

The Study of Democracy Phenomenon of Modernity

M.Sh. Hassanov, V.F. Petrova, G.G. Nuryшева, A.S. Syrgakbayeva Syrgykbayeva,
D.M.Azhusubalieva, B.A. Dzhaambaeva and D.R. Shaidulina
Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Al-Farabi Avenue 71, Almaty, The Republic of Kazakhstan

Abstract: The research describes different types of ancient democracy through the prism of freedom, equality and justice concepts. Emergence and development of liberal and social democracy, civil society, representative democracy, executive, legislative and judicial government main components in Modern history are shown. The article also depicts social relations diversity and substance, adherence to group, hierarchical norms and values, specialty of civil society development, the national idea postulates, integrative ideology influence on democracy phenomenon in modern conditions.

Key words: Democracy types, civil society, liberal democracy, national idea, integrative ideology

INTRODUCTION

The process of expansion and consolidation of democratic regimes becomes leading trend of world development and in fact, embraces the all regions of the world. However, democracy expansion and its perspectives of worldwide approval have individual peculiarities in different quarters of the globe.

Democracy phenomenon main aspects are studied extensively in national and foreign literature. However, philosophical and political aspect remains scantily explored and needs elaboration.

Extended analysis of the nature and criticism of the command-administrative totalitarianism system are in the works of Aron, Lipset, Lijphart, Ilyin, Brzezinski, Hayek, Popper, Zakaria, Bizhanov, Nysanbayev, Tasmagambetov and others. Their studies reveal central failures and historical limination of the Soviet model of socialism, basic features of totalitarian government system, democratical classic and modern types pros and cons.

Analysis of democracy emergence in the modern world is actively discussed in the works of K. Hajiyev, T. Alekseeva, V. Fedotova, A. Melville, I. KIAMKIN, I. Pantin, R. Sakwa, O. Kharitina, A. Nikitchenko, A. Kara-Murza, A. Lijphart, J. Shapira, D. Rastow, E. Toffler, F. Fukuyama, S. Huntington, I. Berlin and others.

Scientific literature also actively discusses the issue of social consensus ideological foundations in conditions of democratic transformations in the post-Soviet republics. The works of A. Balgimbayev, B. Kapustin, D. Kshibekov, G. Vodolazov, I. Pantin, M. Gorshkov, Yu. Krasin, S. Seidumanov, A. Ishmuhamedov and others show how by means of ideology connection between

worldview and behavior establishes and social changes meaning reveals. Ideology as a specific form of public life rationalization allows to find a base for human activity (Petrova and Hassanov, 2016). At the same time, a deep study of democracy in modern conditions suggests its historical reconstruction.

History of democracy: The establishment of democratic government in Athens “the mother of democracy” was promoted by legislative reform (Solon, Cleisthenes, Pericles), high cultural level and a number of socio-economic factors. Particularly, trade development determined economic rise of the Athenian state and this in turn affected the structure of the population. Political weight of so-called “middle class” merchants and artisans interested in legal protection of their interests increased. They were given a possibility to determine the fate of the state, its home and foreign policies. Democratic foundations and collegial management replaced the government of aristocracy. The People's Assembly went by freedom of speech principle, equality of all before the law and encumbering of posts. It based political rights of citizens.

Ancient democracy form was far from perfect, quite controversial and not truly the “power of the people”. An important element of the first democracy form was little power and authority of Athenian elected officials. Underdeveloped legal platform, unclear division and often the legislative and executive government branches mixture led to the situation any law could be rejected at the People's Assembly by persuading art of demagogues on personal or group behalf.

Aristotle not without reason had negative attitude to the democratic form of government with its imperfections:

he repeatedly noted its persistence and ability to hold social cataclysms and external threat. He identified five democracy types. According to Aristotle, freedom and equality, the most important features of democracy, did not receive their proper development and were limited by citizen participation in governance. The thinker sure of rule of law necessity in state structure does not correlate these interconnected and interdependent facts but merely points their importance in public life.

Plato as slave society ideologist gave sharply negative assessment, not devoid of kernel, to the democratic government form. He points the danger of principle of majority coercion by the minority realization and defends the position according to which a person must be a citizen, guided by moral principles and, therefore, correlate his own interests with the interests of the majority.

The principles of democracy of classic liberalism: During the formation of the capitalist economic system the concepts of “jural state” and “rule of law” were developed, without them modern democracy is inconceivable. A new type of politics characterized by Hobbes as a “struggle of all against all” by which the state establishes a leading role in the field of public relations, forms. City power establishes through the voluntary expropriation of citizens rights and material values in favor of a central agency which influence is based on election and accountability.

Theoretical foundations of modern constitutional democracy were being laid in Modern history. The theory of democracy in Modern history was developed by enlighteners of Europe and the New World, J.J. Rousseau, J. Locke, Ch. Montesquieu, D. Hume, I. Kant, B. Franklin. The ideas of total equality and participation in political decision-making were being grounded. The theory of natural law developed by J.-J. Rousseau and J. Locke contributed to democratic institutions development, problem of power legitimacy formulation, separation of legislative, executive and judicial branches of government.

In Modern history the groundings of democracy theory basic categories “freedom”, “equality”, “brotherhood”, “civil society” were given. However, they are interpreted rather abstract and reviewed under the doctrine of the “common good” and the “general will.” In this way Hobbes’ idea that freedom and necessity are compatible and presuppose each other did not receive deep theoretical justification in Modern history: the thinker narrowly interpreted freedom as an absence of external obstacles. According to Hobbes, conditions for achieving this kind of “freedom” involve the presence of

the state, law and the social contract (the general will). Montesquieu, explaining the need of separation of the three branches of the government as a guarantor of freedom, is also guided by the abstract notion of “the common good”.

Generally, the idea of democracy essence at the beginning and the middle of Modern history was far from the real political processes. According to ancient tradition democracy was interpreted only as the mass participation of citizens in public decision-making. Such a narrow understanding of democracy was, apparently, caused by long time requirement of development, practical experience accumulation and need of new realities detailed understanding.

In XVII-XVIII centuries the main concepts of this government form were developed and embedded. According to Hobbes, the main democracy principles were focused on the equality of people in respect of their natural rights, justification of rights and personal autonomy, separation of three government branches. Liberal democracy model protects social rights of citizens, not encouraging political activity of an individual.

Rousseau’s collectivist democracy model is based on the concept of the social contract. It protects primarily the interests of society as a whole by delegating fundamental citizens’ rights to the state for their protection. The government is given executive authority and the legislature remains people’s and performs by a referendum.

The problem of individual freedom is decided by liberals. Liberalism is inextricably linked with the democratic movement of Modern history. Liberalization, as a rule, goes before political democratization. Liberalism revises and expands human and civil rights, develops rules protecting individuals and social groups from arbitrary and unlawful state actions. Democratization also means becoming, inclusion of democratic institutions into the political process and practical application of democratic rules and procedures.

Beyond a doubt, the opposition of two lines democratic and liberal in Modern history contributed to the theoretical justification of the classical democracy theory, party movement registration which the basis of representative democracy, filled democratic ideals, values, principles and methods with new content. And eventually it paved the way for the merger of democratic construction theory and practice.

However, discussing the problem of freedom, liberals of XIX century, as well as enlighteners of XVIII century, meant abstract “citizen”, abstract positive order of government. The “Founding Fathers” of American democracy were able to overcome this approach.

American important contribution to theory and practice of Modern history is development of checks and balances system guaranteeing dispersal and decentralization of political power. As a generalizing term, checks and balances has two meanings - federalism and separation of powers. Federalism in contrast to the centralized government system allows citizens to participate in governance much widely.

Liberal and democratic ideas and humanistic ideals of Modern history form and develop along with Western capitalism. During the formation of heterogeneous capitalist economy with diverse ownership forms civilized forms of communal life are shaping in society. The particular individual becomes a subject of historical development. A civil society arises. Economic freedom, social justice and protection become possible. Equal society members, recognizing their interests, gradually learn to correlate personal interests with the interests of society and the state (Hassanov *et al.*, 2016).

Thus, in Modern history the foundations of a political system with rule of law, formation of lawful state, human rights realization in accordance with international recognized standards were laid. In Modern history in the center of democratic problems there was an issue of public will and democratic good that was neither theoretically nor practically solved. But in the same period preconditions for its decision were created, as well as tasks and base of modern democracy. However, the proclamation of total equality, freedom, humanistic and liberal-democratic ideals was mostly formal, not everywhere it was conferred institutionally and did not mean actual implementation. The percentage of people involved in politics remained so little that free government of this period could not be anything else but an oligarchy in democracy.

Kazakhstan democratization stages: At the end of XIX-early XXth centuries on Kazakh land, as it usually happens in the world history in changing eras, cohort of active, educated, purposeful people who were able to understand the changes taking place and intended to bring the maximum benefit to their nation, appeared. They were representatives of Kazakh progressive intelligentsia of commoners. They woke up the people under the slogan "Wake up, Kazakh", reminding them about the origins of their native culture, nationality, civil self-identity (Hassanov *et al.*, 2015).

Activity of Alash National Democratic Party that put forward the program of bourgeois liberal-democratic reforms in Kazakhstan on the eve of the October Revolution proves it. The program was quite progressive and ahead of that time. Its accents were placed quite

maturely: private property introduction, including ownership of land; presidential form of government and general electoral law, system of checks and separation of powers. In conditions of Soviet government, distant from democracy, it could not be realized. The bourgeois-democratic reforms were not realized by Alash Orda members for some objective reasons but implemented after achieving independence and sovereignty.

In Kazakhstan transition from steppe democracy to modern one has its specific features. It came gradually, as the priority tasks advanced. At the first stage two constitutions and new electoral system were adopted in the republic. It was a transformation of political system under direct government control with a predominance of authoritarianism elements. It reduced the level of young parliamentary democracy but contributed to political and social stability in the country. This circumstance, as well as historical and colonial heritage (excessive power centralization, lack of development of political institutions, public associations and interest groups, etc.) hampered the formation of mature democracy form in Kazakhstan. World practice shows that new democracies, as a rule, are initially mixed mode with elements of the previous system, authoritarianism and democracy. Kazakhstan is not an exception.

Transition to the second stage of democratization became possible only after a set of small liberal reforms in political and economic spheres which were not always consistent and had halfway nature. Nevertheless, they contributed to the gradual eradication of authoritarianism elements; reducing the role of the state and increasing the importance of public organizations, establishment of civil society.

The third stage of democratization involves regular elections holding, opposition existence, recognition and activation of public associations and political parties, power decentralization, separation of powers, strengthening the role of Parliament, institutionalization of democracy, building jural state, ownership forms pluralism, including ownership of land, division of power and capital, spreading of powers of authority to the local level. That is, not only vertical but also horizontal democracy.

The third stage began in December 1997, when N.A. Nazarbayev defined a new governance strategy transition from the rigid centralization to decentralization of powers, transferring them to the regions. Evolution of the political system is still initiated "from above", so far as appropriate socio-economic conditions had not matured by that reform stage. A distinctive feature of the socio-economic transformation is the fact that the most important republic achievement for independence period and, perhaps, its

main strategic advantage in that period was the high educational level of citizens, intellectual wealth of the country. It will allow the nation to be competitive in the XXI century in the professional field.

During democratization of all spheres of public life in the living space of CIS, EAEU, the Republic of Kazakhstan in particular, there is a convergence of two world values systems ??- European and Oriental. And this is, perhaps, the most important, although not fully declared yet, purpose of Democracy. National separating thinking at the present stage of society development is being replaced by a continental, integration one - uniting which is most adequate to correspond multicultural, multiethnic Kazakhstan mentality. Through this syncretism, disinsertions of pure national consciousness specific for the period of the struggle for national identity are being overcome. Although such bridging will be possible after completion of national and cultural identity awareness of the people of Kazakhstan.

Further democratization of Kazakhstan contributes to the improvement of education quality, scientific and technological progress, finding its niche in the international labor division. It is also a way of people's economic welfare raising, conservation and enhancement of their own standards and values ??of life, social and political stability, fair and righteous control by the authorities. As these issues of society are decided it is possible to transit from formal democratic procedures to democracy as a way of life. It involves creating of necessary economic, political, social, cultural and value preconditions. These preconditions should determine direction and stability of socio-political system of Kazakh society. Within its framework a new integrative state-national ideology should be created, a new worldview should be formed, outdated Soviet traditions should be gradually overcome and understanding of necessary tough resistance to political extremism ethnically or religiously based. Democratization recess should lead to property stratification decrease and population activity increase, social mobility of nation, market adaptation and national and civil identity approval (Hassanov *et al.*, 2016).

Modern democracy models: Present democracy models list is growing rapidly. Each model has its advantages and disadvantages. However, a general problem is that none of these modern government forms is not able to solve urgent problems-growth of terrorism and crime, widespread corruption, law violation, external and internal threats- in conditions of accelerated transformation and public life upgrading.

It gives masses rise to doubt about social myth that democracy is the ideal, best government form which fully

protects interests of the masses. In the XXI century there are "three waves of democracy" of European socio-historical space (Huntington) (Huntington, 2003). There are some fears that return to authoritarian (so-called enlightened) government form in vast territory is possible by force of mentioned circumstances even in "fourth wave" of democracy time. As most researchers suggest, it is quite realistic and natural. This mechanism should primarily come out in states with exacerbation of internal and external threats to regime.

The idea is not new but as old as democracy itself. No, in principle, there can be no single ideal form of government. Any one of them and democracy is not an exception just executes a social order to some extent. It "satisfies" society until turning into a brake of social development. In this case, neither advantages nor disadvantages can not save an outdated form. This was repeatedly from Plato and Aristotle to Tocqueville, Churchill and modern political theorists said and written.

According to contemporaries, the best critical assessment of democratic government form was given by French researcher Alexis de Tocqueville. In the middle of the XIX century, after visiting America he described in his tractate "Democracy in America" the main features of its modern models. According to him, in conditions of modern democracy decision making complex shifts from political parties and bodies of state power to financial corporations. Apparently, it is a fusion of power and capital one of the major flaws of democracy. Tocqueville notes that since the Middle Ages European society has been passing through profound and uninterrupted democratic revolution. The aristocracy falls, class inequalities smooth, classes become equal. This democratic stream is irresistible, it has overthrown the aristocracy, the king, it obviously is not going to stop at bourgeoisie.

The peoples aspire to freedom and equality, the full implementation of both principles is the ideal of democracy. Loving the freedom, democratic peoples better understand and appreciate equality charms. Sometimes they agree to sacrifice freedom for the preservation of equality. However, Tocqueville warns, equality, not directly contradicting freedom, develops tendencies in society that threaten despotism establishment! Passion for profit grows; people are indifferent to public interests and concerns, government power increases. Corruption flourishes. Personality gets more dependent; the local government is destroyed and replaced by administrative centralization. Instead of democracy the absolute tyranny of the majority sets. And only one step detaches it from personal despotism. According to this Tocqueville concludes that equality can

lead not to democracy but despotism, as it was in Napoleon's time. The conclusion of French thinker sounds more than actually: the main conditions for the true government form (democracy, for example) maintenance are not institutions but habits and morals.

Despite the fact that social processes in the world take place in the framework of globalization and purposeful stiff monitoring of world market, the "original sin" and the main purpose of which are money and its presence is the main criterion for success and survival, members of the CIS "drop out" of the system. Despite all of them held a course for capitalist society building and democratization after the collapse of the Soviet Union, it is possible to talk about succession of political ideals of the XXI century and the late Soviet period. The nature of today's post-Soviet regimes largely corresponds to it.

"The chief architect of China's reform," Deng Xiaoping at the XIII Congress of the Communist Party of China (25 October 1987) proposed to divide the ideology and the urgent task of Chinese economy modernizing. In 1980-ies this phrase became an unofficial motto, under which pragmatic economic reforms of that time were held: introduction of market elements, private property permission for the means of production, the creation of free economic zones, etc. Governance of the Communist Party has not prevented the country from becoming the second economy of the world. There is its own democracy with its own Chinese specifics. As in culture case there is no comparability in democracy. Like all cultures, all democracies are incomparable, unique. As Churchill once said, Great Britain has no constant friends or enemies but rather constant interests. So geopolitics is often replaced by democracy concept: when it is said we want to bring you democracy, it means geopolitical interests implantation.

Democracy is a part of the ideology. Democracy (at the procedural and institutional level) is just one of possible forms of political rule, actively evolving for over two and a half millennia. Its imposing age ("patriarchy") points its original self-regulation mechanism. It effects on society political system mechanism: staged improvement of three government branches - legislative, executive and judicial; availability of the checks and balances system, allowing to get rid of government negative effects such as the right of minorities and the right of the majority, for example; focus on the rule of law and the basic values - freedom and equality-guarantee. Diversity of this government form, accordance to its expectations of an individual, the masses or the elites, its mimicry ability have allowed democracy to exist longer than other forms of political rule. Background of this phenomenon consists of its generating reasons:

- Availability of statehood (which needs to be managed)
- Masses' requirement of the fundamental values freedom and equality -protection (meaning and essence are variable and several factors depending)
- Private property predominance (of its advanced form slave-owning, feudal or capitalist) over its other types
- High level of spiritual and moral culture components;
- Existence of internal and external "challenges" in society, force ratio, stimulating this imperfect but the most flexible government form

In frame of democracy as ideology, way of thinking, the leading countries of EAEU - Russia and Kazakhstan - have developed over the years their own strategy, social modernization algorithm which allows them to maintain their own culture, selectively assimilating achievements of the world without losing their identity, "their face". In other words, arisen in various regions of the world democracy in the process of its transformation becomes part of the national ideology.

In terms of synergy, studying the formation of order from chaos, there works the law of mutual attraction and repulsion of heterogeneous particles and systems. In inorganic world it reduces to the transfer of mass and energy and in social systems and political doctrines - to the perception and processing of information. In the twentieth century information became the field of action, Western technologists' manipulation instrument, protection document against Western civilization destructive claims for world hegemony in all spheres of public life.

It can be compared with "three-faced" Janus. Two faced Janus of Roman mythology is the god of sky and sunlight, identified with Chaos by Ovid. Roman Janus was the symbol of the beginning and the end of times, he was responsible for internal and external communications, "for inputs, outputs and transitions" from one state to another. A sort of reconstruction steward.

The third hypostasis of Janus is reflected in ability to absorb incompatible contradictions, to find the right solution of crisis. This "third way" is a symbol embedded in culture of some former Soviet republics, ability to find a "way out" is the path of China, Japan and other countries in Southeast Asia. Building a society with traditional, collective culture type with elements of representative democracy that has been recognized as a political and ideological myth by the West.

All concepts of the world order-starting with the mythological, have idea of the prime-creation: "The Gods transform Chaos into Cosmos" (order) (Karakozova and Hassanov, 2011). Into Whole, all parts of which are

interconnected by means of strings (Gunas, ropes and in our time, torsion fields). Ancient pointed out even the number of these links. In the “Vedas”, particularly, it refers to the three main Gunas and more than 80 combinations of them.

According to modern social concepts, a role of one of these Gunas is performed by ideology. It is the main mean of domination and social power in the modern world. In industrial civilization it has replaced religion; modern political technologies use it for implementation of hidden meanings into people’s minds without obvious meaning borders violating. It is a kind of “obvious but incredible” of social life: in politics the main meanings are concealed, social myths and programs cover these meanings.

Western representative democracy structure is grounded on the leading role of so-called “two thirds” conscious and active citizens, ie those who are interested in protecting their possessions. But decisions can also be made by smaller number of votes.

Many Western scholars have been arguing openly and with the facts that democracy form which is widely advertised and described, does not exist. It is a myth suggested to masses in order to convince them of the conscious choice of this practicing government form “for the people, in the name of the people and with hands of the people”. As they say, the difference between tyranny or authoritarianism and democratic government is that modern democracy manipulates public consciousness and a tyrant commands.

Merton, one of the most famous American social scientists of the twentieth century, disciple and follower of Sorokin, studies social structure and political realities adaptation techniques. In assessing US internal policy he notes that those who control the attitudes and beliefs in our society resort to physical violence less and more to the suggestion of the class. Media is replaced by intimidation and violence. They lead a constant ideological and psychological attack on citizens (Merton, 2006).

Famous English political scientist and historian of the twentieth century, author of the book “The Evolution of Political Thought”, Parkinson founded 4 basic government form monarchy, oligarchy, democracy, dictatorship. Analyzing huge factual material of political thinking evolution, Parkinson has shown consistent crashes and changes of political institutions and government forms during a life cycle of different civilizations; one is replaced by another. Parkinson has predicted political disputes on this point in the UK in 90s.

Other Western scholars point to the contrast of authoritarian government forms, eastern and western, coming to replace the modern democracy almost

everywhere. According to them, West put emphasis upon education and media control more, than upon the means of production; at the same time, masses do not have protection from spiritual life monitoring. East as before controls development of productive forces and means of production more. No democratic “mechanisms” in themselves provide human freedom, because the state absolutism in democracies is as possible, as in the most extreme monarchies. This is bourgeois democracy with its formal absolutism of the principle of people’s government. Instincts and skills of absolutism proceed to democracy; they dominate in all the most democratic revolutions” (Canetti and Moscovici, 2009).

Redistribution of spheres of influence, the world's goods (resources) distribution are regularly accompanied by the growth of social tension. Professor Piketty (Paris School of Economics) has collected and systematized data of European countries, Japan and the US of the 200 year period. His target was to find ways to correct the social system under the condition of its output beyond the borders of “social inequality”. Statistics in his book “Capital in the XXI century” fully fits Marx’s theory presented in “Capital”. According to Piketty, social inequality by the beginning of the twentieth century reached in these countries its peak: 10% of the rich controlled 45% of the national income. The main source of income of wealthy European families was capital income. Europe lived almost without producing anything and wealthy citizens lived on rent. Economic crisis and two world wars reduced property stratification, in the US and Europe rentiers were replaced by entrepreneurs. However, poor-and-rich ratio gradually returned to prior index, moreover, it got worse. Piketty says that its cause is absence of soft (non-crisis, nonmilitary) mechanism of correcting system overheating. It carries a serious threat to the world community.

Famous political expert and scientist Zinoviev gives a negative assessment to Western-style democracy and culture. He writes: toughly criticizing government corruption in the Communist countries, Western ideology and propaganda conceal the fact that Western countries are in the same situation. Not without reason there Galbraith and Aron’s convergence theory occurred. Communism and capitalism are extreme manifestation and the highest level of such phenomenon as West. In our time new forces for Westernism overcoming should mature. Essentially Western man is an individualist. His principle is working for yourself and treating others as the environment and the means of existence (Zinoviev, 2003).

In post-Soviet republics their own hybrid and not devoid of continuity of government model national culture are being formed and practiced gradually.

Kazakhstan political regime model, for example, assumes as a basis a presidential-parliamentary government form. In this regard emphasis is placed on enlightened authoritarianism as effective in these conditions and centuries-tested government model.

Analyzing the state of modern post-Soviet society, political scientist, Doctor of Philosophical and Historical Sciences, Director of Center for East Asian and SCO A.V. Lukin accents that it grew out of the political culture and system of the late Soviet time. It borrowed and developed this system but without the centralized power of the Communist Party and the state ideology. He writes that the Russian political system, developed in 90-ies, is characterized by a system of clans and cliques. In economic policy the post-Soviet Russia has more traditional features than the novelty.

Reborn Yasak, new Middle Ages servage for donor countries is brain drain the best “human material”, labor force. And gradually degrading, deserted because of these processes society is easily controlled. It is described by S. Uralov, chief editor of “However, Eurasia Global systemic crisis led Eastern and Western countries to the third, “hybrid” world war. It is already in process. It has begun behind the scenes, when a wave of velvet and color revolutions runs over many countries; when a wave of refugees runs over Europe instead of invading troops.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

FINDINGS: Summing up all of these studies, it can be concluded that, from all appearances, the world is in objective process of denial and self-negation of capitalism and bourgeois values system, searching for other - hybrid – economic management models and political governance. It is commonly accompanied by a transformation of public consciousness. Mass consciousness is formed not only under the influence of modern media technologies, ideological pressure and “brainwashing” by politicians. In conditions of endless systemic crises in the Western world backtracking which was predicted by theorists of politics long before, from democratic government model has begun.

These problems have affected the post-Soviet countries. But, as originally democratic modernization was carried out here in conditions of different cultural type based not on individualism but collectivism and community world perception, masses has felt dire need for comprehension of their own culture origins and invaluable management experience centuries-accumulated. At the

boundary of the XX-XXI centuries in the former republics of the Soviet Union foundations of new spiritual and moral culture were laid. It is formed absorbing revived traditions and values, religious, socio-cultural and political component. Instead of depersonalized mass culture of the West, its aggressive business focused on commercial success at any cost, consumer society will need collective values as a vaccination and protection from extreme individualism.

Recent events have shown that any long smoldering war will once surely flare. In this war Russia already has promising Western allies-France, England and a little lately the United States.

Neither Kazakhstan nor Russia is not alone in its pursuit of better understanding of national cultures origins and basic values, again demanded by masses and in Greece and in the Old World and in the former Soviet Union space. There is comprehension that extreme individualism individuals, corporations, party formations, states, chiefs and leaders, their arrogant belief in their own destiny as “the power of the Supreme Good, Freedom, Equality” leads to alienation. But at the same time it is the devil's temptation mentioned repeatedly by talented poets and writers “on either side of democracy.” And the temptation of power, fire and copper pipes to the present time has not lost its appeal for mere mortals and for the great.

The global market dictates its own laws: the “new democracies” of the second and the third waves in the developing countries always and everywhere aimed at the implementation of the order of patronizing countries. They become economic colonies and blind executors of political tasks of their “benefactors”. Instead of cultural “blossoming diversity” world capital gradually embeds common values, common standards and common ideology.

CONCLUSION

Export and overt expansion of unified government models in the modern world are one way of third - so-called “hybrid” - World War for world domination and the construction of a “new order.” “Induced” democracies in third world countries play the role of a Trojan horse. Non-advertised territories and fields conquer by international corporations involves overbought national elite betraying interests of their own people. It leads to management crisis and degradation of the social system. The world constantly changes. What it will be, it depends only on us.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The study was supported by the Ministry of Education and Science of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

REFERENCES

- Canetti E. and S. Moscovici, 2009. *The Monster of Power*. Algoritm, Boston, Massachusetts, Pages: 40.
- Hassanov, M. and V. Petrova, 2015. *Genesis and Development of Kazakh Civilization*. Palmarium Academic Publishing, Germany, Europe, pp: 139-145.
- Hassanov, M., S.h. Petrova, V.F Baymuhanova and K. Kh, 2016. *Socio-Cultural Formation of Modern Society*. Kazakh University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, pp: 110-127.
- Huntington, S., 2003. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. ROSSPEN Publisher, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 368.
- Karakozova, J.K. and M.S.H. Hassanov, 2011. *Cosmos of Kazakh Culture*. EVer0 Corporation Software Company, Melville, New York,.
- Merton, R., 2006. *Social Theory and Social Structure*. AST Company, Moscow, Russia, Pages: 880.
- Petrova, V. and M. Hassanov, 2016. *Democracy Transformation: History, Theory, Practice*. Kazakh University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, pp: 303-308.
- Zinoviev, A.A., 2003. *The West*. Tsentrpoligraf, Canada, Pages: 464.