

IRSTI 13.11.59

<https://orcid.org/0009-0008-9681-1495>**T. Seryozhkina** 

«Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages» JSC.

Almaty, Kazakhstan

e-mail: Seryozhkina.T@ablaikhan.kz

## **MILESTONES OF CIVILIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: GLOBALIZATION AND DE-GLOBALIZATION OF CULTURE**

The current stage of human growth, which is marked by instability, contradictions, and the nonlinearity of global processes, is examined in this article. The universalist concept of globalization, including its cultural component, is in crisis due to the development of information and communication technologies, the escalation of tensions between rich and developing nations, and the growth of social and geopolitical conflicts. In light of this, the idea of cultural de-globalization has become more popular as a way to oppose unilateral cultural dominance and restore cultural subjectivity. The study's goal is to pinpoint the key elements of cultural de-globalization and how it contributes to the evolution of the world order. In addition to discussing strategies for the resuscitation of regional identities, national languages, and symbolic systems, the study examines the historical development of the link between culture and civilization. The work's scholarly innovation is its conception of de-globalization as a positive trend that fosters cultural heterogeneity. The findings' relevance to the creation of cultural policies founded on communication, inclusion, and respect for the variety of civilizational models demonstrates the study's practical significance.

**Keywords:** culture, civilization, globalization, de-globalization, slowbalization, cultural-historical types.

Т.В. Серёжкина

«Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем тілдері университеті» АҚ,

Алматы, Қазақстан

e-mail: Seryozhkina.T@ablaikhan.kz

### **Өркениеттік дамудың белестері: мәдениеттің жаһандануы және де-глобализациясы**

Мақала жаһандық процестердің тұрақсыздығымен, сәйкессіздігімен және сызықты еместігімен сипатталатын адам дамуының қазіргі кезеңін зерттеуге арналған. Ақпараттық-коммуникациялық технологиялардың дамуы, дамыған және дамушы елдер арасындағы қарама-қайшылықтың шиеленісуі, әлеуметтік және геосаяси шиеленістердің өсуі жаһанданудың әмбебап моделінің, оның ішінде оның мәдени өлшемінің дағдарысын тудырды. Осының аясында мәдени де-жаһандану феномені мәдени субъективтілікті қалпына келтіруге және біржақты мәдени үстемдіктен бас тартуға ұмтылудың бір түрі ретінде өзектіленеді. Зерттеудің мақсаты – мәдени де-жаһанданудың маңызды сипаттамаларын және оның жаһандық тәртіпті өзгертудегі рөлін анықтау. Мақалада мәдениет пен өркениеттің өзара әрекеттесуінің тарихи эволюциясы талданады, жергілікті ерекшеліктерге, ұлттық тілдерге, символдық жүйелерге оралу тетіктері сипатталады. Жұмыстың ғылыми жаңалығы де-жаһандануды мәдени плюрализмді қалыптастырудың сындарлы процесі ретінде түсінуде жатыр. Зерттеудің практикалық маңыздылығы оның нәтижелерін диалогқа, инклюзивтілікке және өркениеттік үлгілердің алуан түрлілігін құрметтеуге бағытталған мәдени саясатты қалыптастыруда қолдану мүмкіндігінде жатыр.

**Түйін сөздер:** мәдениет, өркениет, жаһандану, де-жаһандану, слоу-жаһандану, мәдени-тарихи типтер.

Т.В. Серёжкина

АО «Казахский университет международных отношений и мировых языков имени Абылай хана»,  
Алматы, Казахстан  
e-mail: Seryozhkina.T@ablaikhan.kz

**Вехи цивилизационного развития:  
глобализация и де-глобализация культуры**

Статья посвящена исследованию современного этапа развития человечества, характеризующегося нестабильностью, противоречивостью и нелинейностью глобальных процессов. Развитие информационно-коммуникационных технологий, обострение противостояния между развитыми и развивающимися странами, рост социального и геополитического напряжения обусловили кризис универсалистской модели глобализации, включая её культурное измерение. На этом фоне актуализируется феномен культурной де-глобализации как форма стремления к восстановлению культурной субъектности и отказу от одностороннего культурного доминирования. Цель исследования – выявление сущностных характеристик культурной де-глобализации и её роли в трансформации глобального порядка. В статье проведён анализ исторической эволюции взаимодействия культуры и цивилизации, описаны механизмы возврата к локальным идентичностям, национальным языкам, символическим системам. Научная новизна работы заключается в осмыслении де-глобализации как конструктивного процесса формирования культурного плюрализма. Практическая значимость исследования заключается в применимости его выводов при формировании культурной политики, ориентированной на диалог, инклюзивность и уважение к многообразию цивилизационных моделей.

**Ключевые слова:** культура, цивилизация, глобализация, де-глобализация, глобализация, культурно-исторические типы.

## Introduction

The link between culture and civilization has been significantly altered by current globalization processes, which have also brought forth a whole new paradigm for comprehending human behavior. The process of increasing interdependence between nations and peoples, strengthening transnational ties, erasing national and cultural barriers, internationalizing awareness, and uniting value systems is known as globalization. In addition to creating chances for integration, this process also gives rise to worries about the strengthening of cultural homogenization, the loss of cultural diversity, the formalization of identity, and the rise of a unipolar civilizational growth model.

According to the Russian philosopher G. Litvintseva (2011, p. 43-54), globalization has not lived up to the aspirations of a large portion of the world community; rather, it has sparked new kinds of crises, including existential, axiological, and socio-cultural ones. In the context of this new reality, culture is no longer viewed as merely a component of the superstructure of civilizations but rather as a global phenomena that has lost its local specificity. In a similar vein, civilization itself is increasingly seen as a universal human phenomenon, leveling the playing field between civilizations.

However, maintaining cultural identity is still a pressing concern. Experience demonstrates that

many local cultures lose their uniqueness as a result of global interaction, blending into prevailing civilizational currents. However, in many instances, as shown in nations like China, Japan, India, and many others, old cultural models are steadily preserved alongside continuous civilizational growth. The coexistence of modernizing and traditionalist paths within a single cultural-civilizational framework is illustrated by these examples.

At this point, the question concerning how culture and civilization relate to one another becomes crucial because only by combining them can the problems of global capitalism be resolved and a new global order founded on the values of communication, diversity, and spiritual interdependence be established. In this situation, culture transforms into an ideological trajectory that establishes the paths of global development rather than just a set of symbols or a way to express one's individuality. This calls for fair interactions between civilizations, preserving the globe against ideological and cultural spread, and attempting to achieve a balance between innovation and tradition, technical progress and spiritual regeneration.

The advancement of modern civilization undoubtedly enhanced people's quality of life, from economic expansion to technological advancements in artificial intelligence, information systems, and healthcare. A sustainable and just global future is impossible without culture, which is where the

riches of humanistic meaning are concentrated. Therefore, it becomes strategically necessary for all of humanity to preserve cultural diversity in the context of globalization.

Throughout the history of philosophical inquiry, the phenomenon of civilization has frequently been the focus of both integrative and classificatory examination. In the writings of O. Spengler (1993), A. Toynbee (1934), P. Sorokin (1937), N. Danilevsky (1895), S. Huntington (1994), and other scholars, the subject of the link between culture and civilization continues to be a basic methodological issue that sparks heated discussions. Given the current state of the globe, scholars must conceptualize civilization as a dynamic, non-linear system marked by the ongoing interaction of cultural and socio-political models, rather than the traditional notion of civilization as a stage of material advancement.

The 21st century's civilizational processes demonstrate a conflicting trend: on the one hand, transnational linkages are growing stronger, but on the other, there is a noticeable shift away from globalization, especially in the cultural realm. A reversal trend known as «cultural de-globalization» is characterized by a return to localized forms of cultural identity, traditional traditions, and civilizational self-sufficiency, as well as a weakening of universalist and unifying conceptions of cultural interaction.

### Methodology

This study's methodology, which combines civilizational, cultural, phenomenological, and systems perspectives, allows for a comprehensive examination of the mechanisms and nature of cultural de-globalization in the modern world. The civilizational method, which views civilization as a cultural-historical system with a stable worldview, value-based institutions, and an inherent logic of growth, is the primary analytical instrument. This framework analyzes how local and global civilizations have changed as a result of globalization processes, as well as how these civilizations have responded by undergoing cultural de-globalization. This method makes it possible to see culture as an equally important force influencing the course and substance of civilizational evolution rather than as a supporting component. A fundamental methodological foundation of this research is the cultural approach, which is centered on the investigation of culture as a carrier of identity, tradition, and sym-

bolic significance. Based on the theories of cultural pluralism and dialogism of cultures (C. Geertz (1973), M. Bakhtin (1981), Y. Lotman (1990)), the study investigates how local cultures resist cultural pressure from around the world and why traditional and ethnospecific forms are resurfacing in the context of de-globalization trends. A foundation for examining various forms of civilizational evolution and models of cultural dynamics (such as Western European, East Asian, and Islamic civilizations) is provided by the author's comparative-historical method. Additionally, it enables the recognition of both similar and unique characteristics in their reactions to processes of globalization.

According to Elias (2001), the term «civilization» encompasses a wide range of facts, including the status of technology, manners, scientific advancements, religious beliefs, and customs. It could relate to the way that men and women live together, to the way that people are punished by the law, or to the way that food is prepared. It encapsulates all that sets current, «more primitive» societies apart from ancient societies or from Western society of the past two or three centuries. It is used to describe a number of significant and proudly Western aspects of civilization, including its worldview, scientific understanding, etiquette, and technological advancements.

S. Huntington (1994) defines civilization as a system of cultures ordered in a hierarchical fashion based on the commonality principle. «We can define civilization as the broadest level of human cultural identity, as a cultural community of the highest rank», he says. There are various levels of self-identification; for example, a person living in Rome may identify as Roman, Italian, Catholic, Christian, European, or Western. The broadest degree of community that he identifies with is civilization. A civilization is a distinct entity. Although they are genuine, the lines separating them are rarely obvious. «The differences between civilizations are not just real. They are the most important», Huntington cautions.

«Civilization can be defined as a combination of large social institutions and symbolic structures that have come together as components of an integrated empirically given education as a result of a long historical development», argues V. Kavolis (2001). When it comes to significant, or symbolically organized, organizations that go beyond local society or particular cultures and encompass a certain «super-culture», they can be regarded as the largest understandable units of study.

The theory of cultural and historical kinds was created by N. Y. Danilevsky (1895). Five laws of these types' operation are formulated by this theory:

«Law 1: Any tribe or family of peoples that has a distinct language or a group of languages that are close enough to one another to be felt directly, without extensive philological research, constitutes an original cultural and historical type, provided that it has already emerged from infancy and is capable of historical development in its spiritual inclinations».

Law 2. The political independence of its peoples is a prerequisite for the emergence and growth of a civilization exclusive to a particular cultural and historical type.

Law 3: Peoples of one cultural and historical type do not inherit the origins of a civilization from those of another kind. With varying degrees of influence from alien, ancient, or contemporary civilizations, each variety develops it for itself.

Law 4. Civilization, which is unique to each type of culture and history, only achieves completeness, diversity, and richness when the ethnographic components that comprise it are diverse and independently form a federation or political system of states.

Law 5. The course of development of cultural and historical types is most closely similar to those perennial single-fruited plants, in which the growth period is indefinitely long, but the period of flowering and fruiting is relatively short and depletes the vitality once [and] forever».

Danilevsky views civilization as a type of internal content of a cultural and historical nature, as the above illustrates. Stated differently, he believes that civilization belongs to the cultural and historical kind. On the other hand, culture (or several cultures) is a component of a civilization, according to figures like S. Huntington and V. Kavolis. Accordingly, the latter writes: «Civilization can be defined as a combination of large social institutions and symbolic structures that have joined together as components of an integrated empirically given education as a result of a long historical development. When it comes to significant, or symbolically organized, organizations that go beyond local society or particular cultures and encompass a certain «super-culture», they can be regarded as the largest understandable units of study» (Danilevsky, 1895).

N. Y. Danilevsky's notion of cultural kinds served as the foundation for O. Spengler's theory of closed cultures. There is proof that the French version of his work introduced him to Danilevsky's

theories. Author emphasized the third law of cultural and historical kinds, which was central to Spengler's notion. «The entire history demonstrates that civilization is not passed down from one cultural and historical type to another; however, this does not imply that they do not have any influence on one another; only this influence is not transmission, and the ways in which civilization spreads must be understood more precisely», author reiterated (Spengler, 1993).

The current periodization of history in Western European science, which emphasizes the Ancient World, the Middle Ages, and the Modern Times, is criticized by Oswald Spengler. For all of humanity, history is portrayed by this science as a single process. Furthermore, Spengler claims that because she is Eurocentric, she is utterly misguided. As he writes: «I refer to this scheme, which is familiar to modern Western Europeans, in which developed cultures revolve around us as the imaginary center of all world achievement, as the Ptolemaic system of history. I consider it a Copernican discovery in the field of history that in this book the old scheme is replaced by a system in which antiquity and the West, along with India, Babylon, China, Egypt, Arab, and Mexican culture, are separate worlds of formation that have the same importance in the overall picture of history and frequently surpass antiquity in the grandiosity of the spiritual concept, the power of take-off, – they occupy an appropriate and not at all privileged position» (Spengler, 1993). Spengler contends that there is no one universal history of humanity. With our historical awareness, we Western Europeans are the exception rather than the rule, he adds. «World history» represents our perception of the globe, not «humanity». Perhaps there won't be a culture or a human type for whom world history would be an equally potent awareness when Western civilization eventually disappears, as there was no vision of the developing globe for the Hindus and Greeks (Spengler, 1993).

Spengler (1993) describes the real world as «a veritable spectacle of many powerful cultures». Each of them is unique, self-contained, and has its own art, music, mathematics, and so on. «The phenomenon of other cultures speaks a different language», the statement reads. For others, there are other realities. «As long as we are talking about genuine philosophy and not some academic nonsense about forms of judgment or categories of feelings, there are no eternal truths», notes Spengler (1993). «Every philosophy is an expression of its own time, and only its own, and there are no two such epochs



that would have the same philosophical intentions» (Spengler, 1993: 176).

N. A. Berdyaev (1939) concurs with Spengler that culture tends to deteriorate as civilization succeeds. However, he declares right away that culture does not vanish when civilization begins; rather, it simply fades into the background and into the depths. Furthermore, N. A. Berdyaev (1939) contends that culture not only endures when civilization begins to dominate, but also continues to exist during that time. This is a distinct perspective from Spengler's: Spengler views culture and civilization as stages; the second does not only follow the first in terms of dominance; rather, she displaces it rather than merely pushing it aside. It is impossible for civilization to exist without culture, and culture cannot exist without civilization. However, this is not the only way that Berdyaev deviates from Spengler's approach. He's going on. And he has the chance to advance because of the aforementioned clause. He acknowledges that culture may have a different viewpoint than transforming it into a civilization. He states that there are other ways to move from culture, which is the tragic antithesis of «life», to the actual transformation of «life». Civilization is not the only one. There is also the route of attaining genuine existence, which is the path of religious transformation of life. Additionally, it adds that the history of humanity can be divided into four epochs and four states: religious change, culture, civilization, and barbarism. Since they represent distinct trajectories of the human soul, these four states can coexist and cannot be taken solely in a chronological order (Berdyaev, 1939). However, one of these circumstances predominates in a particular epoch. Furthermore, civilizations are not seen by N. A. Berdyaev as closed structures with no historical continuity.

### Discussion and results

We believe that globalization and de-globalization are just the next stages of the civilizational development of culture, which demonstrate only the results of human achievements in different spheres of life at the same time complementing such concepts as “civilization”, “progress”, “modernity”, “era”, “modernization” from the point of view of theoretical completeness of definitions and relevance. Despite its misleading ease of usage, the term «globalization» is frequently used to describe quite diverse and frequently disparate events, and its definition is becoming even

more ambiguous. We believe that the migration of globalization from the East to the West and from the South to the North is what makes the twenty-first century unique. In contrast to more traditional nations and cultures like China, India, and Turkey, where the state and government as a whole have a strong influence, this blurring of the lines between cultures, states, and technological forms is what has led to the creation of a global government with European-style governing authority.

A new state of humanity, where individual human motivation is observed, his self-determination in the new conditions, was brought about by the expansion of cultural contacts between peoples, which, on the one hand, led to the borrowing of many traits, traditional values, and cultural characteristics by peoples. The term «globalization of culture», which first appeared in science in the late 1980s, defined the integration of national cultures into the global system. However, there is a chance that traditional cultures will be assimilated into more advanced ones as a result of globalization processes. To put it another way, the process of globalization ensures the development of a common, global culture centered on Western values by making it impossible to realize large ideas without regional integration or internationalization. This leads to the cultural diversity of peoples. As cultural and historical entities with their own mentalities and the ability to maintain their identity in the face of globalization, M. Malinovsky (2013) views globalization as «a condition for the interaction and interpenetration of local cultures». «Cultural globalization is associated with several achievements, such as new global infrastructures of unprecedented scale, providing greater opportunities for cultural elements to penetrate across borders», according to D. Goldblatt, E. McGrew, and J. Perraton (2004, p. 402-403), who view globalization as a factor of progress.

However, opposing viewpoints, such as those put forth by American scientist G. Schiller (1975, p. 11), who coined the term «global capitalist monoculture», imply that the American model of culture (civilization) is spreading throughout the world as a distinct set of values, and they also imply that the future of human civilization is less hopeful. In the United States, the ideological defense of the «American century» has gained traction. Zbigniew Brzezinski (1997, p. 5), who advanced the idea of the United States' «sovereign hegemony» in international affairs within the framework of globalization, was the one who most candidly reflected it. He is the owner of the United States'

«natural doctrine of global hegemony». The United States is «an indispensable nation», according to M. Albright's (2014) declaration at the time. The argument that the United States is unique is being made more and more often. The notion that the «American gene» encompasses geographic, economic, and ideological growth was developed by Barack Obama, the 44th President of the United States, and it still holds true for many people today.

Global culture is first and foremost a global capitalist culture, according to a later essay by British sociologist J. Tomlinson (2004) that described the world's civilizational processes. The global wealth and political and economic clout of multinational businesses serve as ideological forces that shape global cultural reality and propagate the ideals of the capitalist lifestyle, ultimately shaping global culture. Since culture deals with a person's and society's consciousness and way of life, Tomlinson (2004) argues that if culture is viewed as a «way of life», then it should be taken into account in the context of globalization.

«Umwelt is a [shifting] world of everyday life, which the individual carries with him from situation to situation, although this art depends on other people involved in confirming this the world or its reproduction», writes renowned British sociologist E. Giddens (1994, p. 107-134) in his article «Fate. Risk and Security», highlighting how man is always changing the world and how the individual's environment and condition are affected by globalization processes.

«The homogenizing influence of 'global culture' causes, as a response, an increase in opposite trends – an increase in interest in local identities: national cultures, ethnic and religious characteristics», argue Russian cultural scientists Z. Zhukotskaya and L. Kovaleva (2011, p. 110-112). Along with additional traits that help communities and particular groups maintain their uniqueness». In this tendency, scientists observe that communities want to show their cultural distinctiveness, self-identify, and more specifically, integrate their own ethnic traditional values rather than global culture.

The world that man has made is an artificial one, a system that can exist in three various states: stable, mobilizing, and critical. The social order should be the unchanging component of this system. It is still impossible to predict what the social order is and should be in the context of globalization, according to Russian sociologist O. Yanitsky (2016, p. 6), who contrasts the idea of environmentalism with the global concept of the SBT system as the latest

conceptual idea, «to understand the society – nature system (in this case, artificial nature) as a form of total interactions, with the main focus being not only on the broadest (all – encompassing) interpretation of this concept, but also on specific forms of mutual influence of social and natural processes and despite the risks and dangers they generate». Even though it defies capitalism's logic, the agreement of the opposing parties is what clearly proves its existence. According to O. Yanitskiy (2018, p. 45), «globalists will never be able to subjugate many small and medium-sized communities and agents of socio-economic activity, so even if we assume that globalism as ideology and geopolitics will prevail over all other types of human communities, this will not solve the problem».

The initial idea behind globalization was to increase interstate collaboration in many areas of human endeavor, including culture, and to promote interdependencies and dependencies—all while maintaining or promoting respect for national cultures and interests. Smaller cultures have revived national values that were previously neglected as a result of the distortion of this process and the general subordination of the national to the transnational. The process of cultural de-globalization, which is fueled more by political and civilizational considerations than by economic ones, coincides with the collapse of globalization, which is currently the subject of much discussion among academics in Europe and America. These same elements have fueled developing economies' increasing engagement in forming a new global order and sociocultural environment. Following S. Huntington's concept of the clash of civilizations, we can state the fact that today the result of the information-cultural war has been the emergence and popularization of elements of deglobalization, which set the tone for socio-cultural interaction. It is precisely now that the strengthening of cultural boundaries is taking place, when local cultural systems demonstrate social community and systematicity in overcoming socio-cultural crises. S. Huntington was confident that it was local cultures that would become the main sources of socio-cultural change, despite the fact that in the political sphere the key initiators of conflicts would remain nations and groups of certain civilizations. «It is my hypothesis that the fundamental source of conflict in this new world will not be primarily ideological or primarily economic. The great divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural» mentioned author of the work «Clash of Civilizations» (1993).

According to the Russian sociologist A. Yakovenko (2017, p. 7): «The Euro-Atlantic community has experienced true global competition from other parts of the world, with their cultures and civilizations, for the first time in the last two to three centuries». Similar patterns are also noted by American academics. Political scientist Ian Bremmer (2012), for example, emphasizes the deterioration of Western institutions and the increasing power of regional actors in his «G-Zero World» idea, which results in polycentrism and cultural fragmentation. According to economist Richard Baldwin (2016, p. 14), earlier models of international engagement are being undermined by the creation and dismantling of global value chains in the age of digitization, which happen faster than cultural integration can develop. He observes that «the trend flipped from 1990; in just two decades, the rise of a century's worth of rich nations has been reversed». In his critique of the «myth of total globalization», researcher Pankaj Ghemawat (2011) highlights that most cultural and economic linkages are still localized, and that the importance of national identities and cultural diversity is increasing in the post-global era. «People, nations, and markets are now more interconnected than ever thanks to globalization. When we examine the data closely, we see a world that is only slightly more interconnected than we previously believed. Any business that disputes this is courting failure, as over 90% of all phone calls, web traffic, and investments are local», according to Ghemawat (2011). According to analyst Fareed Zakaria (2011), we are now seeing a «rise of the rest» – a strengthening of the cultural agency of formerly disadvantaged nations, which can now provide alternative development models, values, and visions of a just global order.

It is important to remember that the phenomena of de-globalization has happened before: between World Wars I and II, global trade volumes decreased. According to renowned economist J. Keynes (1919), «projects and policies of militarism and imperialism, racial and cultural rivalry, monopolies, restrictions and exceptions» were the cause of this drop. It is possible to understand cultural de-globalization as a type of cultural resentment, which originated in Friedrich Nietzsche's (1887) writings and was later refined by André Malraux (2006), and which arose in response to the incredibly unequal nature of international cultural interchange. Over a long historical period, the more dominant civilizational actors, mostly of Western origin, have exported universalist models of consumption, lifestyles, languages, political and legal systems, and

cognitive frameworks under conditions of unequal communication and an imbalance of symbolic capital. Local, non-industrial, postcolonial, and traditional forms of cultural identity were marginalized as a result of these models' presentation as normative, indisputable, and universally applicable to all of humanity. Alongside the displacement of local cultural codes, «peripheral» cultures also gradually internalized a sense of inferiority, which has acted as a trigger for the buildup of latent tension and general dissatisfaction. In this situation, cultural resentment is transformed into a structural form of resistance rather than just being an expression of grievance or jealousy. The next step is the mobilization of cultural identity, the restoration of national languages, artistic forms, mythical and historical narratives, and suppressed and lost traditions.

The desire to «reclaim» cultural space is becoming more and more institutionalized; examples include the establishment of alternative informational and cultural clusters, the rejection of prevailing global exchange platforms, the resurgence of ethnocentric practices, the strengthening of local cultural industries, and cultural protectionism in state policy. Cultural de-globalization, then, is a type of re-politicization of cultural identity in the postcolonial and postmodern setting, where culture reasserts itself as a subject of political agency and ideological expression rather than just being an object of global consumption. This change in cultural policy reflects a larger movement away from the old paradigm of global universalism and toward model-based multiplicity and civilizational pluralism, which creates an atmosphere where each cultural actor has the freedom to express themselves in their own way, grow according to their own terms, and actively contribute to the creation of a new global order.

Developing nations have benefited from hyper globalization and convergence for two golden decades. However, de-globalization is currently proceeding without facing much intellectual opposition. The emergence of cultures that are not based in any one place, such as subcultures, and the growing interconnectivity of various local cultures are the two main ways that world culture is produced (Hannerz, 1990). Sociologist U. Hannerz (1990) examines the problems of deterritorialization and states that it is a process of going back to the original model of development in which all nations worldwide participate.

One of the top economists in the world, Professor Pinelope Goldberg of Yale University (2023), shares a similar opinion, arguing that it is too soon to discuss

de-globalization and characterizing the current state of the world with the term «slowbalization» (Slow – «slow» and «globalization» – «globalization»), which logically followed hyperglobalization, a recent development in the modern world.

### Conclusion

This study aimed to conceptualize cultural de-globalization as a reaction to the asymmetric nature of cultural exchange under the dominance of universalist Western models, and to identify the key features of this phenomenon within the framework of the global world order's transformation. The analysis's findings show that the world system, which was formerly based on a unipolar model, has entered a phase of systemic crisis during the last ten to fifteen years. This crisis has been reflected in a shift toward multipolarity and the escalation of cultural re-autonomization processes. The rejection of globalist models is only one aspect of this continuous change; another is a thorough reexamination of the fundamental ideas underlying social and cultural order. We are seeing a return to old self-identification practices, as well as the strengthening of national languages, local cultural narratives, symbolic systems, and cultural protectionism mechanisms, within this new cultural dynamic. Following a path of simplified economic reductionism, modern Western theorists of post-industrial society, according to Kazakhstani philosopher A.A. Khamidov (2015), continue to rely on the tenets of Jean-Baptiste Say's so-called «theory of production factors», failing to acknowledge the methodological contradictions in their conception of the nature of labor, capital, and land. He stresses how concepts like interest, rent, and wages lose their objectivity as structural components of the current economic system yet become phenomena devoid of conceptual justification when removed from their social and historical context.

Any social system change requires the previous structures to be partially or completely dismantled and new foundations to be established. A new form emerges inside the framework of the old one and first lives on the periphery—as a marginal and secondary element—as stressed in the philosophical and historical tradition. But as the new form becomes more powerful, it makes its presence known, frequently by opposing the status quo. The fundamental tenets of the prior system are being undermined throughout this transitional phase, which begins with this battle. Once the new form

is completely established and any return to the prior condition is impossible, the transitional phase ends. However, traces of the previous system might still be present in the new system's structure, although as incidental and non-essential elements.

Transitional eras of different sizes can be identified in the dynamics of society. Without upsetting the core tenets of the social order, minor changes have an impact on particular institutions or functional aspects of society. Major transitional eras, on the other hand, include a drastic reevaluation of the fundamental principles and conventions that guide social relations, as well as a change in the very universal underpinnings of society organization.

In light of the postmodern crisis of universalist projects, cultural de-globalization can be seen as a manifestation of the demand for cultural re-autonomization. A search for new cultural points of reference has been fueled by the modernization impulse's fatigue, growing disenchantment with the liberal paradigm, and the impact of cultural oversaturation brought on by digital and data flows. The emergence of phenomena like «new traditionalism», cultural protectionism, local identity strengthening, ethnocentric narratives, and the resurgence of national languages, rituals, and symbolic forms are all examples of these processes. In order to promote a more inclusive and multipolar cultural order, these trends collectively point to the increasing necessity to reevaluate cultural policy and broaden the scope of actors involved in global processes. De-globalization presents the possibility of confirming new cultural subjectivities with the capacity for independent expression and growth in the context of a world that is becoming more polycentric. Future research on the phenomenon of de-globalization through the civilizational approach holds promise for a more thorough examination of the processes that give rise to new cultural subjectivities, the function of information technologies in maintaining local identities, and the creation of fresh approaches to cultural policy based on inclusivity, dialogical engagement, and the mutual recognition principle.

Therefore, it is not appropriate to view cultural de-globalization as a categorical rejection of globalization. Rather, it is a complex, multidimensional response to the inherent cultural expansionism, structural asymmetry, and one-sidedness of the globalist worldview. Rather than being a step backward, it is a reallocation of meanings and values toward cultural heterogeneity and civilizational multiplicity.



## References

- Элиас, Н. (2001). *О процессе цивилизации. Социогенетические и психогенетические исследования. Т. 1: Изменения в поведении высшего слоя мирян в странах Запада*. Москва: Университетская книга.
- Хантингтон, С. (1994). Столкновение цивилизаций. *Полис*, (1), 29–41.
- Каволис, В. (2001). Основные положения общей теории цивилизаций. В *Сравнительное изучение цивилизаций: хрестоматия* (с.с. 70–82). Москва.
- Данилевский, Н. Я. (1895). *Россия и Европа: Взгляд на культурные и политические отношения славянского мира к германо-романскому*. Санкт-Петербург: Типография братьев Пантелеевых.
- Шпенглер, О. (1993). *Закат Европы. Очерки морфологии мировой истории. Т. 1: Геистальт и действительность*. Москва: Мысль.
- Бердяев, Н. А. (1939). *О рабстве и свободе человека: Опыт персоналистической философии*. Париж: YMCA-Press.
- Бердяев, Н. А. (1969). *Смысл истории*. Париж: YMCA-Press.
- Малиновский, А. С. (2013). Культурная глобализация (глокализация): локальное и транснациональное. *Вестник Томского государственного педагогического университета*, (1), 176–179.
- Хелл, Д., Гольдблатт, Д., Макгрю, Э., & Перратон, Дж. (2004). *Глобальные трансформации: политика, экономика, культура*. Москва: Практикс.
- Галстян, А. (2014, 30 мая). Американская «исключительность» в меняющемся мире. *Россия в глобальной политике*. Доступно по ссылке: <https://globalaffairs.ru/about/readers-experts/> (дата обращения: укажите дату).
- Tomlinson, J. (2004). *Globalization and culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Гидденс, Э. (1994). Судьба, риск и безопасность. *Тезис*, (5), 107–134.
- Жукоцкая, З. Р., & Ковалева, Л. Е. (2011). Глобализация и ее влияние на культурные процессы. *Успехи современного естествознания*, (1), 110–112.
- Яницкий, О. Н. (2016). Социобиотехнические системы: новый взгляд на взаимодействие человека и природы. *Социологическая наука и социальная практика*, (3), 6–14.
- Яницкий, О. Н. (2018). Четвертая научно-техническая революция, глобализация и институты. *Научный результат. Социология и управление*, (2), 45–57.
- Huntington, S. (1993, June 1). The Clash of Civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*. Retrieved from <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/1993-06-01/clash-civilizations>
- Яковенко, А. (2013). Мир и международные отношения сегодня: новое и хорошо забытое старое. *Международная жизнь*, (9), 3–12.
- Baldwin, R. E. (2016). *The Great Convergence: Information Technology and the New Globalization*. Cambridge: Belknap Press.
- Ghemawat, P. (2011). *World 3.0: Global Prosperity and How to Achieve It*. Boston: Harvard Business Review Press.
- Zakaria, F. (2011). *The Post-American World: Release 2.0*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Keynes, J. M. (1919). *The Economic Consequences of the Peace*. London: Macmillan.
- Hannerz, U. (1990). Cosmopolitans and Locals in World Culture. In *Global Culture* (pp. 237–251).
- Хамидов, А. А. (2015). Общество знания: действительность? утопия? химера?... *Аль-Фараби*, (2), 8–13.

## References

- Elias, N. (2001). *O processe civilizacii. Sociogeneticheskie i psihogeneticheskie issledovanija. T. 1. Izmenenija v povedenii vysshego sloja mirjan v stranah Zapada* [On the process of civilization. Sociogenetic and psychogenetic studies. Vol. 1. Changes in the behavior of the upper stratum of the laity in Western countries]. Universitetskaja kniga. (p. 59) [in Russ.].
- Hantington, S. (1994). Stolknovenie civilizacij [Clash of civilizations]. *Polis*, (1), 34 [in Russ.].
- Kavolis, V. (2001). Osnovnye polozhenija obshhej teorii civilizacij [The main provisions of the general theory of civilizations]. In *Sravnitel'noe izučenie civilizacij: Hrestomatija* [The comparative study of civilizations. Textbook] (p. 72) [in Russ.].
- Danilevskij, N. Ja. (1895). *Rossija i Evropa. Vzgljad na kul'turnye i politicheskie otnoshenija Slavjanskogo mira k Germano-Romanskomu* [Russia and Europe. A look at the cultural and political relations of the Slavic world to the German-Romantic world]. Tipografija brat'ev Panteleevykh. (p. 83) [in Russ.].
- Shpengler, O. (1993). *Zakat Evropy. Oчерки морфологии mirovoj istorii. Vol. 1: Geshtal't i dejstvitel'nost'* [The decline of Europe. Essays on the morphology of world history. Vol. 1: Gestalt and reality]. Mysl'. (p. 674) [in Russ.].
- Berdjaev, N. A. (1939). *O rabstve i svobode cheloveka. Opyt personalisticheskoy filosofii* [On human slavery and freedom. Experience of personalistic philosophy]. YMCA-Press. (p. 74) [in Russ.].
- Berdjaev, N. A. (1969). *Smysl istorii* [The meaning of history]. YMCA-Press. (p. 173) [in Russ.].
- Malinovskij, A. S. (2013). Kul'turnaja globalizacija (glokalizacija): lokal'noe i transnacional'noe [Cultural globalization (glocalization): Local and transnational]. *Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta* [Bulletin of Tomsk State Pedagogical University], (1), 176–179 [in Russ.].
- Hell, D., Goldblatt, D., Makgrju, Je., & Perraton, J. (2004). *Global'nye transformacii: politika, jekonomika, kul'tura* [Global transformations: Politics, economics, culture]. Praktis. (pp. 402–403) [in Russ.].

- Galstjan, A. (2014, May 30). Amerikanskaja «iskljuchitel'nost'» v menjajushemsja mire [American “exceptionalism” in a changing world]. *Rossija v global'noj politike* [Russia in global politics]. Retrieved from <https://globalaffairs.ru/about/readers-experts/> [in Russ.].
- Tomlinson, J. (2004). *Globalization and culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press. (p. 237).
- Giddens, Je. (1994). Sud'ba, risk i bezopasnost' [Fate, risk and security]. *Thesis*, (1), 107–134 [in Russ.].
- Zhukockaja, Z. R., & Kovaleva, L. E. (2011). Globalizacija i ee vlijanie na kul'turnye processy [Globalization and its impact on cultural processes]. *Uspehi sovremennogo estestvoznanija* [Advances in modern natural science], (1), 110–112 [in Russ.].
- Janickij, O. N. (2016). Sociobiotehnicheskie sistemy: novyj vzgljad na vzaimodejstvie cheloveka i prirody [Sociobiotechnical systems: A new perspective on human–nature interaction]. *Sociologicheskaja nauka i social'naja praktika* [Sociological science and social practice], (3), 6 [in Russ.].
- Janickij, O. N. (2018). Chetvertaja nauchno-tehnicheskaja revoljucija, globalizacija i instituty [The fourth scientific and technological revolution, globalization and institutions]. *Nauchnyj rezul'tat. Sociologija i upravlenie* [Research Outcome. Sociology and management], (2), 45–57 [in Russ.].
- Huntington, S. (1993, June 1). The Clash of Civilizations? *Foreign Affairs*. Retrieved from <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/1993-06-01/clash-civilizations>
- Jakovenko, A. (2013). Mir i mezhdunarodnye otnoshenija segodnja: novoe i horosho zabytoe staroe [The world and international relations today: New and well-forgotten old]. *Mezhdunarodnaja zhizn'* [International life], (9), 7 [in Russ.].
- Baldwin, R. E. (2016). *The Great Convergence: Information Technology and the New Globalization*. Belknap Press. (p. 14).
- Ghemawat, P. (2011). *World 3.0: Global prosperity and how to achieve it*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- Zakaria, F. (2011). *The post-American world: Release 2.0*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company. (p. 45).
- Keynes, J. M. (1919). *The economic consequences of the peace* (Chaps. I–II, pp. 10–12). London: Macmillan.
- Hannerz, U. (1990). Cosmopolitans and locals in world culture. In *Global Culture* (p. 237).
- Hamidov, A. A. (2015). Obshhestvo znaniya: dejstvitel'nost'? utopija? himera?... [Knowledge society: Reality? Utopia? Chimera?...]. *Al'-Farabi*, (2), 8 [in Russ.].

**Information about authors:**

Seryozhkina Tatyana Vladimirovna – PhD in Philosophy (Candidate of Sciences), the Associate Professor of History of Kazakhstan Department at Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages (Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: [Seryozhkina.T@ablaikhan.kz](mailto:Seryozhkina.T@ablaikhan.kz))

**Сведения об авторе:**

Серёжкина Татьяна Владимировна – кандидат философских наук, доцент кафедры истории Казахстана Казахского университета международных отношений и мировых языков имени Абылай хана (Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: [Seryozhkina.T@ablaikhan.kz](mailto:Seryozhkina.T@ablaikhan.kz))

**Авторлар туралы мәлімет:**

Серёжкина Татьяна Владимировна – философия ғылымдарының кандидаты (ғылым кандидаты), Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем тілдері университеті Қазақстан тарихы кафедрасының доценті (Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: [Seryozhkina.T@ablaikhan.kz](mailto:Seryozhkina.T@ablaikhan.kz))

Поступила 10 мая 2025

Принята 20 июня 2025