**Political modernization of the society.**

The current stage of historical development is characterized by the fact that in various regions of the world there is a collapse of totalitarianism and authoritarian regimes. The diverse experience of the transition to democracy in Spain, Portugal, and Greece has been accumulated; the transformation of totalitarian regimes is carried out in the countries of Eastern Europe, Russia.

From the point of view of the theory of modernization, the goal of political development is the formation of a new type of interaction between the government and society, the creation of social and political mechanisms that allow most of the population to influence the adoption of major decisions.

The purpose of the lecture is to rely on the theoretical basis of Western political science schools to study representatives of domestic political thought, a) to reveal the essence of the process of political modernization, to reveal its laws and features, b) to analyze the content of the current stage of socio-political development of Russia.

Understanding the theory and accumulated experience of modernization allows us to correlate the problems of our country with the general direction of the civilization process, to find the pivotal moment in the analysis and forecasting of the process of democratization of society.

1. The concept of “modernization” is used in Western sociology to characterize both socio-economic and social development in general. It must be borne in mind that the term modernization is collective: it reflects, firstly, the various stages of development of a modern industrial society, starting from the era of the first industrial revolution; secondly, the process of transforming developing countries from traditional (or agrarian) to industrialized ones.

The emergence of concepts of political modernization dates back to the 50s, when the problem arose of developing Western policies in relation to developing countries. It was based on the theory of modernization, which determined: a) the **direction of development** : from traditional to rational society; b) **ways to implement** this direction: scientific and technological progress, socio-structural changes, transformations of normative and value systems. A general model of the global process of civilization was created. The most famous representatives of theories of political modernization are G. Almond, S. Verba, L. Pai, S. Huntington, D. Darendorf, R. Dahl.

Highlighting the core direction in the framework of the general model of the global process, the theory of modernization takes into account the specifics of its manifestation in various socio-political conditions. This differentiation is reflected in the justification of two types of modernization: **original modernization** - it is inherent in countries that are making the transition to rational social structures as a result of the gradual development of internal processes; **secondary (reflected)** - it is characteristic of countries that are behind in their development and are making “modernization” after them.

It should be borne in mind that there is no unified theory of modernization, but with all the variety of approaches, it is characteristic that the measure of backwardness of a country or region is determined by a deviation from the “development norm”. Moreover, the quality of social life reflecting Western values ​​is accepted as this norm. The question naturally arises of how a traditional society can achieve a modern level of development.

Initially, modernization essentially boiled down to the idea of ​​borrowing backward countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America of advanced technology and the ways and means of social organization in more developed countries. The condition for “modernization” was the direct influence of contacts with existing centers of industrial-market culture. What are the boundaries of this influence? The approach to modernization was widespread as to the global process of crowding out traditional forms with universal forms of modernity, which essentially meant identifying modernization with "Americanization", "Europeanization". The process of democratization was almost equal to the introduction into society of political institutions and values ​​already established and functioning in developed countries.

However, the reality turned out to be much more complicated than the approaches that were formulated in the 50s. Given the variety of levels of socio-economic development, the specifics of domestic political factors, in the late 60s and then in subsequent years, researchers, firstly, expanded the geography of studying modernization objects (recently, the political processes of the post-socialist world have been in the spotlight), secondly, they shifted emphasis to studying the problems of the objective conditionality of crises of political changes, ways and forms of overcoming them, thirdly, political processes began to be studied taking into account their national Wow, cultural context. The experience of some countries has shown that modernization is possible not with weakening, but even with the strengthening of the traditional cultural model. The lack of reliance on national traditions has become recognized as a brake on economic development. And, finally, the understanding of the real inconsistency, and sometimes the inconsistency of transformations, factors affecting the clash of traditional and modernized norms, put forward the problem of the role of the political elite prevailing in society.

Today, the theory of modernization serves as a justification for the nature and directions of political changes in the post-totalitarian world. The central problem of the theory of political modernization is the analysis of political systems in transition. The appeal to the theory of political modernization in our country is caused by the need to comprehend the totality of factors that determine the specifics of the transitional state of modern Russia.

So, in the work on the first question, it is necessary to pay attention to the fact that the theory of modernization should be considered in the context of the socio-economic, political development of the world community. In the development of the theory, an important role is played by the rejection of the perception of modernization as a mechanical borrowing of universal standards without taking into account the traditional cultural model.   
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In definitions of political modernization, as a rule, the emphasis is on the following:

* it’s about the ability of the political system to meet the needs of changing social conditions,
* these conditions and social goals are associated with the need for a new quality of interaction between the government and society: an **effective dialogue** ,
* the reality of dialogue is ensured by the creation of new types of institutions, the differentiation of political structures, and the rule of law.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| STAGES OF POLITICAL MODERNIZATION | |
| Stages of the transition from authoritarianism to democracy | Stage Content |
| The crisis of the authoritarian regime and its liberalization | Expansion of individual and collective political rights while maintaining authoritarian structures in the political system |
| Establishing democracy | A qualitative change in the political system, consisting in the formation of democratic political institutions and structures that interact on the basis of democratic procedures. This process includes:  a) the formation of a competitive party system,  b) the institutionalization of democratic mechanisms of state power. |
| Consolidation of democracy | The period of adaptation of society to a new political mechanism, a new model of conflict management. |

Among the laws of the transition period, it is noted primarily as the initial level - the maturing of the internal crisis of authoritarianism, which covers state institutions and the order of their functioning, as well as the political elite. There is a decrease in the legitimacy of the regime not only at the level of the masses, but also at the level of the elite. Part of the elite considers the inevitable adaptation of the regime to a changing reality. The transition period develops when supporters of this position gain the upper hand in the elite, who begin liberalization.

The core problem of this period, the solution of which ensures the transition to democracy, is the formation of a civil world. “This concept means ... the absence of armed confrontation and other acute forms of social conflict that can disrupt public life, maintaining stability and harmony at a level acceptable for the establishment and consolidation of democracy” (Free Thought. 1994. No. 12-18. P.106). It is achieved if all social groups, political forces are able to implement the requirements of the "three consensus":

1. provide agreement on the past,
2. all political forces determine the "rules of the game" in the new political situation,
3. model of social reorganization, the program for its achievement should be adopted by the majority of society.

Experience has shown that the uniqueness of modernization processes is determined by a combination of socio-economic, political factors. It is necessary to take into account: the initial model of economic relations (whether or not a market economy has developed before political reforms began); simultaneously or in turn, the tasks of economic and political reform are being resolved; what type of preceding undemocratic regime (totalitarian or authoritarian); a way of moving from a dictatorial regime to democracy; the emergence or revival of democracy; content of national traditions, state of public consciousness.

Political modernization takes place in a conflict between national political cultures and civilizational values. Inevitably, a problem arises in every country:   
- should we go by copying any development models and focus on transferring existing samples to this socio-political situation,   
- create an optimal political system that is adequate to the whole complex of specific conditions of a given society?   
Both the theory of political modernization and practice give mixed answers to this question. Along with the contradiction associated with the confrontation of universal standards and traditional values, the process of modernization shows a contradiction between the variety of socio-political interests that have formed in society and the ability of the political system to make effective decisions.

These contradictions permeate all spheres of public life, affect the formation of political interests and the ways in which they interact. Knowing the contradictions of modernization allows us to develop an optimal version of a political position that weakens the manifestation of crises typical of a transitional state. To comprehend the content and relationship of the crises of political development, it is advisable to pose the following questions: “How does the ruling elite respond to the increased political activity of various social groups? Has the country reached agreement on the methods of political power? Is public administration capable of effectively influencing society? ”

It should be borne in mind that during the modernization period various social groups are moving, striving to formalize their political interests and gain access to decision-making. The ruling elite can choose one of the options: suppression through violence, legal recognition of the opposition, not only formal recognition of the opposition, but also cooperation with it. **The participation crisis** arises in a situation where the ruling elite impedes the political activity of groups seeking access to power.

One of the key indicators of the effectiveness and efficiency of the political system is legitimacy. Recall that this concept means recognition by the public of the legitimacy of official authority. Since modernization poses a threat to the status of the main traditional institutions, and the dynamism of changes in the social structure creates such a situation that not all groups gain access to the sphere of decision-making, the interaction of society and the government can take on a conflict form, resulting in a **crisis of legitimacy** . It means the lack of public recognition of the given political system, methods of activity of political power.

The mosaic picture of the modernized society is reflected in the interconnection of the following processes: the gap between economic relations and the formation of the political system; the gap between the system of values ​​on which the legitimacy of power was based and the changes leading social relations in conflict with these values; growing dissatisfaction caused by the mismatch between the expected benefits and the real consequences of government decisions. In the context of these processes, the question naturally arises of how effective government is. To denote the weakening of the state’s ability to pursue its policy, the concept of **conflict management crisis** , or **penetration crisis, is used** .

The presence of contradictions manifesting themselves in the development of modern Russian society, the wide scope of the spread of social conflicts are the basis for the manifestation of crises typical of modernization. Of particular relevance today is the study of factors contributing to or neutralizing the possibility of a social explosion. The theory of political modernization, the development of a conflict resolution transitional period should become the theoretical basis for the emerging political elite of Russia in pursuing a constructive policy.

So, political modernization is a complex, lengthy process of democratization of society, the formation of a new type of interaction between society and government. In the course of it, crises are generated by the dynamism of public life, the contradictions in the modernization of the political system, and the whole complex of socio-economic factors.   
**Political modernization of Kazakhstan in the context of the theory of modernization**

By the most general definition, modernization is a process of transition from a traditional society (agrarian, with a patriarchal culture and a rigidly fixed social hierarchy) to an industrial one based on large-scale machine production and rational management of social processes based on laws. According to the theory of modernization, in Western countries this process took a long period - from approximately the first decades of the XIX century. until the 50s. years XX century In the framework of the theory of modernization, two types of society are primarily distinguished: traditional and modern (modern society). And the process of transition from traditional to modern is called modernization [2].

Almost many political scientists who study the modernization process in many countries undergoing (CIS countries), or who have already passed such a "transition" period (England, Italy, USA, Brazil, etc.), can be divided into opponents and supporters of "Westernization", that is, carrying out modernization according to the Western model. In our opinion, such a separation is determined by the fact that according to the theory of modernization, it was precisely the countries of the West that were the first to follow the path of modernized transformations. The modernization of Western countries was dictated by internal impulses, since the principles of liberalism and scientific and technological achievements were the products of the cultural creativity of the West itself.

In contrast, modernization processes in non-Western countries were carried out mainly as a response to the challenges of the West and their modernization can be considered as reflected, or secondary. In this regard, such modernization, as a rule, turns out to be catching up, that is, it involves following the path that Western countries have already traveled.

The experience of Western countries is of course important from the point of view of assessing the final stage of the path, but however, it is unlikely that other countries will be able to repeat the specific path of its passage by the West. So, some countries of the East, which, on the whole, embarked on the path of modernization later than the West, nevertheless managed to catch up with it, having outlined a goal, but reaching it in another way with a shorter and better corresponding national specificity [8]. Some countries are only just beginning to move in this direction, or they cannot even approach it in any way. Therefore, there are different (successful, problematic, or unsuccessful) ways of modernizing the socio-economic system that lead or do not lead to the successful completion of this process. Those countries of the East that managed to find their own path, not equivalent to the Western one, retained their cultural and civilizational specificity and identity, enriching the experience of world development, overtaking the West and even in some cases adjusting the path of world development [9]. It is the experience of the East is very important for Kazakhstan, which is realized as a whole need for rational solutions to social and political problems, while there is more intuitively by Nogo search than scientific design development model, focused on modernizing.

Today, not only Kazakhstani society, but also almost many countries of the CIS and Eastern Europe, are characterized as transitional, “intermediate”, undergoing catch-up, partial modernization. So what is political modernization? What definition of this phenomenon can we give? What is its content and how does it compare with other areas of the modernization process?

A significant place in the search for answers to questions about the nature and prospects of the current Kazakhstani modernization was taken by the appeal to the historical experience of the countries of Western Europe, North America and the countries of the East. In these countries, the process of "natural" modernization has embraced all spheres of society - economy, politics, law, culture, social relations. The experience of the transformation of the countries of the former socialist system, which is very contradictory and heterogeneous, is also very interesting. The political regimes emerging in the former socialist and Soviet spaces often formally meet such minimum criteria of democracy as universal and equal suffrage, regular elections and the presence of opposition parties, but at the same time they are no less often far from Western democracies with their commitment to a market economy and civil rights and freedoms. The results of the ongoing post-Soviet transit do not yet allow us to talk about the completeness of this process, rather, on the contrary, demonstrate its permanence.

“Theory of modernization” - such a name was given to the concept that arose in the 70s. XX century, and which at that time was rightly considered a powerful way to look into the future of industrial society. Nevertheless, the conceptual core of this theory remains valid today, as industrialization creates pervasive social and cultural consequences: from raising the level of education to changing gender roles [1]. Industrialization is seen as the central element of the modernization process, which in turn has an impact on all other factors in the development of society. The theory of modernization is aimed at identifying successive stages of social development, which are simultaneously a fundamental characteristic of coexisting, but in different phases of the evolution of modern societies. It is the characteristic desire for this theory to take into account the features and variety of factors that characterize the differences between countries, peoples, regions, makes it more complex and largely debatable [1]. According to the theory of modernization, a traditional society is characterized by the following main features [2]:

- the dependence of the organization of social life on religious or mythological representations;

- cyclical (and not progressive) development;

- the collectivist nature of society and the lack of emphasis on the personal (personal) principle;

- predominant orientation on metaphysical rather than instrumental values;

- the authoritarian nature of power;

- lack of ability to produce not for the sake of immediate needs, but for the sake of the future;

- the prevailing distribution of people with a special mental mentality - an inactive person;

- the prevalence of tradition over innovation (innovation).

The characteristics of a modern (in the sense of modernization) society are largely opposite to those inherent in traditional [2]. These include:

- the prevalence of innovation over tradition;

- secular (non-religious) nature of social life, progressive development, distinguished personality;

- predominant orientation on instrumental values;

- liberal democratic power system;

- the ability to produce not for the sake of immediate needs, but for the future;

- the predominance of people with an active, active psychological mindset.

Recent studies in the field of socio-economic development have given rise to two competing theoretical schools. One focuses on the convergence (convergence of different systems) of values ​​as a result of modernization, believing that economic and political forces lead to inevitable cultural changes. This school predicts the decline of traditional values ​​and their replacement with more modern ones. Another emphasizes the preservation of traditional values, despite economic and political changes. Accordingly, in their opinion, convergence on the basis of a certain set of “modern” values ​​is unlikely, and therefore traditional values ​​will continue to have an impact on cultural changes resulting from economic development. The central thesis of the theory of modernization is that economic growth determines parallel, and to some extent predictable, changes in cultural, social, and political life.

In the framework of the theory of modernization, the concept of modern society is not equivalent to chronological modernity. That is, not all currently existing societies can be classified as modern: in some, traits of the traditional prevail, while others have moved to the phase of a post-modern society. Features that define the face, spirit, lifestyle and thinking of a society related to the modern type are characterized by the term “modernism”. The modernization process consists of two main components: the adoption in society of the values ​​of liberalism and the development of the achievements of modern scientific and technological progress [4]. In the process of modernization, the values ​​of liberalism are more and more being affirmed in the consciousness of members of society, becoming the starting point for a way of social organization. The historical experience of the transition of various countries to industrial society indicates that the general systemic transformation of society (in modern accepted political science terminology is transit) is not always, especially in the early stages, accompanied by profound shifts in the field of political institutions. History allows for the fundamental possibility of implementing socio-economic modernization "from above" within the framework of old political institutions under the leadership of the traditional and / or grown mainly from the traditional elite. In order for the process of transition from traditional to modern society to begin successfully, it is necessary to observe a number of conditions and, above all, ensure a dynamic balance between changes in various areas of society. At the same time, it is objectively necessary, on the one hand, to maintain political stability as an important condition for social development as a whole and, on the other hand, to expand the possibilities and forms of political participation of various segments of the population in the ongoing changes [5]. We can also say that modernization is probabilistic rather than deterministic. As a rule, economic development transforms all societies in predictable directions, but the specific process and development path are not predetermined at all. Many factors play a role, therefore any forecasts should take into account the probability of deviations taking into account the historical and cultural background of a given country. Today, there is no ready-made model of political modernization, moreover, the regimes themselves, even in the space of the former Soviet Union, are so different (Lithuania and Turkmenistan, for example) that it is difficult to imagine the very possibility of one model for all. However, we can expect a gradual transformation of the ruling regime in the direction of real strengthening of the state on the way of dividing the bureaucratic apparatus, political and economic communities, bringing formal legal norms in line with political and economic practice, real separation of powers and ensuring their mutual autonomy, ensuring the independence of the media. These circumstances further confirm the need for rethinking many political science clichés, the re-systematization of political processes, political institutions and technologies, taking into account new data.

On the issue of the nature and main directions of modernization in political science, there are different points of view and, accordingly, several main types of modernization are distinguished [5,8]:

1) Spontaneous and organic (Europe and North America) - proceeded naturally and organically, starting “from below”, with a change in public consciousness, then leading to a transformation of socio-economic and political relations - the religious Reformation, bourgeois revolutions and industrial revolution in Western countries;

2) Catching up and inorganic in the countries of the Second and Third World (parts of Europe, Latin America, Asia, Africa), lagging behind in the socio-economic development from the countries of the West, which is carried out by borrowing from the latter mainly technical and cultural achievements, distributed on "foreign" to them "soil." Catching up and inorganic modernization is often authoritarian - due to the lack of strong support in society, the initiators of radical transformations are the state and the ruling elite, overcoming the resistance of opponents of reforms. On a countrywide scale, peripherals and centers (the capital and large cities) stand out that disseminate innovations. Often accompanied by internal conflicts and social divisions that could lead to “curtailing reforms”;

3) Forced modernization - in this case, the emphasis is on the accelerated development of the economy and export potential (30-35 years) while maintaining the "narrow nature" of the domestic market and mainly traditional (authoritarian-patriarchal) political relations (countries of Southeast Asia - South Korea , Taiwan, Singapore, etc.);

4) Partial modernization - borrowing some elements of a Western-type civilization (economic, military, scientific and technical) without a profound change in socio-political relations that retain their traditional character;

5) Dead end or so-called. totalitarian modernization - i.e. forced creation by a totalitarian regime based on non-economic coercion of a powerful industrial, defense and scientific potential within the framework of a mobilization model of the economy, which is unable to adapt and develop normally in market conditions, creating a deep crisis in all areas of society (industrialization, collectivization, liquidation carried out during the Stalin period illiteracy).

In those countries where modernization was carried out within the framework of a spontaneous and organic model (Western Europe and North America), economic and cultural changes (the development of capitalist relations in the bowels of feudalism and religious Reformation) were preceded by political ones (bourgeois revolutions, the demolition of the system of absolutism and the transition to constitutional rule) [6].

In countries where modernization was catching up, authoritarian, or partial (the countries of the Second and Third Worlds), changes in politics and the sphere of power, in the minds of the ruling elite, preceded large-scale economic and cultural changes (reforms of the founder of the modern Turkish state, Kemal Ataturk 20-40s, the "white revolution" of Shah Reza Pahlavi of the 60-70s in Iran, the transformations initiated by the CPC leader Deng Xiaoping in the 70s and continuing to this day in China) [6].

It should be noted that this typology is based on the identification of certain ideal types. In fact, within the framework of the “classical” modernization core, development occurs using imitation mechanisms and the most frequently used mechanism of political modernization is the borrowing (copying, imitation) of samples [4]. Two types of simulation are usually distinguished:

· Simulation of an algorithm when the mechanism of a process is copied, including its content or functional load (for example, the process of interaction of the three branches of power)

· Imitation of a result or form, in other words, “simulation” (for example, the proclamation of free and competitive elections as a principle, that is, de jure, with their non-free and non-competitive nature de facto or the creation of three branches of government without actually implementing the principle of separation of powers).

At the same time, as some prominent political scientists rightly note (for example, M.V. Ilyin), imitation of algorithms gives the best results from the point of view of solving modernization problems.

A more perfect typology is the allocation of three types of modernization. One of the successful variants of such a typology belongs to M.V. Ilyin. He distinguishes the following types [2]:

· Endogenous, that is, implemented on its own basis (Europe, USA, etc.)

· Endogenous-exogenous, carried out on its own basis, as well as on the basis of borrowing (Kazakhstan, Russia, Turkey, Greece, etc.)

· Exogenous modernization (imitation, imitation-simulation and simulation options), carried out on the basis of borrowing in the absence of their own foundations.

Compared with countries of the first type, in the societies of “catching up” modernization (or endogenously-exogenous, exogenous modernization), the political factor plays a more significant role. This is understandable, since there were not enough prerequisites for spontaneous transformation of traditional economic, social, socio-cultural and political structures, therefore the state is forced in some cases to act as a “push” and organizer of the transformation process [7]. The establishment of an authoritarian regime in these countries, which is called "authoritarianism of development," is often associated with this.

Despite the fact that discussions about the effectiveness of individual political regimes from the point of view of the success of the modernization process are of scientific and practical significance, their secondary nature should be noted. This is because modernization is a fairly lengthy process, measured on the scale of evolution, while the existence of an authoritarian regime occurs on the scale of everyday life and history; it can only affect the specifics of an individual moment in the modernization process. In addition, the very question of the effectiveness of the regime may indicate the intention of the researcher to present modernization as the result of the implementation of a certain political course, the result of the activities of political elites, that is, evidence of a one-sided interpretation of the very concept of modernization by the researcher.

One of the "founders" of the theory of modernization is, one of the most influential American political scientists, Samuel Huntington. In accordance with his concept, a set of internal and external factors that prompt the political elite to initiate reforms serves as an incentive to start modernization. The book “The Clash of Civilizations and the Transformation of the World Order” (1996) sets forth the author’s views on the balance of power in the modern world that were first presented to him in the article “The Clash of Civilizations?” Published in 1993 in the journal Foreign Affairs. The book, published three years later, contains a number of the author’s predictions, and first of all regarding the growing influence on the world politics of ethnic, religious, linguistic and other differences based on following established traditions. Different societies follow their paths, even when they are subject to the same forces of an economic nature, in part because specific factors, such as cultural heritage, also influence the development of countries. Huntington claims that the whole world is divided into eight main civilizations, or “cultural zones,” the differences between which have existed for centuries. These zones are formed by religious traditions, which to this day have great power, even despite all the progress of modernization. Among them - Western Christianity, the world of Orthodoxy, the world of Islam, as well as Confucian, Japanese, Hindu, African and Latin American zones. “Today, borders separating various civilizational types are manifested much more convexly than ever before, and conflicts arise over these, as the author calls them,“ demarcation lines ”[3]. Considering that one of the most important “lines”, according to S. Huntington, is partly located within individual CIS countries, the analysis proposed in the book is extremely relevant for us. The author does not contrast his approach to the study of the phases of the economic evolution of economic systems, but rather tries to study the interaction of economic and socio-cultural components of social life, which gives the hypotheses and conclusions contained in the work a deeply balanced and reasoned character.

S. Huntington, of course, is not a supporter of modernization along the path of the West. “The West,” the author believes, “occupies a special place among civilizations, exerting a serious and sometimes devastating effect on them [3]. The relationship between power and the culture of the West and the power and culture of other civilizations is the most remarkable characteristic of the world today. As the strengths of other civilizations increase in relative strength, the attractiveness of Western values ​​decreases, and non-Western peoples experience greater confidence and adherence to their own indigenous cultures. Therefore, the main problem of the relationship between the West and the rest of the world is that its efforts (and especially the USA) to promote Western culture are undertaken against the background of objectively reduced opportunities in this area ”[3]. Political modernization, which S. Huntington understands as "the democratization of the political institutions of society and its political consciousness" is determined, in the opinion of the author, by a number of factors of a social nature. Whatever the motives of the ruling elite, when starting reforms, they almost always lead to completely deterministic changes. Any steps aimed at socio-economic progress inevitably contribute to the adoption of advanced ideas.

Combining the above, it is possible to note several provisions common to all of these points of view. Each recognizes and justifies the leading role of the political, economic elite in the modernization process [7]. The transition to democracy, which means a radical shift in the organization of power, has always occurred as a result of a conscious decision from the top of the political elite, which was then transferred to the level of political parties and through them to the population as a whole. The next general point is that each of the concepts recognizes that in order to overcome the political immaturity of the people, outstanding individuals, outstanding measures (actions) are needed. And finally, they all insist on the country's identity, the path of its transformation. Westernization as a blind imitation of the West is no longer relevant, each country should choose its own development path, based on its traditions, principles, mentality of the people and, of course, economic and cultural opportunities [10].

What features of Kazakhstan's political modernization can be distinguished based on the use of existing research experience?

The changes taking place in modern Kazakhstan over the past ten years can be considered as another modernization, as another transit, but carried out in a fundamentally different historical situation, when a number of the most developed countries in the world have already entered a new stage of development, defined as post-industrial or Information society. The ongoing process of political modernization in Kazakhstan can be generally attributed to the endogenous-exogenous type (borrowing some elements of a Western-style civilization without a profound change in socio-political relations that retain their traditional character). And the fact that a characteristic feature of the Kazakhstani type of modernization is a combination of various own and borrowed institutions and traditions (partial modernization) with imitation of results. Due to the weakness of civil society and the exceptional role played by the state in Kazakhstan, the modernization of society is largely replaced by the modernization of the state - its military power, bureaucratic apparatus, repressive organs, the public sector of the economy, etc. As a result, the tasks of modernization of the state are often solved through anti-modernization, partial archaization and degradation of society. Thus, it can be said that a new understanding of both the historical and modern experience of modernization as an integral and regular stage in the development of societies moving into the post-industrial stage and transforming within this stage itself is now one of the urgent tasks of modern Russian political science. And those studies of processes in the light of the theory of modernization taking place in modern Kazakhstan, as in other countries of the post-Soviet space, are extremely urgent tasks. Today, wealthy states are dominated by worldviews that are radically different from those common in economically backward societies. And in our opinion, the main forecast of the theory of modernization should be fully supported: in any case, economic development is associated with major changes in the system of basic values ​​and beliefs. The theory of modernization does not imply obligatory cultural convergence, but predicts the general direction of the corresponding changes (to the extent that this process depends on the change of generations of people) and even offers some considerations as to how soon they can happen. In this connection, many events of recent history - the collapse of the Soviet system, the rise of ethnic and confessional terrorism, the integration of European powers, active economic globalization, the gradual establishment of a unipolar world with US domination, the outbreak of the global financial crisis, etc. - they compel us to take a fresh look at the processes that are taking place, which we hope will allow us not only to more accurately understand the past, but also to anticipate, and partly influence the political future of our country.

Kazakhstan at the present stage, in a situation of finding a development model that would allow it to restore economic potential, successfully complete modernization and take its rightful place in the global community of countries that have transitioned to a qualitatively different post-industrial era.