



Scientific article  
IRSTI 02.41.11



<https://doi.org/10.32523/3080-1281-2025-150-1-73-92>

## Philosophical Foundations of the Formation of Global Culture

Torgyn Sadykova<sup>a\*</sup>, Vakur Sumer<sup>b</sup>, Assem Kulbayeva<sup>c</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*S. Seifullin Kazakh Agro-Technical Research University, Astana, Kazakhstan*

<sup>2</sup>*Selçuk University, Konya, Turkey*

<sup>3</sup>*Sh. Yessenov Caspian University of Technology and Engineering, Aktau, Kazakhstan*

✉ [storgyn@mail.ru](mailto:storgyn@mail.ru)

**Abstract.** The article provides a philosophical analysis of the process of global culture formation. The study reveals the dialectical relationship between objective patterns, namely historical context and cultural codes, and subjective factors, particularly the preservation of uniqueness. The primary focus is on the mechanisms of cultural globalization: unification, the dynamics of global and local interaction, and the impact of digitalization on the socio-cultural sphere. The methodological foundation includes Hegel's historical-dialectical approach, Nietzsche's cultural criticism, and Jaspers' paradigm of civilizational development. Using examples such as the historical interaction between nomadic and sedentary civilizations and the cultural expansion of empires, the evolutionary development of global culture is examined. The research results highlight key contradictions between the integration of cultural elements and the preservation of national identity, the role of mass culture, and the asymmetric nature of cultural exchange. The importance of selective approaches to assimilating values is emphasized, enabling harmonious interaction among diverse cultures. The findings confirm that cultural globalization, despite the influence of historical experience, social transformations, and digital technologies, emerges as a contradictory yet objective process. The article contributes to a comprehensive study of the balance between global and local cultures, as well as to the interdisciplinary interaction of philosophy, history, and cultural studies.

**Keywords:** global culture, cultural globalization, cultural identity, dialectical contradictions, cultural uniqueness, philosophical transformation, historical dynamics, historical and cultural analysis.

**For citation:**

Sadykova T.M., Vakur S., Kulbayeva A.M. Philosophical foundations of the formation of global culture// Jete – Journal of Philosophy, ReligJete – Journal of Philosophy, Religious and Cultural Studies. – 2025. – Vol. 150. – No.1. – P. 73-92. <https://doi.org/10.32523/3080-1281-2025-150-1-73-92>

## **Introduction**

Modern globalization processes significantly impact the cultural landscape by enhancing the interaction between various national cultures while also creating contradictions that necessitate thorough analysis. Although numerous studies have sought to understand cultural globalization, many important questions remain inadequately addressed. In particular, it is still unclear whether it is feasible to sustainably integrate diverse cultural elements into a single global culture, considering the intricate historical and social factors at play.

The significance of the study is due to its contribution to the understanding of cultural globalization and the development of approaches to the harmonisation of cultural interactions in the modern world.

The object of the study is global culture as a phenomenon, and the subject is the process of its formation, specifics, and contradictions arising in the interaction of cultures. The work aims to investigate the main features and problems of global culture formation, as well as to identify how cultural differences and historical contexts affect the possibilities of uniting cultures. To achieve the goal, the following tasks are addressed: analysis of existing theories of globalization of culture, identification of factors contributing to and hindering its formation, and research into the manifestations of cultural interaction.

The scientific novelty of this study lies in a comprehensive analysis of the process of global culture formation, taking into account modern philosophical transformations in the field of cultural globalization. Unlike previous works, in which global culture was viewed primarily as the result of unification and Western expansion, this study focuses on identifying the philosophical contradictions accompanying this process, including the preservation of local identities, intercultural conflicts, and the asymmetry of cultural exchange.

Special attention is paid to:

- comparison of different theoretical approaches to understanding global culture (universalism, glocalization, multiculturalism);
- analysis of the mechanisms of translation of cultural norms and values in the context of digitalization and information society;
- consideration of historical and cultural factors influencing the heterogeneity of perception of global culture in different regions of the world;
- identification of new trends in intercultural communication emerging against the background of global crises and the growth of cultural reflexivity.

In the article «Globalization as a Factor in the Development of National Cultures», Gezalov A.A. and Komissarov S.N. emphasize that «universal human culture is manifested through national distinctiveness and is enriched by the uniqueness of diverse cultures. However varied

the vision of the world - in its past, present, and future - may be for each nation or individual, the internal integrity of this worldview constitutes the spiritual foundation of humanity's existence. Integrating the cultural values and meanings of other peoples into a national mentality not only imbues them with new vitality, reincarnating and repainting» their essence into nationally distinctive value-aesthetic "colors" but also transforms the entire spiritual and cultural paradigm of a people's existence (Gezalov A.A., Komissarov S.N., 2022: 33).

For example, using the typology of cultural codes proposed by Gudkov D.B., cultural codes can be divided into verbal, real, and action codes. First of all, verbal cultural codes include national languages, which are the main code of any national culture (Gudkov D.B: 2004: 39). Thus, a global culture should also have its verbal code, its language. English is already such a language today. The problems associated with the formation of English as a global language are well described in D. Kristal's book "English as a Global Language". The author analyzes the real state of affairs with the spread of the English language in the world, indicates a set of reasons that, in his opinion, determined the choice of English as a global language, and makes a forecast regarding the main trends in the transformation of this language as a global one (Crystal, 2003). Academician A.S. Zapesotsky, in his book "The Formation of global culture and conflicts of Civilizations", which is devoted to understanding several relevant processes of world development, considered two issues: on the one hand, the formation of global culture, on the other - the aggravation of conflicts of civilizations (Zapesotsky, 2018: 196). The famous scientist I. Wallerstein, in his work "After Liberalism," considered culture as an "idea-system of the capitalist world economy". But R. Robertson, on the contrary, has been studying the global-local dynamics of cultural globalization since the mid-60s. A. P. Sadokhin, in his work, considered theoretical and practical issues of intercultural communication from the standpoint of cultural anthropology. Well-known scientists V. G. Zinchenko, V. G. Zusman, and Z. I. Kirnosa made a good contribution to the study of the issue. In their research, they identified the impact of the modern synergetic paradigm of scientific knowledge on culture and language, its role and place in international relations and business communication.

Thus, the authors of this study complement the existing scientific base, expanding the understanding of the dynamics and internal contradictions of the process of global culture formation, as well as offering directions for further empirical and theoretical developments in the framework of cultural studies, sociology, and philosophy of culture.

## **Materials and Methods**

The study employed a multifaceted methodological framework to investigate the formation of global culture. The historical and cultural method served as a foundational approach, enabling an analysis of the evolution of cultural ideas within globalization processes. This method traced the stages and trends in global culture's development, contextualizing historical events and cultural shifts that shaped its trajectory. Building on this analysis, the comparative method was utilized to juxtapose diverse models of global culture formation across regions, such as contrasting Western and Eastern scientific traditions. This comparative lens highlighted regional disparities in conceptualizing cultural integration and globalization.

To further explore these comparative insights, content analysis was applied to examine scientific publications, media narratives, and cultural artifacts. This method revealed dominant themes, recurring values, and semantic patterns embedded in discourses about global culture. Subsequently, the method of system analysis provided a holistic perspective, framing global culture as an interconnected system where language, norms, symbols, and cultural codes dynamically interact. This approach proved particularly valuable in dissecting the interplay between localized practices and global cultural trends.

Finally, to uncover the ideological underpinnings of global culture, discursive analysis was employed. By scrutinizing scientific, political, and media discourses, the study illuminated how narratives about global culture are constructed, disseminated, and legitimized. These methodological approaches were operationalized through a combination of qualitative and quantitative data collection, drawing from interdisciplinary sources in cultural studies, history, and sociology. Historical case studies of cultural exchange and integration complemented theoretical frameworks, offering concrete illustrations of the complexities and outcomes of global cultural interactions.

## **Discussion and results**

The main findings of the article indicate that the development of global culture involves the inevitable integration of various cultural elements. The analysis reveals that the globalization of culture is a complex process that maintains both cultural unity and diversity. Historically, globalization has manifested through the mutual influence of cultures, leading to increased cultural contact and unification while preserving the differences between sedentary and nomadic peoples.

A comparison with previous research suggests that cultural globalization also depends on the power and influence of individual cultures. In particular, mass culture and consumerism pose challenges to national cultures, necessitating the establishment of selective mechanisms to engage with global processes without compromising unique cultural identities.

Conclusions about the process of global culture formation in the context of cultural globalization are also presented. The detailed analysis shows that globalization not only promotes the unification of cultures but is also accompanied by conflicts and contradictions related to the preservation of cultural identity.

According to the results of the conducted research, the authors propose the following distinctive characteristics of global culture. First, global culture is a necessary result of the globalization process, which has an objective character. The process of globalization proceeds in waves. It goes on with varying degrees of intensity in different periods, sometimes there are «recessions» when it seems that globalization has come to an end. Therefore, the process of forming a global culture (and today scientists are talking only about its formation) is contradictory, complicated by many problems, and the appearance of little predictable side effects. Secondly, global culture is a unique and singular entity. There can be only one global culture. It is a culture that has an obligatory, often forced character for all people. Thirdly, it is formed as a result of the unification process (as a necessary component of globalization), which includes both existential unification and spiritual unification.

In this article, we will try to answer three questions of principle. Firstly, to what extent has the problem of the formation of global culture been researched? Secondly, is cultural globalization or cultural globalisation possible at all? Thirdly, what is cultural globalization in reality, and what does it lead to? Note that the answer to the last question indirectly implies a positive answer to the first of the above questions. Indeed, if cultural globalization is impossible in principle, then all other questions arising in connection with it are meaningless; they simply do not arise. Consequently, we proceed from the fact that globalization in the sphere of culture is not only possible, but it has actually taken place in the past and is being carried out at present and will be carried out in the future, and the later, the more intense and effective it will be. However, due to the significant differences between many cultures existing at present, this process - cultural globalization - is often very painful, contradictory, and conflicting, not to mention the mutual struggle of cultures, which is a direct and indirect consequence of the struggle, competition of peoples for territories and resources, is, in fact, a constant companion of human history. The latter circumstance contains something that denies the possibility of integrating a multitude of cultures into a more or less unified, global culture. The practically unceasing struggle for many millennia of various proto-ethnic, then ethnic, and, finally, national communities for territories and resources, it has to be stated, continues at present, which, at first sight, if not denying the possibility of merging a multitude of cultures into a single one, at any rate significantly complicated this process before and complicates it now. But in reality, everything is not so unambiguous and simple. To understand this process and try to judge objectively its further possible fate, it is necessary to understand its essence, and for this purpose, in turn, to trace it in historical and cultural retrospect, that is, to make a historical excursion, specifying firstly that man, as such, is both the subject and the object of culture, or, in other words, he is the one who in one way or another creates culture, and, on the other hand, any man is formed as a full-fledged personality within the limits of a certain culture, that is, he is a whole person. This circumstance allows us to deduce with equal success both man from culture and culture itself from man, his essence, and nature, about which F. Nietzsche wrote the following: "All philosophers have the common disadvantage that they proceed from the modern man and imagine to come to the goal through the analysis of the latter. Involuntarily, they imagine "man" in general, as... unchangeable in the universal flow, as a reliable measure of things. However, everything that the philosopher says about man is, in fact, nothing but a testimony about man of a very limited period. ... But everything essential in human development took place in primitive times, long before the 4,000 years that we know approximately ..." (Nietzsche, 2025: URL).

Taking this idea as a starting point, a reference, on which our further judgments will be built, it is necessary to determine the depth of time when «long before the 4000 years that we know approximately» man was formed as a thinking man, that is, capable of abstract, speculative thinking, even if primitive at first, and, accordingly, as a man capable of cultural production and reproduction, a cultural man. It is not possible to determine this with absolute certainty. However, we can assert with a high degree of certainty that the man of faith was a thinking man, since belief, even in its simplest, elementary forms, is the result of abstract thinking, and, accordingly, a cultural man, that is, capable of creativity and development.

As evidenced by a great number of archaeological and ethnographic artifacts, including those that have been identified in the study of tribes that adhered to primitive or close to

primitive way of life, almost all ancient tribal and tribal societies adhered to certain beliefs, that is, the consciousness of members of primitive communities had a religious character. A.V. Men, a famous Russian theologian of the XX century, philosopher, and historian of Christianity and other religions, points out the following interesting religious feature of ancient people: "Primitive man saw everywhere hidden animality: in tree trunks, in forest animals, and in the run of clouds. .... In the babbling brook, in the flames of the fire dwelt spirits, hostile or good ... Spirits are geniuses - patrons of every piece of land, having in their power all the phenomena of nature occurring in a given place, and all events in the lives of people living within their boundaries. Their number is infinite" (Men, 1991: 30-31). Or, as indicated by a group of scientists led by authoritative archaeologists G. Frankfort and G. A. Frankfort in the collective monograph "On the Threshold of Philosophy. Spiritual quests of ancient man", "the fundamental difference in the attitude of modern and ancient man to the surrounding world is the following: for modern man the world of phenomena is primarily "It", for ancient – and also for a primitive man – it is "You" (Frankfort, 1984:25)

It should be emphasized that one of the most characteristic and widespread features of the most ancient beliefs was that of all the variety of spirits most closely associated with people, the spirits of ancestors occupied a special and honorable place. Thus, in Kazakhs it is Aruaktar, and in Kyrgyz - Arbaktar. It is noteworthy that this cult in one or another form and degree exists in both peoples even nowadays, at least in a rather large part of the population. Obviously, such persistence of this cult is explained not only by the peculiarities of religious consciousness but also by quite natural attachment and dependence of children on their parents, as well as by the feeling of gratitude.

The insignificant amount of knowledge possessed by primitive people by today's standards, with necessity led to the fact that the consciousness of primitive man was strictly oriented to the steady, strict reproduction of the same once-learned patterns, stereotypes of behavior, and their sacralization, which, in turn, inevitably led to the fact that in primitive society established a strict taboo on any innovations. Society as if consciously withdrew into itself, closed in on itself, which, however, was quite justified, at least from the psychological point of view. The instinct of self-preservation in extremely difficult and severe conditions of survival urged, or rather, forced primitive man to constant collective interaction with kin and tribesmen. It is quite obvious that it was possible to survive in the primitive epoch only by joint efforts. The matter is not only in the unfavorable natural environment but also quite often in an external hostile environment, represented by other clans and tribes. It has to be stated that war is one of the integral components of human history and psychology and, in fact, an important condition in which the diverse cultures of both modern peoples and those that for various reasons have already left the historical scene were formed.

For many millennia, the individual was dependent on both the natural and social environment in which he lived. Mentally and spiritually, he was completely dissolved in the community in which his life took place and which alone could ensure his daily life and survival. F. Nietzsche wrote the following about such an individual: "Throughout the long period of humanity's life nothing has inspired greater fear than the feeling of self-isolation. ... Freedom of thought was considered a total inconvenience. ... To be oneself, to measure oneself by one's yardstick - then

it was contrary to taste. To be inclined to do so might have been considered madness, for with loneliness was associated every misfortune and every fear. ... . Anything that harmed the herd, whether it happened by will or against the will of an individual, caused her remorse then - and also her neighbor, even the whole herd!" (Nicshe, 2025: URL).

It would be absurd and foolish to see in the above-described feature of primitive man something devoid of common sense, although, of course, one can see irrational in itself, outside the real conditions of his existence. People, as social beings, could not before and cannot now be formed as full-fledged individuals outside society. However, let us turn again to the times when primitive man certainly dominated the global historical scene, up to the emergence of the first cities, states, and civilizations.

For many and many centuries the world of primitive man did not undergo any significant changes, in favor of which speaks, in particular, a lot of archaeological and ethnographic data and facts.

The last of the quotes we have given clearly and convincingly enough speaks in favor of the fact that the culture of primitive man (interpreted in this case and context as a certain totality of stable forms of human activity, skills, abilities, and knowledge that ensure the survival and existence of people, as well as a set of certain rules prescribing them this or that behavior, accompanied, as a rule, by certain experiences and thoughts, which ensures the continuity and stereotypical of behavior) was characterized by the absence of seriousness. Regardless of the geographical zone in which the primitive culture existed and by whom it was created and reproduced, it was very similar in its various manifestations, if not in formal terms, at least. It is quite easy to explain this peculiarity of pre-civilization culture by the fact that ancient people, wherever they dwelt, were engaged in various combinations and proportions in only three kinds of activity - hunting, fishing, and gathering, or one or two of them. Thus, the very modest volume of knowledge and skills that primitive people had, with the same insignificant differentiation of their activities, ensured the absence of any significant differences between the cultures of tribal communities. It is possible to assert with certain reservations that in this period of history, there was a global culture in the sense that the low level of its development provided a significant essential closeness and similarity between its various forms and manifestations.

Primitive society, for objective reasons, not only had but, in fact, could not have a tribal organization, that is, such a form of connection between individuals forming a primitive community when all its members were blood relatives. In such conditions the initial and at the same time the basic feeling, which the primitive man, being an infant, literally absorbed with his mother's milk and which created the basis for his perception of both natural and social reality and the basis for the formation of the totality of ideas about it, was undoubtedly the feeling of kinship, common origin, blood, which, naturally, also provided a high degree of internal, as well as, however, external similarity of primitive cultures. The real conditions of people's existence did not allow the latter to unfold in full measure, which provided a high degree of sameness for primitive societies. However, it should be borne in mind that it was in this epoch when the first languages began to emerge, and a little later the first religious ideas in the primitive consciousness and beliefs and the corresponding picture of the world, that a socio-psychological and cultural phenomenon was formed, a complex, which is usually defined in modern humanitarian science

as “us and them” and about which the Russian researcher Ya.G. Shemyakin writes the following: “... in the mythological picture of the world man was completely subordinated to natural rhythms, the individual was dissolved in the social whole..... Such a solution to the main issues of life led to a severe limitation of a person's spiritual horizon, to the tendency to close within the experience of one's collective. This was most vividly manifested in the formation in the primitive epoch of the socio-psychological complex “them and us” or «us and them», the essence of which “... is reduced to the following: “we”, i.e. members of a given clan, tribe or other community, are “real people”, while “they”, i.e. all those who belong to other, not similar to “us”, varieties of humankind, are not people or, in any case, not quite people” (Shemjakin, 2003: 42).

It can be assumed that this complex began to take shape much earlier, since the first people, or rather, the first clans, were not exempt from the need to survive in competition for the best territories and conditions of existence. Long before the emergence of the first civilizations, people had settled over vast territories and penetrated into the far corners of the planet, but the free spaces were inevitably exhausted in time, and people would be forced to engage in a brutal mutual struggle. When the hunting and gathering potential came to an end, or, in other words, when the animals that made up the main food ration of people were noticeably reduced in number, the struggle between different clans and tribes sharply escalated, accompanied by mutual extermination, which, along with hunger, naturally led to a quantitative reduction of the human population by an order of magnitude. It seemed that the already extremely slow evolution had brought mankind to a dead end, the way out of which was so complicated by depopulation that the further existence of the human species was in great doubt. However, with the acquisition of language, through which humans began to develop the capacity for abstract and creative thinking, once the amount of knowledge available to humans exceeded a certain critical level, the crisis that threatened the very existence of humanity was overcome. This transition in humanitarian science was called the Neolithic Revolution, as a result of which such fundamentally new activities as cattle breeding and agriculture emerged, which contributed to the creation of a stable surplus social product, which in turn contributed to the creation of the first cities on Earth, and then - the first states, and with them civilizations (Grechko, 2025: URL). Doctor of Philosophy G.S. Mambetalieva writes: “When the hunting and gathering potential of development was exhausted, the Neolithic revolution took place, replacing hunting and gathering with cattle breeding and agriculture, which significantly expanded the possibilities of the human species, because even the most primitive agriculture contributed to the population growth in tens of times, irrigation - in thousands. The consequence of the transition to a producing economy was the growth of useful information and, accordingly, intelligence and social differentiation, which was fixed by rudimentary forms of human exploitation by man” (Mambetalieva, 2007:112).

If we evaluate the above-mentioned facts, which had profound consequences for all mankind, from the point of view of radical changes in the phenomenon of culture, we can quite confidently assert that with the emergence and further development of cattle breeding and agriculture, not that the process of differentiation, i.e. division and separation of cultures, which existed at that time, began. But, certainly, this process was considerably accelerated. We argued earlier that in the primitive epoch there was a conditionally global culture, one



of the main typological features of which was its extreme primitiveness, and comparative underdevelopment, when the bulk of people's efforts, their energy for thousands of years was spent on elementary survival, and in principle the same actions gave rise, respectively, to the same mental type. With the transition of mankind to a completely new level of development and the emergence of the first civilizations, as we have already said, the process of differentiation of cultures began to take place. People, scattered over a vast space, although not completely isolated from each other, nevertheless created such a phenomenon as the plurality of cultures. It should be noted that this phenomenon should not be confused with another phenomenon, namely, the so-called multiculturalism, which is commonly understood as a policy that some Western European states, at least, tried to pursue relatively recently, and which was aimed, as its theorists and apologists tried to present it, at preserving and developing, both in a particular state and in the world as a whole, the existing cultural differences. It should be noted in passing that the theory and practice of multiculturalism emerged as the antithesis of the concept and policy of a «melting pot», in which, according to those who purposefully implemented this policy, many other cultures were to merge into a single one. We cannot claim, in our opinion, that both the policies of multiculturalism and the “melting pot” have failed completely and utterly. However, it is quite obvious that they have not been and, as it seems to us, cannot be implemented in the way they were thought and planned to be implemented by the cultural, political, and economic elite of the Western world, since it was, they who “invented”, initiated and tried to put them into practice.

The emergence of cattle breeding and agriculture allowed the peoples who introduced them into their daily life to reproduce on a systematic basis surplus social product, which in turn contributed to the process of socio-property differentiation of society and the emergence of estates and classes. The further result of this process was the emergence of the first cities and states, in which the redistribution of surplus social product began to be carried out based on class differentiation of society, almost always by force or, in any case, on the basis of the principle of force. And, no matter how unjust (from the modern point of view) this redistribution was, those people who created the first states began to develop more rapidly in comparison with those people who, for one reason or another, could not create them. It should be noted that practically all the most ancient peoples adhered to a nomadic way of life to a greater or lesser extent, which itself implied such activities as hunting and gathering. The transition to cattle breeding not only did not eliminate the nomadic form of life but, on the contrary, as it seems, only contributed to its strengthening, since nomads always needed pastures. Only the transition of some people to agriculture allowed the latter to abandon nomadic pastoralism and engage in its sedentary form. And since that time, for many centuries, universal human culture began to develop in its main common varieties - nomadic and sedentary, when the latter, in whatever concrete form it appeared, whatever people it was created by, was characterized, in comparison with the former, by greater dynamism.

The emergence of agriculture and its corresponding form of pastoralism, as the latter evolved, led to the fact that the exploitation of man by man took on such a stable and habitual character that such an order was finally enshrined in appropriate formalized laws, and from that moment, in fact, such a phenomenon as the state emerged. Special attention should be paid to the last

circumstance. The point is that to date, there is no single, universally recognized definition of the category of the state in any of the humanities, nor even in international law. There are many technical definitions, according to one of which the state is a political form of organization of society on a certain territory, a political-territorial sovereign organization of public authority, which has an apparatus of management and coercion, to which the entire population of the territory is subordinated in one way or another.

Ancient states, despite their antiquity, nevertheless, in general, corresponded to this definition. However, for our work, several philosophical definitions of the state belonging to G. Hegel are of greater interest. According to one of these definitions, the state is a common spiritual life, to which "individuals treat with trust and get used to from birth and in which their essence and their activity are expressed" (Gegel', 1993: 148). According to another definition, the state is "the reality of the moral idea - the moral spirit as an apparent, self-evident, substantive will that thinks and knows itself and fulfills what it knows, and because it knows it. In morals, it has its immediate existence, and in the self-consciousness of a single person, his knowledge and activity - its mediated existence..." (Gegel', 1934: 279).

Thus, if we strictly follow the meaning and spirit of the definitions that were given by the German philosopher, then within the state, existing, of course, on a certain territory, protected and improved by its population, a stable special semantic and spiritual space, in which the self-consciousness of an individual, a single person, his real life, develops and then develops with necessity, and without the state the formation of such a space is, if not impossible, then at any rate impossible. It is well known that G. Hegel was an absolute advocate, adherent of the state as such, and for this reason he refused, in fact, in the development of peoples who for one reason or another failed to create a state, because the state, according to his conviction, is nothing else than "a form, which is the full realization of the spirit in the actual being" (Gegel', 1934: 70).

It is well known that Kazakhs and Kyrgyz, due to their deep commitment to the nomadic way of life, for the predominant part of their history existed without the state and, accordingly, outside the state forms of life, and, thus, both our peoples do not fit, or rather, do not fully correspond to Hegel's ideas of development. It would, however, be a mistake to reproach him for denying development to non-state peoples, since it is obvious that all people once existed outside the state. Still, as soon as they found it, they began to evolve, firstly, much faster than before, and, secondly, in a special way - purposefully and often quite consciously, since states and entire civilisations entered, as a rule, into mutual fierce competition, in which those states that were more developed, at least in technical and military terms, won.

In connection with the essential difference between sedentary and nomadic types of civilisation, it should be pointed out that the first states emerged not only around the first cities but also on their basis. A city could arise only in the simultaneous presence of several conditions. First, there was a relatively high level of division of social labour, which, in turn, was possible at a relatively high level of labour productivity in agriculture. Secondly, with a significant predominance of the producing form of economic management over the appropriating form, i.e., such a form, when people use in their life process ready-made natural products, which do not contain in themselves, or contain a very small amount of human effort. It is obvious that the producing form of economy, although it does not remove man's dependence on the natural

environment, thanks to certain knowledge and relatively high productivity of labour, made him much less dependent than in the primitive epoch when this dependence had an absolute character. Getting out from under it meant, at the same time, a significant reduction in the dependence of people on each other within societies close to their internal life. The state is an effective form of organisation of initially tribal and then proto-ethnic formations. The social, finally formed into a people, *ethnos*, further developing within the state, became so accustomed to the state existence that later it could not think of its existence outside it, which, gave the basis for G. Hegel to define the state as a common spiritual life, to which "individuals treat with trust and get used to from birth and in which their essence and their activity are expressed" (Gegel', 1993:148).

As soon as the first states and civilisations emerged, the process was greatly accelerated when a more or less homogeneous universal (in the purely summarised sense of the word) culture began to develop in different directions, which in a certain sense can be interpreted as the disintegration of a single human culture into a multitude of ethnic cultures, which, as they develop, will necessarily acquire more and more new features. As a result, over time, the differences, taken in their totality, will be so significant that it may give a false impression, in our opinion, that there is an insurmountable gulf between the many civilizations that have emerged in the process of historical development. In this connection, let us recall an excerpt from the famous poem of the British writer and poet, Nobel Prize winner R. Kipling, "The Ballad of East and West":

"West is West, East is East, they will never come together.

Until the very last days of the earth, until the Last Judgement!"

It should be noted that many researchers, while often citing these two poetic stanzas as an argument in favour of the impossibility of unity of heterogeneous civilizations and cultures, their fatal negation of each other, rarely refer to the two further stanzas, which are as follows:

"But there is neither West nor East, there are no countries, no borders or races,

If two strong face-to-face meets at a certain hour!"

It is not clear what exactly R. Kipling meant when he wrote these lines. It can be assumed that, for example, when the West and the East clash in their relationship, everything will ultimately be decided by force. The famous German philosopher of the XX century K. Jaspers, considering the West and the East in their close and inseparable interrelation, emphasized that "since the times of Herodotus, the contradiction between the Western and Eastern worlds has been realized as an original and eternal opposition, revealing itself in all new images. ... The Greeks laid the foundation of the Western world, and they did it in such a way that this world exists only insofar as it constantly directs its gaze to the East, is in a division with it, understanding it and alienating from it, adopting from it certain features and processing them, struggling with it, and in this struggle the power alternately passes from one side to the other" (Jaspers, 1991: 89).

The civilizational development of mankind was marked by the eventual creation of an enormous diversity of languages and cultures, which was largely since many societies, possessing different knowledge and production capabilities, began to develop at different speeds. Social time, which was identical to physical time, ceased to be the same for all people in the primitive epoch and began to be divided according to the level and nature of the division of social labour of each of the people, who began to live at different socio-economic pace and

time, which became a derivative of purposeful, systematic economic activity of people. In other words, with the emergence of civilizations on the historical stage, the phenomenon of social time, which has a forced rhythm, character, and pace, emerged. However, only those people who created their own states were involved in this process. Thus, nomadic peoples, who continued to adhere mainly to the appropriating rather than producing a form of economy, continued to live in ordinary, physical time, adjusting their economic activity to natural rhythms. The constant movements in space did not allow them to go beyond their habitual rhythm and sense of time. It does not follow from the above that the sedentary peoples neglected or did not take into account natural rhythms, because agriculture, which served as the basis of any ancient civilization, is impossible without knowledge and consideration of natural regularities and rhythms. But, on the other hand, sedentary peoples developed many professions and occupations (construction, architecture, engineering, pottery, various crafts, weaving, carpentry and many other industries and professions), in which it was not necessary to take into account natural rhythms, orienting their activities mainly on the demand and social need for certain products of labour. Sedentary peoples, being placed in enclosed spaces, had to systematically improve production to survive, which was a chain of rational, purposeful efforts that invariably resulted in the space being constantly saturated with labour. People, whose basis of life was agriculture, as it has already been said, did not ignore natural rhythms, as plants cannot live outside these rhythms, however, constantly improved production, or production skills saturated the space in the sum of both material and spiritual content, which, in fact, allowed almost all agricultural peoples, who created a systematic surplus social product, to create such an important and complex cultural phenomenon as the city. It should be stressed that the city is perhaps the main thing that distinguishes all sedentary civilizations from nomadic ones. Although powerful empires, which in the process of history were formed by nomadic peoples, had their cities and capitals, the latter were created by the labour and knowledge of the sedentary part of the population of the empires, which was in complete subordination to the nomads. The city, in which nomads felt squeezed into a narrow and uncomfortable space, was alien to them, and habitual activities, mastered, as a rule, from childhood, were not connected with the urban way of life. The habitual and authentic life of nomads could take place only in the presence of wide spaces that contained everything necessary for life. However, such an attitude to the city, and inevitably to the state, led to the fact that nomadic peoples were extremely conservative in their development, which in turn determined their place and role in the historical process. Nomadic peoples in their overwhelming majority represented militarised, militaristic or semi-militaristic societies, which were conditioned by the struggle for survival, and fierce competition for fertile, livable territories and resources. They, unlike sedentary peoples, created a non-creative type of civilization. Under such conditions, they were assigned the role of a catalyst of the historical process in world history. Sedentary peoples, coming in contact in one way or another with nomadic peoples, often had to make considerable efforts to ensure their military, economic and political security, in connection with which K. Jaspers wrote the following: «The invasion of nomadic peoples from the centre of Asia, who reached China, India and the countries of the West (from them the great cultures of antiquity borrowed the use of the horse), had similar consequences in all three areas: having horses, these nomadic peoples learnt the far reaches of

the world. They conquered the states of the great cultures of antiquity. ... As the dominant race, they brought to the world heroic and tragic consciousness, which was reflected in the epic» (Jaspers, 1991: 46).

Despite the fact that the culture of nomadic peoples was, as has already been said, militaristic in nature, it does not necessarily follow that the sedentary peoples were less warlike and aggressive than the nomads. The expression of T. Hobbes "war of all against all", who thus described the natural, as he thought, state of society before "social contracts" were concluded and states were formed, is quite true for all peoples both in the primitive epoch and in the civilization epoch. In politics, the basic principle has almost always been, and still is, the inviolable principle of the rigid defence by the peoples who have entered into certain mutual relations of their own interests and mutual restraint. This principle, which is based on human nature, follows another fundamental principle, which in modern geopolitical science is usually defined as the principle of balance of power, and which is one of the fundamentals in the system of international relations. This principle, as a huge and diverse historical experience shows, is the basis of real politics and has been and remains the guiding principle in the interactions of all peoples and states from the primitive era to the present. In history, there has not existed, as experts have emphasised many times, a single state or system of states that could ignore this principle as a fundamental one. Strictly obeying this principle, each nation and state, as rich practice shows, if it was not hindered or had little resistance, seized territories and spread its influence as far as it had enough strength and opportunities. As one of the founders of geopolitics, Swedish sociologist and political scientist R. Chellen wrote: "The state is not an accidental or artificial conglomeration of various aspects of human life... it is characterised by organic growth, it is an expression of the same fundamental type as man himself. ...it is ... a biological entity or living being", which follows the law of growth, while "strong, viable states, having a limited space, obey the categorical imperative to expand its space by colonisation, amalgamation or conquest" (Bartol'd, 1963:18-19).

We would not have paid so much attention to the above principles if the cultures of particular peoples or groups of peoples were not disseminated locally, regionally, and globally according to the same principles. In other words, in strict adherence to this principle, each people and State, as ample practice amply demonstrates, if there is little or no obstruction, spreads its own language and culture to the extent that it has the strength, means, and capacity to do so. Culture has been and remains the most important political instrument, providing mainly the solution of long-term, strategic tasks, connected, as a rule, with the irrevocable inclusion of subordinated territories into the body of the state or, if such a task is impossible, with such a long-term influence on the culture of another people, providing allied or loyal attitude to itself. The experience and practice of the most successful empires in the history of mankind testify in favour of this statement. The ancient Romans were able to spread their language and culture and thus ensured their existence for thousands of years. The Russian Empire did the same and successfully continued its own existence by introducing its own language and culture throughout its vast state. China, as we know, has rarely won external wars. However, by incorporating into its own culture all those peoples who conquered and subjugated it eventually transformed them to such an extent that it turned them into itself. Conversely, people who failed for one reason or

another to incorporate their own culture into the fabric of the cultures of other people fell off the historical stage, at least as leaders, as supreme rulers. Thus, the Mongols, having established the most extensive empire in all of human history, lost the empire within less than a hundred years. The Arabs, despite their relative smallness, were able to create an empire that lasted about six centuries, and even though the Seljuks invaded the Caliphate and then the Mongols eliminated them from the political map of the world as representatives of the imperial people, nevertheless, the Arabs, thanks to the fact that they spread Islam, maintained their spiritual supremacy, which has not been lost to this day for quite a large part of the world.

With the emergence of the first states and civilizations on Earth, a process of continuous fragmentation and differentiation of languages and cultures began. This phenomenon was largely driven by the dispersion of people across the planet. However, alongside this process, there was another, directly opposing process, in which some people and cultures absorbed others.

Currently, the process of cultural absorption has reached unprecedented levels, particularly in the context of globalization. Russian philosopher S.S. Chistyakova notes that “the globalization of culture in the modern world challenges the central position of national cultures, national identities, and their institutions” (Chistyakova, 2007:9). According to her, this challenge - and indeed a threat - comes primarily from mass culture and the consumerist and materialistic tendencies prevalent today (Chistyakova, 2007: 9).

In this environment of cultural globalization, the issue of values has become a critical concern, which Chistyakova identifies as one of the «central problems of modern civilization» (Chistyakova, 2007:10). To preserve original values, it is essential to do so within the boundaries of national cultures. Therefore, Chistyakova emphasizes the need for selectivity when borrowing forms, modes of thinking, and cultural values. A selective mechanism must be developed to ensure that national cultures can participate successfully in the global space (Chistyakova, 2007:10).

S.S. Chistyakova notes that globalization processes in the sphere of culture have been taking place practically throughout the history of mankind, but with different intensities and in different spheres at different historical intervals. However, these processes took place in the sphere of religion in the most vivid and contradictory way. On the other hand, the globalization of culture in the past was carried out mainly by empires and was part of their “multicultural strategy” (Chistyakova, 2007:15).

S.S. Chistyakova rightly points out that in the conditions of globalization of culture, one of the key issues has become the problem of identity of the individual and society in connection with the real and ever-increasing threat of the loss of the original cultural and civilizational identity, the loss of which leads to fragmentation, disintegration of society, the split of its socio-cultural space and a deep crisis of culture (Chistyakova, 2007:17). At present, we can distinguish two main directions in the search for their own identity, one of which is multiculturalism, and the other is isolation, closing on group cultural values, which are the characteristics of their own difference from the rest of the world (Chistyakova, 2007:17).

S.S. Chistyakova draws attention to the special role of religion in the conditions of globalization of culture. Such a role is since religion is most closely related to traditional values, worldview, and social institutions, the existence of which largely depends on the provision at the expense

of religious institutions and worldview. "World religions, - stresses S.S. Chistyakova, - offer their options for coexistence with globalization, from which it is impossible to hide in the modern world" (Chistjakova, 2007: 19).

In the modern world, according to S.S. Chistyakova, of the world religions, Islam is the most viable, at the same time, on the one hand, it is intensively globalised, on the other hand, it actively and often fiercely resists globalization, or rather, westernisation, which in this case is the same thing. One of the reactions and responses of Islam is its politicisation (Chistjakova, 2007:21).

## **Conclusion**

Based on the results of the study, the authors have structured the following conclusions:

1. The problem of global culture formation is a complex and multifaceted process located at the intersection of various disciplinary fields - cultural studies, sociology, philosophy, anthropology, and political science. The analysis shows that, despite the abundance of research on cultural globalization, the question of the essence, mechanisms, and consequences of the formation of global culture remains insufficiently studied and causes scientific discussions.

2. Modern research focuses on either the universalization of cultural practices or the phenomenon of glocalization, but there is a methodological gap between these approaches. The aspects of the influence of historical and cultural contexts on the perception of global culture in different regions of the world have also been insufficiently developed, which leads to a simplified understanding of cultural integration processes. In addition, the impact of digital technologies and transnational information flows on the transformation of cultural norms and identities requires deeper scientific reflection.

Thus, the problem of global culture formation remains relevant and promising for further scientific research. An interdisciplinary approach combining theoretical analysis with empirical data is needed to better understand the balance between global and local, as well as to develop mechanisms for the harmonious coexistence of cultures in the context of increasing globalization.

In conclusion, it can be stated that cultural globalization, despite its complexities and conflicts, has accompanied humanity throughout history since the primitive era. The processes of cultural integration and differentiation are historically interconnected. On one hand, they facilitate the exchange of knowledge, technology, and values; on the other hand, they help preserve the uniqueness and differences among people. The emergence of the first states and civilizations accelerated the fragmentation of a homogeneous universal culture, paving the way for the formation of distinct ethnic and national identities.

In the modern era, the globalization of culture has intensified and faces several challenges, including the potential loss of national identities. This situation highlights the need to develop selective mechanisms of interaction. Additionally, it can be emphasized that culture remains a crucial policy tool that can both foster integration and provoke conflict.

Therefore, this study affirms that the process of cultural globalization is not only inevitable but also requires careful consideration of historical, social, and cultural factors to preserve the harmony and uniqueness of national cultures.

### Authors' contributions

**Torgyn Sadykova** – a significant contribution to the conception and design of the study; carrying out the analysis and interpretation of the data obtained; writing the text of the article and critically revising its content; approving the final version of the article for publication; responsibility for adhering to scientific standards and collecting bibliographic material.

**Vakur Sumer** – conceptual contribution to the research with a focus on global and historical analysis; contributing to the writing of key theoretical sections of the article; providing peer review.

**Assem Kulbayeva** – organisation of data and management of the research process; preparation and design of the text of the article; coordination of collaborative work between authors, analysis of the results of the work.

### CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The authors declare no relevant conflict of interests

### References

1. Гезалов А.А., Комиссаров С.Н. Глобализация как фактор развития национальных культур // ПОИСК: Политика. Обществоведение. Искусство. Социология. Культура: научный и социокультурный журнал // М.: РУТ (МИИТ), 2022. – Вып. №4 (93). – С. 33-44.
2. Гудков Д.Б. Единицы кодов культуры: проблемы семантики // Язык, сознание, коммуникация. – М.: МАКС Пресс. – 2004. – С. 39-50.
3. Crystal D. English as a Global Language – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. – 212 p.
4. Запесоцкий А.С. Становление глобальной культуры и конфликты цивилизаций // Материалы Международных Лихачевских научных чтений. – СПб.: СПбГУП, 2018. – 197 с.
5. Ницше Ф. Сочинения в 2 т. – Т. 1 / Сост., ред. изд., вступ. ст. и примеч. К. А. Свасьяна; Пер. с нем. – М.: Мысль. – 1997. – 829 с. [Электронный ресурс] – 2025. – URL: <https://www.philosophy.ru/library/sochineniya-v-2-kh-tomakh-t-1-filosofskoe-nasledie-t-125/> (дата обращения 15.01.2025).
6. Мень А. История религии: В поисках Пути, Истины и Жизни. – М.: СП «Слово», 1991. – 462 с.
7. Франкфорт Г., Франкфорт Г.А., Уилсон Дж., Якобсен Т. В преддверии философии. Духовные искания древнего человека. – 1984. – 236 с. [Электронный ресурс] – 2025. – URL: [https://psv4.userapi.com/s/v1/d/QZMVD5qtA\\_dUMxO\\_ZUINT2i124QOTduanc106JcN13zqptyCMk0G1POB8BFcQEjZGdBzWc5v15VUjJPvxk9PX1GbcWVmPDMuNO--milTz\\_zwsFy/Frankfort\\_i\\_dr\\_V\\_preddverii\\_filosofii.pdf](https://psv4.userapi.com/s/v1/d/QZMVD5qtA_dUMxO_ZUINT2i124QOTduanc106JcN13zqptyCMk0G1POB8BFcQEjZGdBzWc5v15VUjJPvxk9PX1GbcWVmPDMuNO--milTz_zwsFy/Frankfort_i_dr_V_preddverii_filosofii.pdf) (дата обращения 15.01.2025).
8. Шемякин Я.Г. В поисках смысла. Из истории философии и религии: Книга для чтения. – М.: РИПОЛ Классик, 2003. – 432 с.
9. Гречко П.К. Концептуальные модели истории. Пособие для студентов. – М. Логос. – 1995. – 144 с. [Электронный ресурс] – URL: [https://www.gumer.info/bibliotek\\_Buks/History/Grech/01.php](https://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/History/Grech/01.php) (дата обращения 15.01.2025).
10. Мамбеталиева, Г.С. Оптимизация в контексте глобализации. – Бишкек: Илим, 2007. – 126 с.
11. Гегель Г.В.Ф. Философия истории. – СПб.: Наука, 1993. – 480 с.



12. Гегель Г.В.Ф. Философия права. – М.: Соцэкгиз, 1934. – 384 с.
13. Ясперс К. Смысл и назначение истории. – М.: Политиздат, 1991. – 527 с.
14. Бартольд В.В. Киргизы. Исторический очерк. Соч. – Т. II. – Ч. I. – М.: Политиздат, 1963. – 560 с.
15. Чистякова, С.С. Глобализация культуры: генезис, типология, современные смыслы: диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата исторических наук: защищена: 22.04.07. – Белгород: Наука, 2007. – 168 с.

**Торғын Садыкова<sup>а</sup>, Вакур Сумер<sup>б</sup>, Әсем Көлбаева<sup>с</sup>**

<sup>а</sup>*С. Сейфуллин атындағы Қазақ агротехникалық зерттеу университеті, Астана, Қазақстан*

<sup>б</sup>*Сельчук университеті, Конья, Түркия*

<sup>с</sup>*Ш. Есенов атындағы Каспий технологиялар және инжиниринг университеті, Ақтау, Қазақстан*

### **Жаһандық мәдениеттің қалыптасуының философиялық негіздері**

**Аңдатпа.** Мақалада жаһандық мәдениеттің қалыптасу үдерісіне философиялық талдау жүргізіледі. Зерттеу объективті заңдылықтар, яғни тарихи контекст пен мәдени кодтар, мен субъективті факторлар, атап айтқанда бірегейлікті сақтау, арасындағы диалектикалық байланысты ашып көрсетеді. Негізгі назар аударылатын мәдени жаһандану механизмдеріне: мәдени унификация, жаһандық пен жергілікті өзара әрекеттесу динамикасы, сондай-ақ цифрландырудың әлеуметтік-мәдени салаға әсері жатады. Методологиялық негіз ретінде Гегельдің тарихи диалектикалық тәсілі, Ницшенің мәдени сын көзқарастары және Ясперстің өркениеттік даму парадигмасы пайдаланылды. Номадтық және отырықшы өркениеттердің тарихи өзара әрекеттесуі, империялардың мәдени экспансиясы сияқты мысалдар арқылы жаһандық мәдениеттің эволюциялық даму барысы қарастырылады. Зерттеу нәтижелері мәдени элементтердің интеграциясы мен ұлттық сәйкестікті сақтау арасындағы негізгі қайшылықтарды, массалық мәдениеттің әсер ету рөлін, сондай-ақ мәдени алмасудың асимметриялық сипатын айқындайды. Құндылықтарды игеруде таңдаулы тәсілдерді қолданудың маңыздылығын атап өтеді, бұл әртүрлі мәдениеттердің үйлесімді өзара әрекеттесуіне мүмкіндік береді. Нәтижелер бойынша мәдени жаһанданудың тарихи тәжірибе, әлеуметтік трансформациялар және цифрлық технологиялардың әсері ескерілген жағдайда да қайшылықты, бірақ объективті үдеріс ретінде қалыптасатыны дәлелденеді. Мақала жаһандық пен жергілікті мәдениет арасындағы тепе-теңдікті сақтау мәселесін кешенді түрде зерттеуге, сондай-ақ философия, тарих және мәдениеттану салаларының өзара әрекеттесуіне үлес қосады.

**Түйін сөздер:** жаһандық мәдениет, мәдени жаһандану, мәдени бірегейлік, диалектикалық қайшылықтар, мәдени бірегейлік, философиялық трансформация, тарихи динамика, тарихи-мәдени талдау.

**Торгын Садыкова<sup>а</sup>, Вакур Сумер<sup>б</sup>, Асем Кульбаева<sup>с</sup>**

<sup>а</sup>Казахский агротехнический исследовательский университет имени С. Сейфуллина,  
Астана, Казакстан

<sup>б</sup>Университет Сельчук, Конья, Турция

<sup>с</sup>Каспийский технологический и инженерный университет имени Ш. Есенова,  
Актау, Казакстан

### **Философские основы формирования глобальной культуры**

**Аннотация.** В статье проводится философский анализ процесса формирования глобальной культуры. Исследование раскрывает диалектическую связь между объективными закономерностями, а именно – историческим контекстом, культурными кодами и субъективными факторами, в частности, сохранением уникальности. Основное внимание уделено механизмам культурной глобализации: унификации, динамике взаимодействия глобального и локального, а также влиянию цифровизации на социокультурную сферу. Методологическая база включает историко-диалектический подход Гегеля, культурно-критические взгляды Ницше и парадигму цивилизационного развития Ясперса. На примере исторического взаимодействия кочевых и оседлых цивилизаций, культурной экспансии империй рассматривается эволюционный ход развития глобальной культуры. Результаты исследования выявляют ключевые противоречия между интеграцией культурных элементов и сохранением национальной идентичности, роль массовой культуры и асимметричный характер культурного обмена. Подчеркивается важность избирательных подходов к усвоению ценностей, что обеспечивает гармоничное взаимодействие различных культур. Результаты подтверждают, что культурная глобализация, несмотря на влияние исторического опыта, социальных трансформаций и цифровых технологий, формируется как противоречивый, но объективный процесс. Статья вносит вклад в комплексное изучение баланса между глобальной и локальной культурами, а также во взаимодействие философии, истории и культурологии.

**Ключевые слова:** глобальная культура, культурная глобализация, культурная идентичность, диалектические противоречия, культурная уникальность, философская трансформация, историческая динамика, историко-культурный анализ.

### **References**

1. Gezalov A.A., Komissarov S.N. Globalizaciya kak faktor razvitiya nacional'nyh kul'tur [Globalization as a factor in the development of national cultures]. POISK: Politika. Obshchestvovedenie. Iskusstvo. Sociologiya. Kul'tura: nauchnyj i sociokul'turnyj zhurnal [SEARCH: Politics. Social Science. Art. Sociology. Culture: scientific and sociocultural journal] M.: RUT (MIIT). 2022. №4(93). P.33-44. [in Russian]
2. Gudkov D.B. Edinicy kodov kul'tury: problemy semantiki [Units of cultural codes: problems of semantics]. Yazyk, soznanie, kommunikaciya. M.: MAKSS Press. 2004. 39-50 p. [in Russian]
3. Crystal D. English as a Global Language – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. 212 p.
4. Zapesockij A.S. Stanovlenie global'noj kul'tury i konflikty civilizacij. Materialy Mezhdunarodnyh Lihachevskih nauchnyh chtenij [Formation of global culture and conflicts of civilizations. Proceedings of the International Likhachev Scientific Readings]. SPb.: SPbGUP, 2018. 197 p. [in Russian]

5. Nicshe F. Sochineniya [essays] v 2t. – T.1. M.: Mysl'. 1997. 829 p [Available at: <https://www.philosophy.ru/library/sochineniya-v-2-kh-tomakh-t-1-filosofskoe-nasledie-t-125/> (accessed 15.01.2025). [in Russian]
6. Men' A. Istoriya religii: V poiskah Puti, Istiny i Zhizni [History of Religion: In Search of the Way, Truth and Life]. M.: SP «Slovo», 1991. 462 p. [in Russian]
7. Frankfort G., Frankfort G.A., Uilson Dzh., Yakobsen T. V preddverii filosofii. Duhovnye iskaniya drevnego cheloveka [On the Threshold of Philosophy. Spiritual Quests of Ancient Man]. 1984. 236p. Available at: [https://psv4.userapi.com/s/v1/d/QZMVD5qtA\\_dUMxO\\_ZUINT2i124QOTduanc106JcN13zqptyCMk0G1POB8BFcQEjZGdBzWc5v15VUjJPvXk9PX1GbcWVmPDMuNO--milTz\\_zwsFy/Frankfort\\_i\\_dr\\_V\\_preddverii\\_filosofii.pdf](https://psv4.userapi.com/s/v1/d/QZMVD5qtA_dUMxO_ZUINT2i124QOTduanc106JcN13zqptyCMk0G1POB8BFcQEjZGdBzWc5v15VUjJPvXk9PX1GbcWVmPDMuNO--milTz_zwsFy/Frankfort_i_dr_V_preddverii_filosofii.pdf) (accessed 15.01.2025). [in Russian]
8. Shemyakin Y.G. V poiskah smysla. Iz istorii filosofii i religii: Kniga dlya chteniya [In Search of Meaning. From the History of Philosophy and Religion: A Book to Read]. M.: RIPOL Klassik, 2003. 432 p. [in Russian]
9. Grechko P.K. Konceptual'nye modeli istorii. Posobie dlya studentov [Conceptual Models of History. A Manual for Students]. M. Logos. 1995. 144 p. Available at: [https://www.gumer.info/bibliotek\\_Buks/History/Grech/01.php](https://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/History/Grech/01.php) (accessed 15.01.2025). [in Russian]
10. Mambetalieva, G.S. Optimizaciya v kontekste globalizacii [Optimization in the context of globalization]. Bishkek: Ilim, 2007. 126 p. [in Russian]
11. Hegel' G.V.F. Filosofiya istorii [Philosophy of history]. SPb.: Nauka, 1993. 480 p. [in Russian]
12. Hegel' G.V.F. Filosofiya prava [Philosophy of Law]. M.: Socekiz, 1934. 384p. [in Russian]
13. Yaspers K. Smysl i naznachenie isto-rii [The meaning and purpose of history]. M: Politizdat, 1991. 527 p. [in Russian]
14. Bartol'd V.V. Kirgizy. Istoricheskij ocherk [The Kyrgyz: A historical essay]. Soch. – T. II. – CH. I. M.: Politizdat, 1963. 560p. [in Russian]
15. Chistyakova, S.S. Globalizaciya kul'tury: genezis, tipologiya, sovremennye smysly [Globalization of Culture: Genesis, Typology, Modern Meanings]: dissertaciya na soiskanie uchenoj stepeni kandidata istoricheskikh nauk: zashchishchena: 22.04.07. – Belgorod: Nauka, 2007. 168p. [in Russian]

#### **Авторлар туралы мәлімет Сведения об авторах / Information about authors:**

**Садыкова Торғын** – гуманитарлық ғылымдар магистрі, С.Сейфуллин атындағы Қазақ агротехникалық зерттеу университетінің аға оқытушысы, Жеңіс даңғылы 62, 010000, Астана, Қазақстан, email: storgyn@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8952-0253>

**Сумер Вакур** – PhD, Селжук университетінің профессоры, Конья қаласы, 42003, Түркия, email: vsumer@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7015-5660>

**Көлбаева Әсем** – магистр, Ш. Есенов атындағы Каспий технологиялар және инжиниринг университеті, әлеуметтік-гуманитарлық пәндер және Қазақстан халқы Ассамблеясы кафедрасының меңгерушісі, Ақтау қаласы, Ақтау көшесі, 32, 130000, Қазақстан, email: assemkulbayeva@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-9225-9809>

**Sadykova Torgyn** – Master of Humanities, Senior Lecturer, S. Seifullin Kazakh Agrotechnical Research University, Zhenis Avenue 62, 010000, Astana, Kazakhstan, email:storgyn@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8952-0253>

**Vakur Sumer** – PhD, Professor, Selcuk University, Konya City, 42003, Turkey, email:vsumer@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7015-5660>

**Kulbayeva Assem** – Master's degree holder, Head of the Department of Social and Humanitarian Disciplines and the Assembly of People of Kazakhstan, Sh. Yessenov Caspian University of Technology and Engineering, 32 Aktau Street, 130000, Aktau, Kazakhstan, assemkulbayeva@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-9225-9809>

**Садыкова Торгын** – магистр гуманитарных наук, старший преподаватель, Казахский агротехнический исследовательский университет имени С. Сейфуллина, пр. Победы, 62, 010000, Астана, Казахстан, email:storgyn@mail.ru, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8952-0253>

**Сумер Вакур** – PhD, профессор Сельчукского университета, г. Конья, 42003, Турция, email:vsumer@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7015-5660>

**Кульбаева Асем** – магистр, заведующий кафедрой социально-гуманитарных дисциплин и Ассамблеи народа Казахстана Каспийского университета технологий и инжиниринга имени Ш. Есенова, проспект Актау, 32, 130000, Актау, Казахстан, assemkulbayeva@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-9225-9809>

The article was submitted 07.01.2025; approved after reviewing 15.03.2025; accepted for publication 27.03.2025