contributes to the fragmentation of society. And very often the interests of these movements in our country are protected by various international organizations as well as at the state level in the form of expression of concerns, advice (and sometimes direct pressure) in the context of human rights.

Socio – economic wellbeing of the population is also a very important factor in the consolidation and the problems of state-building. It is clear that the transition to a market economy contributed to the stratification of society, and the conditions of globalization intensified the situation of distinction between «subject» and «object» of globalization, both at the State level and at the level of individuals [20].

One of the determining factors of socio-economic well-being of the population is an ambiguous attitude to the question of the legitimacy of the distribution of wealth at the dawn of independence of Kazakhstan. This is the case for almost all the former Soviet republics. Thus, his opposition to the redistribution of wealth in Russia has repeatedly expressed by the Nobel Prize owner in Economics (2001), Joseph Stiglitz. He noted that, rather than to increase the pace of economic growth, they (the team of T. Gaidar) destroyed it, relying on even more fantastic than that of Karl Marx, concerning the nature of capitalism [21]. Jeffrey Sachs, who worked in the T. Gaidar's government as an economic adviser in the early 90's, described the policy of this government as a «malignant, willful, deliberate, well thought redistribution of wealth in favor of a small group of individuals».

In connection with the above, a very important role of the elites in the problems of state building and consolidation should be noted. It is primarily the responsibility of the elites, as in the formation of a «new world order» is a situation of increasing «temptation» of imitation of democratic institutions, the increasing trend of destruction of feedback, which is possible in the first place, with the real action of the two basic principles of democracy (in 19) – selectivity and accountability. In the situation described above, each person increases feelings of fear, concern for their future, and the opportunity to express their concerns, fears, and possibilities of their sublimation into concrete steps are reduced. Therefore, the responsibility of elites for the preservation and development of democratic institutions is increasing.

Another important factor affecting the problem of state-building and consolidation of society is the occurrence of the conditions for the formation of a new identity after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Identity should not be seen as a property of the inherent to the individual, and as a ratio, being generated in the process of social interaction. According to many researchers, the identity in the strict sense of the word can be attributed only to individuals because only individuals have the quality of subjectivity and, therefore, are able to refer or not to refer to themselves certain characteristics (values). It is believed that the identity of the groups allowed attributing only in a figurative sense. Thus, in the Soviet period was declared a new identity, new community – the Soviet people. And in political science from the mid 80's, it was generally accepted use of the terms «Islamic identity», «Christian Identity», «Western identity», «Eastern identity», «Eurasian identity», etc. to identify subjects of international relations as a competing «identities».

After the collapse of the Soviet Union the social relations of all the former Soviet republics have changed, that the condition for the formation of a new identity appeared instead of dominated the Soviet type of identity – the «Soviet people.» Kazakhstan has also changed the

system of social relations, which was anchored in Article № 7 in the new Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan, in which the Kazakh language admitted as a state language. In Kazakhstan, the process of forming a new identity has not taken place, but the options it as «Kazakhstani nation» or «the Kazakh nation» cause considerable controversy and debate, not only among researchers. Let's recall of the controversy between a journalist Duvanov S. and political analyst Zhunusov S. in the newspaper «Republic» in 2008 concerning the national idea [22]. Or publication of the same Duvanov on identity in which he offers the ethnonym «Kazakh» seen as civic identity. He writes: «The essence of the compromise (between the supporters of the ethnic and non-ethnic option of statehood – Comm. Mine – S.R.) is that all non-Kazakhs – citizens of Kazakhstan should become the Kazakhs, but the very notion of» Kazakh «is no longer ethnic and expresses his membership in the state. Everything is simple: we are all one nation – the Kazakhs. With each ethnically remains what he was» [23].

By the way, in the Russian media that option long ago (was) widespread use: they often called Kazakhs the citizens of our country with absolutely non-Kazakhs phenotypes and surnames. Russia, which is also a multi-ethnic state, as Russian scientist Vladimir Inozemtsev counts, «requires new approaches that combine the principle of the civil nation with the concept of group identity, reconciling various «specialness» and not giving them to become the basis for the approval of exclusivity» [24].

In the context of the problems of the formation of national identity and issues nationalism is considered. As noted by the Russian scientist Alexander Khazin, there are two forms of nationalism – civil (France) and ethnic (Israel, Germany).

In Kazakhstan, civic nationalism implies the recognition of the existence of «a nation of Kazakhstan», which, in the opinion of Khazin, actually is not. And there is the Kazakh nation and ethnic minorities who are citizens of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Accordingly, ethnic nationalism is recognition of the Kazakh nation. In this case, nationalism is seen as inevitable, an objective phenomenon, a product of post-industrial society. Not long ago, our president first used the term «Kazakhstan nation», which is, in our view, with the objectives of consolidation of Kazakhstani citizens in the need to address a number of important tasks of modernization. However, this led to a lively debate among scientists, journalists and ordinary people. Opponents of the term (and they are many) think that it (the term) erodes the Kazakh identity. But do not forget that a Kazakh identity in our conditions, and responsibilities should include representatives of the Kazakh people for all Kazakhs and representatives of other ethnic groups. And this is no easy task.

In Kazakhstan, however formed a new identity – as a «nation of Kazakhstan» and «Kazakh nation» (supporters and opponents believe that such identity is eroded «their own» ethnic identity), – it should include a greater responsibility for the welfare of the Kazakhs of each Kazakhstan citizen regardless of their ethnic and religious affiliation. But this process requires that the representatives of each ethnic group have to share the resource of «ethno-social well-being». Kazakhs have to understand that many of the other ethnic groups are also entitled to consider themselves indigenous to our state, and members of other ethnic groups need to understand and respect the fact that the Kazakhs have no other historical homeland

Our country became independent de facto that is not on the rise of the passionate energy of the population, although this situation may be a positive background for the solution of problems of state building. Therefore the task of improving the activity and creativity of people cooperation is very important. And here science can help and, above all, synergy that helps to scientifically substantiate the importance of civic engagement of each person, the importance of this activity in the formation of a general scenario of the future.

Well, of course, a very important basis for consolidation of the citizens of Kazakhstan and the entire population of the planet should be a new system of basic values, in our opinion, which should be based on a new ethic of responsibility and solidarity, which is based on a positive spiritual experience of mankind, provides for the liability of each person for the future of the Earth, which, in turn, requires a (human) activity, creativity and cooperation. In addition, and therefore, a new ethic of responsibility and solidarity should include a new understanding of

spirituality. Such spirituality – is not only and not so much the morality or intelligence, but also the awareness of its unity with the world and the formation on the basis of such understanding of behavioral strategies aimed at co-operation and care about the world. Such spirituality and its understanding becomes a practical necessity.

CONCLUSION

Thus, the problems of social and cultural development of our country – is, above all, the problems of intercultural dialogue, social and cultural consolidation. Dialogue of Cultures involves identifying, updating and, if possible, institutional establishment of identical things in cultures of ethnic groups whose members reside in one state. Social and cultural consolidation of the people of our country, the possibility of its implementation has two main structural aspects: social and national. First – caring about the person, that is, each person has to feel that the government on behalf of all the structures really care about him, it's a demanding job of every official in his place, the fight against corruption. In addition, every member of society must feel that he can really influence social processes through the electoral system, non-governmental organizations, and civil society organizations. That is really to act feedback principle, the system of human communities must be based on two basic principles of democracy (among 19) – selectivity and accountability. The second aspect of the socio-cultural consolidation – national – linked to the process of formation of the new identity in Kazakhstan, the conditions for the realization of which were formed after the collapse of the Soviet Union, Kazakhstan's independence and fixing of Kazakh as the state language in the article № 7 of the Constitution of Kazakhstan. Of course, the process of forming a new identity would require the representatives of ethnic groups living in Kazakhstan, sharing their resource of «ethno-social well-being». It is important to reach a consensus on what will be this «part», but it is clear that the concord is necessary.

Systematic, well-designed and scientifically sound solution of the problems of social and cultural development will help to successfully solve large complex of modernization tasks that are vital to our country.

REFERENCES

- 1 Dugin A. At the dawn of the Global Crossing // News (The opinions and the commentary) on March 16, 2011 – p.6.
- 2 Lutsenko K. Who will win? The nation-state in the era of globalization. // Free Thought. – 2006. – № 3. – P.192-199.
- 3 Kuznetsova Z. How to protect national culture // Free Thought. – № 1/2 (1563). – 2006. – P.14-27
- 4 Brzezinski Z. Choice. World Domination or Global Leadership / transl. from English. – Moscow: International Relations, 2006. – P. 288.
- 5 Sartayev S.S., Nazarkulova L.T. Formation of the Constitution of the Republic of Kazakhstan: problems and prospects. – Almaty: Out of KIPMO, 2002. – 408 p.
- 6 Tankayeva G., This groan we call a song. (Interview with AuezhanKodar) // Time, № 11 (44), March 16, 2000 – p.6.
7. Ibid.
- 8 Dotsuk E., Guslyarskaya ballad // News, August 24, 2001 – p.9.

9 Danilevsky N. Ya.

10 Spengler O., Decline of the West: Essays on the morphology of world history. – M.: Thought, 1993.

11 Shulgin N. Culture and rationality. Interview with A. Smirnov // Problems of Philosophy. – № 1, 2007. – P.16-25.

12 Gumilev L.N. Ethnogenesis and the Biosphere. – Moscow: AST: – AST, 2006. – P. 512.

13 Artykbaev J. The nomads of Eurasia (a kaleidoscope of centuries and the Millennium). – St.: Major, 2005. – 320 p.

14 Cit. by Zadde I.N. Some of the problems of education and culture in the context of the global evolution of civilizations // New technologies in science and education. – Novosibirsk: Publishing House NGPU, 1998. – Vol.3. – P.131.

15 Adambaev B. Kazakh folk oratory. – Almaty: «Ana tili», 1997. – P.31

16 Geoffrey Hosking, «I am a Russian nationalist» (Interview). // Izvestia, August 1, 2001 – p.8.

17 Gumilev L.N. In search of an imaginary kingdom. – St. Petersburg: Abris, 1994. – P. 352-353.

18 Aji M. Turks and the world: the hidden history / MuradAdji. – Moscow: AST: AST Moscow, 2008. – 649 p.; M. Aji No Eternal Blue Sky. Sketches of our history / MuradAdji. – Moscow: AST: AST, 2010. – 576 p.

19 Bushkov A. Russia, which was not. Puzzles version hypothesis. – Moscow: Olma-Press, Red Proletarian, 2005. – 599 p.

20 See p. 2.

21 Stiglitz J., Globalization: disturbing trends / Per. from English. and comment. GG Pirogov. – Moscow: The idea: The National Science Foundation public, 2003. – 300 p.

22 ZhunusovDuvanov C. Response: National idea – need or whim? // The Republic, May 16, 2008. – P.7.

23 Duvanov C. Can I win without a flag? // The Republic, February 4, 2011. – P. 7-8.

24 Inozemtsev V. Imper on inter // News, May 5, 2011. – P. 6.

ЛИТЕРАТУРА

1 Дугин А. На пороге Глобального Перехода // Известия (Мнения и комментарии) от 16 марта 2011 г. – с.6.

2 Луценко К. Кто победит? Национальное государство в эпоху глобализации. // Свободная мысль. – 2006. – №3. – с.192-199.

3 Кузнецова З. Как защитить национальную культуру // Свободная мысль. – №1/2 (1563). – 2006. – с.14-27

4 Бжежинский З. Выбор. Мировое господство или глобальное лидерство / Пер. с англ. – М.: Международные отношения, 2006. – 288 с.

- 5 Сартаев С.С., Назаркулова Л.Т. Становление Конституции Республики Казахстан: проблемы и перспективы. – Алматы: Из-во КИПМО, 2002. – 408 с.
- 6 Танкаева Г. Этот стон у нас песней зовется. (Интервью с Ауэзханом Кодаром) // Время, №11 (44), 16 марта 2000 г. – с.6.
- 7 Там же.
- 8 Доцук Е.. Гуслерская баллада // Известия, 24 августа 2001 г. – с.9.
- 9 Данилевский Н.Я
- 10 Шпенглер О. Закат Европы: очерки морфологии мировой истории. – М.: Мысль, 1993. –
- 11 Шульгин Н.Н. Культура и рациональность. Интервью с А.В. Смирновым // Вопросы философии. – №1, 2007. – с.16-25.
- 12 Гумилев Л.Н. Этногенез и биосфера земли. – М.: АСТ: – Астрель, 2006. – 512 с.
- 13 Артыкбаев Ж.О. Кочевники Евразии (в калейдоскопе веков и тысячелетий). – СПб.: Мажор, 2005. – 320 с.
- 14 Цит. по Задде И.Н. Некоторые проблемы образования и культуры в контексте глобальной эволюции цивилизаций // Новые технологии в науке и образовании. – Новосибирск: Изд-во НГПУ, 1998. – Т.3. – с.131.
- 15 Адамбаев Б. Казахское народное ораторское искусство. – Алматы: «Анатілі», 1997. – с.31
- 16 Джефффри Хоскинг: «Я русский националист» (Интервью). // Известия, 1 августа 2001 г. – с.8.
- 17 Гумилев Л.Н. В поисках вымышленного царства. – Санкт-Петербург: Абрис, 1994. – с. 352-353.
- 18 Аджи М. Тюрки и мир: сокровенная история / МурадАджи. – М.: АСТ: АСТ МОСКВА, 2008. – 649 с.; Аджи М. Без Вечного Синего Неба. Очерки нашей истории / МурадАджи. – М.: Астрель: АСТ, 2010. – 576 с.
- 19 Бушков А. Россия, которой не было. Загадки, версии, гипотезы. – М.: ОЛМА-ПРЕСС; ОАО ПФ Красный пролетарий, 2005. – 599 с.
- 20 См. пункт 2.
- 21 Стиглиц Дж. Глобализация: тревожные тенденции / Пер. с англ. и примеч. Г.Г. Пирогова. – М.: Мысль: Национальный общественно-научный фонд, 2003. – 300 с.
- 22 Жунусов С. Ответ Дуванову: нацидея – необходимость или блажь? // Республика, 16 мая 2008. – с.7.
- 23 Дуванов С. Можно ли победить без флага? // Республика, 4 февраля 2011. – с. 7-8.
- 24 Иноземцев В. Импер на интер. // Известия, 5 мая 2011. – с. 6.

Резюме

Сартаева Р.С. О некоторых особенностях и проблемах социо-культурного развития Казахстана

В статье автор исследует особенности и проблемы социокультурного развития Казахстана, связывая необходимость их успешного решения с реализацией целого комплекса жизненно необходимых модернизационных задач. В качестве основных проблем социокультурного развития Казахстана автор рассматривает и исследует следующие проблемы: 1) «диалог» культур как действенный инструмент государственного строительства; 2) тип рациональности, общие основания в культурах главных культуuroбразующих этносов в Казахстане; 3) проблемы консолидации и формирования новой идентичности в Казахстане; 4) новую систему базовых ценностей и новое понимание феномена духовности.

Резюме

Сартаева Р.С. Қазақстанның әлеуметтік-мәдени дамуының кейбір мәселелері мен өзгешеліктері туралы

Мақалада автор Қазақстанның әлеуметтік-мәдени дамуының ерекшеліктері мен мәселелерін зерделеп, оны шешудің тиімді жолдарын мейлінше маңызды модернизациялық міндеттердің тұтастай кешенін жүзеге асыру қажеттілігімен байланыстырады. Қазақстанның әлеуметтік-мәдени дамуының негізгі мәселелері автор келесі мәселелерді қарастырып, зерттейді: 1) мемлекеттік құрылыстың әрекетшіл құралы ретіндегі мәдениеттер «сұхбаты»; 2) Қазақстандағы басты мәдениет құраушы этностардың мәдениеттеріндегі жалпы негіздер мен рационалдылық типі; 3) Қазақстанда жаңа бірегейлік қалыптастыру мен шоғырлану мәселелері; 4) іргелі құндылықтардың жаңа жүйесі мен руханилық феноменінің жаңа түсінігі