

## GLOBALIZATION AND GLOBALISM: THE PROSPECTS OF THE NATIONAL-STATE POWER

ZEKRIST RIDA

Research Scholar, Department of the Philosophic Science, Kazakhstan

Professor, Department of the Humanities, Kostanay Social -Technical University, Kostanay, Kazakhstan

### ABSTRACT

The article deals with the problem of power and the nation-state, which is understood from the perspective of the modernity global challenges as the multi-level process system of world-historical development. The analysis showed that in the modern world has three levels of government - macro, mezzo- and micro. Author examines the interaction between them through the prism of fundamental concepts of modern globalization. Raises the question about the fate of the nation-state in modern conditions, also makes distinction between globalization and globalism.

**KEYWORDS:** Modernization, Globalization, National State Power, Globalism, the System, The Elite

### INTRODUCTION

The currency of presented research subject depends not on only theoretical interests but and requests of real practice. In 1977 M. Foucault in one of the interviews mentioned that there is a such situation in the world that the question about power «is the question for whole world...» (Foucault, 2002). The life shows that his words are fair and at the second decade of XXI century.

For the twentieth and after coming the twenty-first century characterized by unprecedented dynamism of all spheres of life, especially politics and economics, which increased in the last decades of the twentieth century [1, p.6]. These transformations were the subject for analysis of philosophers, political scientists and economists. Variety of theories were appeared, the most famous of which was the shock concept of the collision with the future by A. Toffler, end of history by F.Fukuyam and the theory of the clash of civilizations by S.Huntington.

### Methods and Theoretical Base of Researching

At XX and present XXI century at west philosophy to the problems of government and power gave and continue to give much attention such researchers as Avtorkhanov A. (Avtorkhanov, 1983), Alexander J. (Alexander, 2009), Arendt H. (Arendt, 1992), Aron R. (Aron, 1984), Baechler, J. (Baechler, J., 1978), Bauman. Z. (Bauman, 1997), Burbach R. (Burbach and Robinson, 1999), Bourdieu P. (Bourdieu, 2002), Deleuze G., Guattari E. (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987), Clark I. (Clark, 1997), Cox R. (Cox, 1996), Hirst, P., Thompson G. (Hirst and Thompson, 1995), Kaufmann F.-X. (Kaufmann, 1998), Kiely R. (Kiely, 1998), Lafonten O., Müller, Ch. (Lafonten and Müller, 1998), Lasarus N. (Lasarus, 1999), Marshall D. (Marshall, 1996), Moosmüller, A. (Moosmüller, 1998), Naudet, J.-L. (Naudet, 1998), Navarro, V. (Navarro, 1998), Ohmae, K. (Ohmae, 1995), Nuscheler, F., Perrot, E. (Perrot, 1996), Reinicke, W. H. (Reinicke, 1997), Rieger, E., Leibfried,

S. (Rieger and Leibfried, 1998), Robertson, R., Knondker, H. (Robertson and Knondker, 1998), Schwartzman, K. C. (Schwartzman, 1998), Stryker, R. (Stryker, 1998), Valaskakis, K. (Valaskakis, 1998), Waters, M. (Waters, 1996), Wrong, D. H. (Wrong, 1979).

Intensively researches different problems of government and power, including at the conditions of globalization, in post-Soviet social philosophy, political philosophy and political science. In the first place, there are such authors as K. A. Abishev (Abishev, 1996), V.N. Abramov (Abramov, 1992), C. A. Baybakov, C. U. Barsukova, G.A. Belov (Belov, 1992), I.O. Belogradov (Belogradov, 1992), A. Gazitsky (Gazitsky, 1992), V.G. Grafskiy (Grafskiy, 1992), V. A. Gusev (Gusev, 1992), A. A. Degtyaryov (Degtyaryov, 1996), C. E. Zhusupov, V. G. Ivanov, A. G. Zdravomyslov (Zdravomyslov, 1996), Z. M. Zotova (Zotova, 2001), M. V. Ilin and A. U. Melville (Ilin and Melville, 1997), V. K. Kantor (Kantor, 2006), V. G. Lyadev (Lyadev, 2012), P.A. Sapronov (Sapronov, 2011), E. D. Slizovskiy, V. F. Halipov (Halipov, 1995), A. A. Hamidov (Hamidov, 2005), F. V. Tsann-kay-si (Tsann-kay-si, 2011).

At the research as fundamental used dialectical methodology as it was created at Hegel's tradition. The most enable were such principles as principle of concretion, principle of historicism, principle of determinism, principle of integrity, principle of development and etc., and also categories of part and whole, essence and occurrence, form and content, universal and special and etc. Besides there were used comparative method.

Quite significant are the conceptions of human and society, created by K. Marx, G.S. Batishev, V.E. Kemerov and his school. The most important role of primary importance are the works which in one or another form or degree, expressly or by implication realizes recognition of globalization and globalism. First of all these are the works of A. B. Veber (Veber, 1990), A. A. Galkin (Galkin, 2002), U.D. Granin (Granin, 2008), G. A. Zuganov (Zuganov, 2002), K. M. Kantor (Kantor, 2006), O. V. Nechiporenko and A.N. Nasybayv (Nechiporenko and Nasybayv, 2006), A. S. Panarin (Panarin, 2000), R.S. Sartaeva (Sartaeva, 2006), A. A. Hamidov (Hamidov, 2005). Essential help gave the conception of alienation, created by K. Marx (Marx, 1956) and found some concretization at the works of G.S. Batishev (Batishev, 1969), H. Marcuse (Marcuse, 2011), A. P. Ogurtsov (Ogurtsov, 2001), E. Fromm (Fromm, 1992), A. A. Hamidov (Hamidov, 1989).

We will not consider them, we will look to the concepts that suggested by many authors with real basis. Let's consider the power and the nation-state problem, which understood from the perspective of the global challenges at present time, as the multi-level process system of world-historical development. In the modern world, there are three levels of government - macro, mezzo and micro. Consider the interaction between them through the prism of the fundamental concepts of modern globalization.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The current situation on our planet is characterized by the processes of modernization and globalization. These processes, no matter how they are understood and interpreted, can not affect to the state's education, which are predominantly national states, and also on national-state power. Our analysis focuses on the opening features of functioning state and political authority of the Transitional Society (and those are still have the post-Soviet state's education) in contemporary processes of globalization.

The concept of globalization can be divided into: 1) those in which the processes of globalization and their implications are reviewed and evaluated exclusively positive; 2) those in which the processes of globalization and their implications are reviewed and evaluated exclusively negative (the authors are so-called anti-globalizes); 3) those in which their authors see both positive and negative points. But before we analyze them, we should look at how the phenomenon of globalization treated. Indeed, the assessment of this phenomenon depends on its interpretation. Some authors distinguish between the concepts of globalization and globalism. So, A Galkin distinguishes globalization as an objective process and global studies, or globalism as a form of understanding (ordinary or theoretical) of the objective process. He believes that the concept of "globalism" today has replaced the notion of "internationalism", which, in his opinion, overly ideologically loaded, and the concept of "globalization" and "globalism" from this are free. Consequently, globalization, according to him, is one of the stages of historical development of mankind, replacing the previous one. Authors: A. Panarin and A. Hamidov also distinguish between globalization and globalism, but on entirely different grounds (which shows - below).

Many authors emphasize the objective and necessary and inevitable character of globalization and with that it's limited. Of course this is not enough. Some isolated stages of the globalization process. Thus, the American journalist, three times winner of the Pulitzer Prize T. L. Friedman identifies three main stages of the globalization process, which began, according to him, before the rise of capitalism, although in Western Europe. According to him the first stage, covers the period from 1492 to 1800 (approximately). He embarked of H. Columbus journey in search of western route to India and the discovery of a new continent, later called America. This stage T. Friedman calls "Globalization 1.0." "It's - he writes - established a new dimension: the world has ceased to be great and became medium " (Friedman, 2006). The second stage, "Globalization 2.0," lasted, according to the author, from 1800 to 2000 years. "During this period the world has ceased to be medium and became a small" (Friedman, 2006). Finally, from 2000 became the third stage of globalization - "Globalization 3.0." Finally, 2000 was the third stage of globalization - "Globalization 3.0." The author writes: "Globalization 3.0 reduces the world to the limit: the world ceases to be a small and becomes tiny and at the same time it evens the worldwide playing field. And if driver of Globalization 1.0 was countries, Globalization 2.0 - the company, the driver of Globalization 3.0 - which is its unique feature - it becomes unformed potential for global cooperation and competition, which is now available for "individual person "(Friedman, 2006). World, according to T. Friedman was not only tiny - it has ceased to be spherical: the round world becomes flat. Wherever you glimpsed, all hierarchical structures are either "forced to withstand the onslaught of the bottom, or they themselves are converted from vertical structures to more horizontal, more responsible model of equal cooperation" (Friedman, 2006). Rise of new social, political, economic and cultural model. At the same alignment of the world, T. Friedman says, occurs with astonishing speed and ubiquity: it covers the whole world. We can say that two of globalization phase is still possible to accept, but the third is more complicated. The process of globalization began to take shapes, which are not consistent with the ideals of the Enlightenment Age. In this regard, some researchers such as A. Panarin and A. Hamid (second - more consistently) distinguish globalization and globalism. This distinction is based on other grounds than the distinction of A. Galkin. The position of these authors is as follows (based on quite reliable historical facts): after the Second World War, on the planet was established world order, which was dominated by the two poles, which were presented as the capitalist world and the socialist world (what was thought to be), and even more specifically - between two superpowers - the United States of America and the Union Soviet Socialist Republics (USA and USSR). Countries of the so-called "third world" gravitated toward one pole, the other - to another. This period in the history of mankind was called "Cold War."

By leading capitalist countries was elaborated doctrine according to which the planet's resources for a full existence may last only a very small group of the population, numbering about a billion. This doctrine was named the "the golden billion". Naturally, in this "golden billion" were included governments of most developed countries, and first of all - the United States, as the main among them. With the collapse of the Soviet Union and the so-called "socialist camp" doctrine of the golden billion turned into a real strategy and tactics primarily the United States. Consequently, the new world order doctrine no longer connects the progress of history with all of humanity on our planet; it's links with the progress only limited part of humanity - so-called "golden billion". This doctrine, the opposite doctrine of globalization, authors calls globalism. "In this new world order - says A. Hamidov - USA and several other leading capitalist states took Center place, all the rest of the world suffered the fate of the periphery. Occupying the center position, USA usurped the right to dictate their will becoming increasingly disenfranchised periphery. Consequently, the only doctrinal before globalism became almost-effective. Today's world order - this regulation and rules of world-historical process of a single center unilaterally and only in the interest of the Centre. The main instrument of implementation of the strategy and tactics monocentric globalism is an international financial capital" (Hamidov, 2011). In light of this understanding, if the first two-stage form which marked by T. L. Friedman, you can still take steps as a form of globalization, the third - we can not, because it is not globalization, its globalism.

However, nature is so ordered that the main resources of the world are concentrated in areas of the world, which are deployed on the territory of the state, globalists enrolled in the periphery of the discharge. Many of these areas are concentrated more or less strong national state. Consequently, the main obstacles in the way implementation of policies of globalization are strong national state. Many foreign researchers agree with this. So, P. Berger writes that "there can be no doubt that the economic and technological change, which is caused by the phenomenon of globalization, has created serious social and political issues such as the division winners and losers (both within a single society and between societies) and challenge to traditional notions of national sovereignty" (Berger, 2004). V. Reinecke argues that globalization "defies the sovereignty of nation-states" (Reinicke, 1997); F.-H. Kaufman argues that globalization by inherently has to cross borders of national-state formations (Kaufmann, 1998); R. Burbach and U. Robinson writes that the defining characteristic of globalization is the "crowding out nation-state as an organizing principle of capitalism and the establishment of the interstate system at the same time as the foundation of capitalist development" (Burbach, R., Robinson, 1999). However, these authors emphasize that the system of global capitalism cannot exist external phenomena: any intrastate processes must become global character. This means that all institutions of the nation-state should be ousted and replaced by global transnational institutions (Burbach, R., Robinson, 1999). R. Burbach and U. Robinson notes, that sovereign nation-state for the purpose of self-preservation forced to adapt to an ever growing trends and challenges of globalization.

Stands somewhat apart viewpoint of K. Ohmae, the Japanese scientist, journalist and businessman. It dispenses with the concepts of "globalization" and "globalism." He - a typical technocrat. The global economy, according to him, is formed due to the irreversibility of scientific and technical progress. The main factors of historical progress at the present stage are, in his opinion, "four I" which he meant investing, Industry, Information Technology and Individual consumption. In the way of progress at the moment, says K. Ohmae, are closed states with their boundaries. As such, they have become outdated and anachronistic. The state itself as an institution in our eyes becomes "nostalgic fiction" (Ohmae, 1995).

Loopback state, he says, start being replaced with specific territorial entities, K. Ohmae called "regions-states." But they - only intermediate forms in the way the global economy, ignorant of state borders. "In the same way, - he writes - as the current paralysis of nation-states shows that they were only transitional form of organization management of economic processes- regions, states may well lose its value in the future. Nothing is forever. But at the moment they are - just what "the doctor ordered." After receiving the necessary degree of independence-regions of the state, due to its unique ability to function on the basis primarily of global logic will be that demand time - efficient engines of prosperity and quality of life of people working in the global economy" (Ohmae, 1995).

But the fact that the national state prevents the processes of globalization (more precisely, of course - globalism) and that it is - unwanted Institute, also written in the literature. So that the nation state is supposedly brake further evolution of mankind, wrote the former head of the Club of Rome A. Peccei in 1977 in his well-known book "Human qualities" (Peccei, 1985). A. Peccei and his supporters have adherents among the post-Soviet philosophers and political scientists.

Does globalization associated with modernization? Many researchers answer this question in the affirmative. Globalization could not start and get by without any upgrades. Modernization, of course, continues, but now it becomes the mechanism of the globalization. Some authors also believe that in fact today we are dealing with the same upgrade. V. Inozemtsev, for example, writes: "Which now calls globalization, more accurately be defined as westernization" (Inozemtsev, 2001). But this is certainly not the case. On the planet realizes strategy and tactics of globalism, directed from single center, which skillfully uses the mechanisms of modernization. Thus, the objective which still persist, the processes of globalization in the sense as understood by A. Hamidov, V. Inozemtsev and others, carried out under the authority of the globalists, adjusted and regulated them. Gennady Zyuganov, recognizing fact of some secret existence "world behind the scenes", however, he states: "There is no doubt that these forces today are trying to take maximize benefits from globalization and implement "American globalization" scenario. However, this does not mean that globalization - completely handmade phenomenon. Need to be aware that globalization processes have an objective character, they occur regardless of our desires and intentions " (Zuganov, 2002). Above it was noted that many authors emphasize the objective nature of globalization. Of course, this process carries completely objective character. But does it? Some, however, speak more carefully. But, Kazakh scholar R. Sartayeva accurately noted that "globalization is an objective process, in which a significant role is played by subjective factors.... Subjective factors can influence the direction for the objective process (future scenario)" (Sartayeva, 2006). Exactly "golden billion» states are not just seeking to extract itself from the dividends of these processes, but also strive to substitute globalization by "manmade" (the expression of G. Zyuganov) phenomenon by characterization of A. Panarin and A. Hamidov, globalism. Thus, we consider not only justified the distinction of globalization and globalism, but we convince that it will allow to navigate in the modern world processes. There is point of view that the nation-state interferes with the processes of globalization (more precisely, of course - globalism) and that it is - unwanted institute.

Unprecedented pretenses of globalists gave rise to anti-globalization movement. Anti-globalists denounce and reject the globalists usurpation rights to determine the prospects and driving force of history, their self-serving monopoly on the dispensation of the Future. Intellectual elite representatives, biased by globalism center and their emissaries, strongly brand the anti-globalization and anti-globalization. However, noted by A. Hamidov, "anti-globalization, whatever form it takes, can not be considered meaningful alternative to globalism. Insolvency antiglobalism, - said A. A. Hamid, -

consists in that it represents only backlash against globalism (Hamidov, 1989).

A reasonable question arises: how does the phenomenon of globalization impact on the nation-state and its power in terms of the transition to the new system. This question bothers modern post-Soviet philosophers, political scientists and sociologists. Kazakh scientists and philosophers also sidestep the problem of the impact of globalization on national statehood. A. Nysanbaev emphasizes: "Especially becomes important such study (study of the processes of globalization. – R.Z.) for independent states of Central Asia, our Kazakhstan too. In this context, occur acutely problem: how without deviating from the objective process of globalization - that is basically impossible - to preserve their national sovereignty, national "I am", an original and unique culture of Kazakhstan and Central Asia peoples, the great value of traditional culture which express the centuries-old experience of folk art and wisdom " (Nysanbaev, 2009)?

What is the main problem? Post-Soviet states have set the transition to a market economy. However, this transition can happen in many ways. Market economy - is just another name for the capitalist economy. The ratio of the economy and the state (the government power) - take place those limits beyond which government interference in the economy is considered acceptable and even necessary. However, consultants of state power implementing policies of globalization, seeking to impose young post-Soviet states maximum policy of non-interference in the economic sphere, and especially in the financial sector. This market fundamentalism in fact does not lead to the consolidation of the young national states, but rather to their weakening. Indeed, in this case the national economy becomes dependent on transnational corporations and finance begin to serve for international financial institutions in the service of policy globalism.

Of course, on the planet today is not the situation that took place immediately after the collapse of the bipolar world. Gradually the world arena come new "players" and growing trend multipolar world of education. But this is only a tendency. Countries - the implementation of policies of liberalism still dominate the planet. Consequently, the fate of nation-states are not clear yet.

We emphasize: methodologically incorrect to raise the question of the fate of the nation-state in modern conditions, in conditions of modern world order without distinguishing between globalization and globalism. In the long term - with the proviso that the phenomenon of globalization as such will be eliminated - the nation-state (the state in general) may have exhaust itself. You can remember the Marxist idea of the state withering away. But K.Marx is linked this dying to overcoming exclusion and building societies that objective will not need to institute the state. But in the current situation is not the case. Globalists wish to get rid of many nation-states, while preserving their own state (and, of course - the hegemony). Consequently, those authors who argue that globalism - a dangerous enemy of national statehood, absolutely right.

With the current dominance of globalism, implemented by representatives of the "golden billion" nation-states should not take their positions and must strongly resist efforts of globalism. In this situation, consistency is very important in the functioning of all three levels of government - the macro-, meso-and micro power. And special attention should be directed at the meso level of government, since it is level of the least reliable, already mentioned, and most corrupt. Only to that estimated action of globalists to weaken and (or) degradation of national statehood.

Transnational corporations and financial institutions tend to put for dependent from themselves of the national

political and economic (primarily) the elite and make them your own puppets. A. Panarin said: "Today, to be an elite and realize itself as an elite means to put yourself in the position of an independent national interests and national aspirations. [...]Era of globalization has put the national elites in some intermediate position between its own people and the international centers of power" (Panarin, 2000). On the same level macro power their performer must maximally promote the transition state from the legal to the social. Such a nation-state can effectively resist the efforts of globalism. This is especially important for multi-ethnic and multi-confessional state formations, what, for example, are the Russian Federation and the Republic of Kazakhstan. Under these conditions the strong national states can resist globalism and participate in the processes of true globalization.

## CONCLUSIONS

In the conclusion mention the next. These researchers are right that on principle distinguish globalization and globalism. It is absolutely necessary for clear understanding of such processes that happen at the world. The globalization is not intentionally non-management historical process of transformation of the history of different nations to world history; globalism is the management of historical process from united center in the interests of this center, named «gold billion». If, in common, globalization does not encroach on the interests of national governments, but the main aim of globalists is to loosen, or in limit – to eliminate national governments, firstly that in the territory of which are situated minerals or another resources. But any government is not a self-acting subject, it, for its functioning, needs at subjects which realize powerful or permissions. During long history these permissions realize powerful elite resists to another citizens of the government, commonly named the nation. Moreover at the soviet past the most of representatives of economic and particularly intellectual so-called creative elite does not contrast with nation, in one or another measure tried to show its interests. The situation changed after creation of post-Soviet ethno-national governments. There were some transformations not only in nation, but among the elite too. There were coming of emissaries of globalism to national elite for taking their part, exactly to the side of their heads. New, corrupt and depending on transnational financial rounds national elite manly became marionette of these emissaries.

In modern conditions the world of vital activity of people go through the influence not only from the side of self national government and its power, but also mainly from the side of which realizes strategy and tactics of globalism, of «gold billion». Globalists realizes processing of ordinary and mass cognition of citizens of national governments in the direction of decomposition of valued level of cognition and taking it to the level of utility, inculcate thirst for acquisitiveness. The imperative *be* forces out by the imperative *have*. The object of processing often is young men of youthful or teen age. Suggests an idea to them that use is the most superior, that the man should aspire to, and the all means are good there. Spreads the cult of hedonistic way of life. Propagandizes unisexual marriages, intensively spreads drugs and pornography, including and child pornography. Special efforts direct to the destroying of educative sphere. In perspective – implantation to everybody personal identification polyfunctional microbiochips that creates the opportunity of total control for every resident of the planet and transferring to the system of noncash money that provides the opportunity of total manipulation of human behavior.

In transformation of power and technologies of its influence of the vital activity of the person considerable mission if of the humanism principle and humanistic world-view. Moreover not any variant of humanism is useful for it. Religious humanism couldn't pretend to this role and also humanism based upon the principle of anthropocentrism. Such

technology that could promote positive transformation of power and its using of the technologies of using on the vital activity side of dependent. But it could promote the successes only to national-governmental powerful élite, but not at all to them who from the name of «gold billion» realizes strategy and tactics of globalism. But it is not very desperate: position could save multipolar organization of the world which accumulates the power.

### **Perspectives of Researching in Future**

Examined problems do not limit the researching of power. We could enumerate themes. Under which the power still researches, but it is not actual four the theme of current work. There are such themes like: «power and right», «power and business», «power and social organization», «power and intellectuals», «power and opposition», «money and power» etc.

Also the main researching problem is one of the main form of realizing of the strategy of government power – manipulation of the cognition and behavior of depend side. The main means of such manipulation is ideologically loaded language. Using of the language in political aims creates the language in one of the factors of the politics. The language of politics and political ideology – if one of the kind of functional language. This language is the mean of realizing the politics, mean of achievement of political aims. The language has difficult and multilevel structure. The most evident and at the same time the most frequent using of language by ideology shows on its lexico-semantic level. Besides at self pragmatic aspect the language more closely connect with ideology. But it is not absorbed, keeping the distance to it. Ideology also does not include into semantics as a system of wraparound connotations but directs to the language the participation in particular system of subject-object and object-subject relations, including in which it makes correspond ideological function – not equitant all, but not alien to the nature of language. Relations between pragramems show at so-called ideological tetrad, that is modified logical square of Michael Psyll. The most important meant for ideological using of the language has the linguistic principle formulated by F. de Saussure and supported by modern poststructuralism according on which signifier is independent of denotatum.

The important problem – is the problem of the power structure. But there are not many researching here. We should mentioned works of V. N. Amelin (Amelin, 1991), N. Bobbio (Bobbio, 1997), K.E. Buolding, E. Vyatr (Vyatr, 1979), A. Kozhev (Kozhev, 2007), I. I. Kravchenko (Kravchenko, 2001), L.T. Krivushin (Krivushin, 1969), K. T. Petrov (Petrov, 2009). And there is no unity between researchers. The important problem is the typology of power. This is the works of T. A. Alekseeva (Alekseeva, 1989), M. N. Keyzerov (Keyzerov, 1966), A. Kozhev (Kozhev, 2007), I. I. Kravchenko (Kravchenko, 1989), H. Lasswell and E. Keplen, V.G. Lyadev (Lyadev, 2005), O. M. Lyadeva (Lyadeva and Lyadev, 2003), N.I. Osadchiy (Osadchiy, 1983), T. Parsons, G.V. Puskaryova (Puskaryova, 1995), V. F. Halipov (Halipov, 2002), S. V. Tsirel (Tsirel, 2006) and etc. As with another problem, the solving is the same. As many authors, as many point of view. We should mention that some authors give attention to the question of typology of the power conceptions. These are – T. A. Alekseeva (Alekseeva, 2000), A. A. Degtyaryov (Degtyaryov, 2006), A. Kozhev (Kozhev, 2007), V. G. Lyadev (Lyadev, 2005), V. F. Halipov (Halipov, 2002).

For our theme this question is very important: critical analysis of general conceptions of the power is more comfortable to realize, grouped them in common types.

This analysis brings to the conclusion that there are many points of view according to the different aspects of

phenomenon of power and there is no any unity. The main is that there is no some unite view on the essence and structure of power. Such position of business makes a question about necessity of future research of mentioned problems. For participation of this researching will orientate the future work. Here we could suppose the possible perspectives of future researches of learning theme.

## REFERENCES

1. Abishev, K.A. Totalitarianism as form of alienation [Text]/ K. A. Abishev //Human in the world of alienation. – Almaty: Gylym, 1996. – P. 41 – 59.
2. Abramov, V. N. «New enlightenment» and questions of human nature, civil society and political power [Text]/ V. N. Abramov //Power of many faces. – M.: Russian philosophic society with participation of SP «Dimak», 1992. – P. 147 – 165.
3. Avtorkhanov, A. The Technology of Power [The Technology of Power] (Frankfurt/Main: Possev-Verlag, 1983).
4. Alexander, G. Power, politics and civil sphere. Social researches, No10, october 2009, P. 3-17.
5. Amelin, V. Multidimensional model of political power [Text]/V. Amelin //Social science and modernity. 1991. – № 2. – P. 48 – 58.
6. Alekseeva, T. A. Power [Text]/ T.A. Alekseeva //New philosophic encyclopaedia. – In 4 t. – T. I. – M.: Mysl, 2000. – P. 418 – 419.
7. Alekseeva, T. A. Power and legitimacy. (Evolution of non-marxist approaches in modern political philosophy) [Text]/ T.A. Alekseeva //Power. Philosophic political aspects. – M.: IP AS USSR, 1989. – P. 110 – 133.
8. Arendt H. Lectures on Kant's Political Philosophy. Edited and with an Interpretive Essay by Ronald Beiner (The University of Chicago Press, 1992).
9. Aron R. Les dernières années du siècle, Paris: Julliard, 1984.
10. Baechler, J. Le pouvoir pur [Text]/ J. Baechler. – P. : Calmann-Lévy, 1978. – 273 p.
11. Bauman, Z. Glokalizacja, czyli komu globalizacja, a komu lokalizacja [Text]/ Z. Bauman //Studia socjologiczne. – Warszawa, 1997. – № 3. S. 53 – 69.
12. Batishev, G.S. Activity essence of human as philosophic principle [Text]/ G.S. Batishev//Problem of human in modern philosophy. – M.: Science, 1969. – P. 73 – 144.
13. Berger, P. L. Introduction. Cultural dynamic of globalization [Text]/ P. L. Berger //Globalization of many faces. Cultural variety in modern world. – M.: Aspect Press, 2004. – P. 9.
14. Belov, G. A. Resources of power [Text]/ G. A. Belov // Globalization of many faces. – M.: Russian philosophic society with participation of SP «Dimak ». 1992. – P. 30 – 46.
15. Belogradov, I. O. Power and ecological cognition (problems of correlation) [Text]/ I. O. Belogradov // Globalization of many faces. – M.: Russian philosophic society with participation of SP «Dimak», 1992. – P. 166 – 183.

16. Belyaev, V. A. Philosophy of management between the theory of management and philosophy of culture [Text]/ V. A. Belyaev. – M.: Book house «LIBROCOM», 2012. – 174 p.
17. Burbach, R., Robinson, W. I. The fin de siècle debate: globalization as epochal shift [Text]/ R. Burbach, W. I. Robinson //Science and society. – N. Y. – 1999. – Vol. 63. – n 1. – P. 10 – 39.
18. Bobbio, N. Intellectuals and power [Text]/ N. Bobbio //Anthology of world political ideas. In 5 t. – T. 2. – M.: Mysl, 1997. – P. 545 – 562.
19. Bourdieu P. Interventions politiques (1960–2000). Textes & contextes d'un mode d'intervention politique spécifique, 2002.
20. Degtyaryov, A. A. Political power as regulatory mechanism of social communication [Text]/ A. A. Degtyaryov //Polis. – 1996. – № 3. – P. 108 – 120.
21. Deleuze G., Guattari F. Capitalisme et Schizophrénie 2. Mille Plateaux (1980). Trans. A Thousand Plateaus (1987).
22. Galkin, A. A. About globalization without illusions [Текст]/ A. A. Galkin //Globalization. Conflict or dialogue of civilizations? (Calls – versions – perspectives). – M.: Pub. House «New Century», 2002. – P. 164 – 172.
23. Granin, U. D. «Globalization» или «westernization»? [Text]/ U.D. Granin //Questions of philosophy. – 2008. – № 2. – P. 3 – 15.
24. Gazitsky, A. Political science as social phenomenon (social physiological aspect). Author's abstract of dissertation of c.s.s.: 19.00.05./ A. Gazitsky. – M., 1992. – 26 p.
25. Grafskiy, V. G. Problem of relationships of power and knowledge in the history of political thought. Author's abstract of dissertation of doctor of jur. science: 12.00.01./ V. G. Grafskiy. – M., 1992. – 41 p.
26. Gusev, V. A. Organic conception of power (according to the works of I. A. Ilin) [Text]/ V. A. Gusev // Power of many faces. – M.: Russian philosophic society with participation of SP «Dimak ». 1992. – P. 129 – 146.
27. Friedman, T. Flat world: short history of XXI century [Text]/ T. Friedman. – M.: AST: AST MOSCOW: KEEPER, 2006 – P. 14.
28. Foucault, M. Power and knowledge [Text]/ M. Foucault // Foucault, M. Intellectual and power. Elected political articles, presentations and interviews. – M.: Praxis, 2002. – P. 280.
29. Fromm, E. Marx's Concept of Man (1961) // Soul of a man. – Moscow: Republic, 1992. – P. 375-414. – 430 p.
30. Clark, I. Globalization and fragmentation: International relations in the twentieth century [Text]/ I. Clark. – N. Y. etc.: Oxford university press, 1997. – X, 220 p.
31. Halipov, V. F. Cratology – science of power. Conception [Text]/ V. F. Halipov. – M.: Economics, 2002. – 367 p.
32. Halipov, V. F. Introduction to the science about power [Text]/ V. F. Halipov. – M.: Technological school of business, 1995. – 380 p.

33. Hamidov, A. General logic of correlation of *I* and *Society* [Text]/ A. Hamidov // *I and Society*. – Almaty: Kazakhstan, 1989. – P. 13 – 75.
34. Hamidov, A. A. Problem of globalization without alternative: globalism or antiglobalism. Almaty, 2011. – P. 25.
35. Cox, R. W. Global “perestroika” [Text]/ R. W. Cox // *Approaches to world order* /Ed. by Cox R. W. with Sinclair T. J. – Cambridge, 1996. – P. 296 – 313.
36. Sapronov, P. A. Conception of power of Kozhev. Critical analysis [Text]/ P. A. Sapronov // *Herald of Russian Christian humanist academy*. – St. Petersburg – June 2011. – T. 12. – P. 285 – 292.
37. Tsann-kay-si, F. V. Party and power – unite? [Text]/ F. V. Tsann-kay-si // *Herald of Russian philosophic society*. – 2011. – № 4 (60). – M.: RFO, 2011. – P. 147 – 149.
38. Tsirel, S. V. «Power-property» in works of Russian historians and economists [Text]/ S.V. Tsirel // *Social sciences and modernity*. – 2006. – № 3. – P. 119 – 131.
39. Keyzerov, N. M. About correlation of conception «social» and «political» power [Text]/ N. M. Keyzerov // *Herald of LSU. Series of economic, philosophy and right*. – 1966. – № 5. – Edit. 1. – P. 35 – 46.
40. Kozhev A. Conception of power [Text]/ A. Kozhev. – M.: Praxis, 2007. – 182 p.
41. Kravchenko, I. I. Regime political [Text]/ I. I. Kravchenko // *New philosophic encyclopaedia*. – In 4 t. – T. III. – M.: Mysl, 2001. – P. 431 – 432.
42. Kravchenko, I. I. Middle («meso») level of political and non political power. Questions of typology and structure of power [Text]/ I. I. Kravchenko // *Power. Philosophic political aspects*. – M.: IP AN USSR, 1989. – P. 6 – 25.
43. Krivushin, L. T. About structure and conception of political power [Text]/ L. T. Krivushin // *Man and society. Scientific notes*. – Edit. V. – L.: Edit. LSU, 1969. – P. 3 – 14.
44. Hirst, P., Thompson, G. Globalization and the future of the nation state [Text]/ P. Hirst, G. Thompson // *Economy and society*. – L. – 1995. – Vol. 24. – N 3. – P. 408 – 442.
45. Ilin, M. V., Melville, A. U. Power [Text]/ M. V. Ilin, A. U. Melville // *Polis*. – 1997. – № 6. – P. 146 – 163.
46. Inozemtsev V., Westernization as globalization and "globalization" as Americanization. – P. 60.
47. Kaufmann, F.-X. Globalisierung und Gesellschaft [Text]/ F.-X. Kaufmann // *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*. – Bonn, 1998. – N 18. – S. 3 – 10.
48. Kiely, R. Globalization, post-Fordism and the contemporary context of development [Text]/ R. Kiely // *International journal of sociology*. – L. – 1998. – Vol. 13. – N 1. – P. 95 – 115.
49. Kantor, K. M. Globalisation? – Yes! But what? [Text]/ K. M. Kantor // *Questions of philosophy*. 2006. – № 1. – p. 25 – 37.
50. Ledyayev, V. G. Sociology of power. Theory and experience of empirical research of power in city society [Text]/ V. G. Ledyayev. – M.: Pub. house High school of economics, 2012. – 471 p.
51. Lafonten, O., Müller, Ch. Keine Angst vor der Globalisierung: Wohlstand und Arbeit für alle [Text]/ O. Lafonten,

- Ch. Müller. – Bonn: Dietz, 1998. – 352 S.
52. LedyaeV, V. G., LedyaeVa, O. M. Multidimensional of political science: conceptual discussion [Text]/ V. G. LedyaeV, O. M. LedyaeVa //Logos. 2003. – № 4 – 5. – P. 23 – 32.
  53. LedyaeV, V. G. Models of empiric research of power [Text]/ V. G. LedyaeV //Power and elite in Russian transformation: Collection of scientific articles. – Spb.: Intersotsis, 2005. – P. 65 – 79.
  54. Lasarus, N. Charting globalization [Text]/ N. Lasarus //Race and class. – L. – 1998/1999. – Vol. 40. – N 2/3. – P. 91 – 109.
  55. Marx, K. Economic-philosophic manuscript of 1844. From early works, M., Politizdat, 1956, P. 519.
  56. Marcuse, H. Critical theory of society: Elected works of philosophy and social critics. M.: AST, Astrel, 2011. – 384 p.
  57. Marshall, D. Understanding late-twentieth-century capitalism: Reassessing the globalization theme [Text]/ D. Marshall //Government and opposition. – L. – 1996. – Vol. 31. – N 2. – P. 193 – 215.
  58. McMichael, Ph. Globalization: Myths and realities [Text]/ Ph. McMichael //Rural sociology. – N. Y. – 1996. – Vol. N 1. – P. 25 – 55.
  59. Moosmüller, A. Interkulturelle Kommunikation und globale Wirtschaft: zu den Risiken und Chancen von kultureller Differenz [Text]/ A. Moosmüller //Schweizerisches Archiv für Volkskunde. – Zürich. – 1998. – N 2. – S. 189 – 207.
  60. Naudet, J.-L. Face au neo-liberalisme et la globalisation [Text]/ J.-L. Naudet // Analyses et documents econ. P. – 1998. – N 74. – P. 66 – 71.
  61. Navarro, V. Neoliberalism, “globalization”, unemployment, inequalities, and welfare state [Text]/ V. Navarro //International journal of health services. – 1998. – Vol. 28. N 24. – P. 607 – 682.
  62. Nechyporenko, O., Nysanbaev, A.N., civilizing process at the turn of the century: globalization, modernization, transformation [Text] / O.Nechyporenko, A. N. Nysanbaev //Kazakhstan in the context of globalization. Philosophical - political analysis. - Almaty: K-IC ISP of MES RK 2006.– P. 6 – 81.
  63. Nysanbaev, A.N. essence of globalization and its influence on the Republic of Kazakhstan [Text]/ A. N. Nysanbaev // Kazakhstan in the conditions of globalization: philosophic politology analysis. – Almaty: K-IC ISP of MES RK 2006. – P. 85.
  64. Nuscheler, F. Reiche Welt und arme Welt [Text]/ F. Nuscheler //Die neue Welt-politik. – Baden-Baden, 1995. – S. 112 – 122.
  65. Ohmae, K. The end of the nation state: The rise of regional economies [Text]/ K. Ohmae. – L.: Harper Collins, 1995. – X, 214 p.
  66. Ogurtsov, A. P. Politics [Part of article] [Text]/ A. P. Ogurtsov // New philosophic encyclopaedia. – In 4 t. – T. III. – M.: Mysl, 2001. – P. 268 – 272.

67. Osadchiy, N. I. Social-philosophic analysis of power as social occurrence. Author's abstract of dissertation of c.p.s: 09.00.01./ N. I. Osadchiy. – MSU. – M., 1983. – 20 p.
68. Panarin, A. S. Temptation of globalism [Text]/ A. S. Panarin. – M.: Russian National Fund, 2000. – 381 p.
69. Perrot, E. Penser la mondialisation [Text]/ E. Perrot //Recherches des sciences religieuses. – P. – 1998. – Vol. 86. – N 1. – P. 15 – 40.
70. Pushkaryova, G. V. Power as social institute [Text]/ G. V. Pushkaryova //Social-political magazine. – № 1995. – 2. – P. 84 – 96.
71. Petrov, K. P. Secrets of management of humanity or the Secrets of globalization. – Book 1 [Text]/ K.P. Petrov. – M.: Academy of management, 2009. – 873 p.
72. Peccei, A. Human qualities. – Pub. 2-d. [Text]/ A. Peccei. – M.: Progress, 1985. – P. 301.
73. Reinicke, W. H. Global public policy [Text]/ W. H. Reinicke //Foreign affairs. – Washington. 1997. – Vol. 76. N 6. – P. 127 – 138.
74. Rieger, E., Leibfried, S. Welfare state limits to globalization [Text]/ E. Rieger, S. Leibfried //Politics and society. – Stoneham. – 1998. – Vol. 26. – N 3. – P. 363 – 390.
75. Robertson, R., Knondker, H. Discourses of globalization: Preliminary considerations [Text]/ R. Robertson, H. Knondker //International sociology. – L. – 1999. – Vol. 13. – N 1. – P. 25 – 40.
76. Sartaeva, R. S. Globalization and new regulatives of world development [Text]/ R. S. Sartaeva //Kazakhstan in the conditions of globalization: philosophic politology analysis – Almaty: K-IC ISP of MES RK 2006. – P. 322 – 359.
77. Schwartzman, K. C. Globalization and democracy [Text]/ K. C. Schwartzman //Annual revue of sociology. Palo Alto. – 1998. – Vol. 24. – P. 159 – 181.
78. Stryker, R. Globalization and welfare state [Text]/ R. Stryker //International journal of sociology and social policy. – Hull. – 1998. – Vol. 15. – N 2 – 4. – P. 1 – 49.
79. Toffler, E. Metamorphosis of power. Knowledge, wealth and strength at the beginning of XXI century [Text]/ E. Toffler. – M.: AST: AST MOSCOW, 2009. – P. 22.
80. Valaskakis, K. Mondialisation et gouvernance [Text]/ K. Valaskakis //Futuribles. – P. – 1998. – N 230. – P. 5 – 28.
81. Veber, M. «Objective character» of social-scientific and social-political cognition [text]/ M. Veber //Veber, M. Elected works. – M.: Progress, 1990. – P. 345 – 415.
82. Vyatr, E. Sociology of political relations [Text]/ E. Vyatr. – M.: Progress, 1979. – 463 p.
83. Waters, M. Globalization [Text]/ M. Waters. – L.; N. Y.: Routledge, 1996. – XIV, 185 P.
84. Wrong, D. H. Power: Its forms, bases and uses. – Oxford: Blackwell, 1979. – VIII, 326 p.

85. Zdravomyslov, A. G. Rationality and powerful relations [Text]/ A. G. Zdravomyslov //Questions of sociology. – Edit. 66. – 1996. – P. 7 – 70.
86. Zotova, Z. M. Power and society: problems of interaction [Text]/ Z. M. Zotova. – M.: IKF «Omega-L», 2001. 346 p.
87. Zyuganov, G. A.,. Globalization and the fate of mankind. / G.A. Zyuganov - M.: Young Guard, 2002. – 447 p.