

# **Integrated promotion model of the European culture in the global world: a socio-philosophical analysis**

Raushanbek Absattarov – Galimzhan Absattarov – Marat Absattarov  
– Zhanna Karimova – Nailya Seisen

DOI: 10.18355/XL.2022.15.01.17

## **Abstract**

The article analyzes the problem of the integrated model of the promotion of European culture. The paper shows that the crisis trends in the development of culture are a natural process, which is a necessary stage of the movement of culture to progressive development in the given ontological foundations of the culture system. At the same time, crises are divided into structural and systemic. The latter, according to the author, is a socio-cultural transformation. The author analyzes the concepts of “culture” and characterizes the features of the technogenic civilization of the West. In the context of civilization, culture is subject to technogenic influences, which is concretized when considering the transition from modern to postmodern, when art and cultural values are transformed into industrial production. The concepts of late capitalism and globalization are related. They characterize the interaction processes between postmodern and traditional cultures, which leads to their destruction and unification. The symbolic aspects of culture in Kant’s theory of knowledge are considered, and the general principles of understanding the symbolism of culture are formulated. The features of understanding the relationship between culture, symbol, and person are shown. The directions of understanding the symbolism of European culture are revealed. The author analyzed the peculiarities of understanding the symbolism of culture in the framework of symbolic anthropology.

**Key words:** European culture, cultural dynamics, socio-cultural transformation, cultural crisis, cultural evolution

---

## **Introduction**

In the modern philosophical language, the concept of “culture” is one of the most common and polysemantic. Their use today goes far beyond the original, etymological meaning. The term “culture“ (in Latin: Cultura) is translated as “cultivation, development, veneration” and implies at the early stages of its use the purposeful influence of man on nature (tillage, etc.), as well as the education and training of man himself. Interest in culture and attempts to understand this complex phenomenon date back to ancient times. In the ancient consciousness, the concept of culture is identified with good breeding, education, which distinguished the Hellenes from the “uncultured” barbarians. In the Sophists and Cynics, one can see the opposition of nature as a relatively constant phenomenon to human law or an institution - changeable, arbitrary. Culture in this system of values is interpreted as a phenomenon less significant than nature. (Romakh, 2002)

## **Research methods**

In the late Roman era, a different set of meanings was born. In the Middle Ages, it became widespread: attention to man’s inner world increased, culture became associated with signs of personal perfection, such as the elimination of sin and the approach to the divine plan. At the same time, there is a positive attitude to the values of urban social life, which marked a movement in the direction of the concept of civilization that emerged later.

Renaissance philosophers consider culture as a means of forming an ideal universal personality-comprehensively educated, corresponding to humanistic values, contributing to the development of the sciences and arts, and strengthening the state. The concept of culture becomes one of the central concepts in the philosophy of the Enlightenment. In the works of Voltaire, Turgot, Condorcet, and Vico, culture appears as the result of the progressive development of history and the degree of realization of the rational principle, realized in religion, philosophy, science, law, and morality as objectification of reason. The goal of culture corresponds to the highest purpose of "reason" to make people happy, living according to the needs of their "natural" nature.

In German classical philosophy, culture is considered an area of a person's spiritual freedom. Kant approaches culture as a subjective state of personality and distinguishes between the culture of skill (as civility) and the culture of education (as morality). G. F. Hegel analyzes such cultural discoveries as art, religion, philosophy, science as various forms of self-knowledge of the mind, the spirit of the people who create history, and form the "faces" of culture. German classical philosophy is characterized by recognizing a plurality of types and forms of culture located in a particular historical sequence and forming a single line of humanity's spiritual evolution.

In the 19<sup>th</sup> - early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the relative universalism of the existing evolutionary ideas about culture is "overcome" by the emergence of several philosophical trends and schools. The "Philosophy of life" (V. Dilthey, G. Simmel, O. Spengler, H. Ortega y Gasset, A. Bergson, etc.) considers the spirit as the substance of culture, which can be understood not rationally, but through inner experience, intuition. Culture is interpreted as an original and local reality with its own identity, a unique mentality, and a "spiritual mood" of life. Nietzsche, on the other hand, sees in any culture as a means of suppressing and enslaving man. (Tarasov, 2013)

Marxist philosophy considers culture as a specific characteristic of society, expressing the achieved human level of historical development, including a confident attitude of man to nature and society and the development of creative forces and abilities of the individual. Culture is understood not only as a purely spiritual problem of educating and enlightening a person but also as a problem of creating the necessary conditions, including material ones, for the comprehensive and integral development of the individual. Culture can be understood not from itself, but only in connection with society, with labor; it is the totality of its results and the very process of human activity.

These schools and concepts can be attributed (with a certain degree of conditionality) to the classical model of culture. This model is based on the principles of humanism, rationality, and historicism, and culture is the result of the liberation of man from the rigid dependence on the natural and divine worlds. Man - the subject of culture-acts as a rational dynamic being, developing his spirit and creating culture. The object of cognition is the supra-individual cultural reality, from which the culture of the individual is derived. Philosophically, this model is predominantly idealistic (except the Marxist concept) since culture is a purely spiritual formation, a deterministic act of consciousness transcending itself. There is a replacement of forms of human activity with spiritual objectivity. (Ritzer, 2012)

In the classical model, the universals that serve as the basis for understanding culture and at the same time as the norms of culture are:

- 1) knowledge, art, morality, law, customs, cults
- 2) generally valid values - moral, aesthetic, religious, erotic, logical
- 3) universal structures of human consciousness
- 4) transcendental-logical foundations, thinking represented in the form of science; symbolizing the activity of practical reason as the substantial basis of all spheres of culture considered as symbolic forms - language, myth, religion, art, science, history

5) universal archetypes - archetypes, the dynamics of which is the basis of the creation of culture

6) the idea of “axial time,” which reveals the original and universal meaning of history and culture, for the search and understanding of which, in all their subsequent discoveries, new “ciphers” are needed.

The theoretical insufficiency of the classical model of culture (the identification of the latter mainly with the phenomena of the sphere of the spirit, the speculative nature, and inability to explain many of its empirical forms), the failure of claims to strict scientific objectivity in the study of culture, the embodiment of the ideology of Eurocentrism, doubts about the linear direction of the development of culture – all this led to the emergence of newer, non-conventional models of culture. (Wallerstein, 2000)

The modernist (non-classical) model, which developed at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (it has the origin and basis of the ideas of A. Schopenhauer, F. Nietzsche, A. Bergson, E. Husserl, K. Jung, M. Heidegger, J. P. Sartre, A. Camus, etc.), has an emphatically anti-traditionalist character. Culture is considered an everyday reality with hidden meaning; its elements interact with each other and are perceived by a person in experiencing rather than rational comprehension. The world appears in this model most often cruel and absurd, not needing an orderly design, the person in it — lonely and doomed, the surrounding circumstances “dark,” hostile, meaningless. The art of modernism, striving to overcome canonized forms and styles, discovers and develops new ones — “stream of consciousness,” collage, associative editing, and others.

The postmodern model of culture was formed in the late 1960s and 1970s in the works of J.-F. Lyotard, J. Baudrillard, J. Derrida, R. Rorty and other researchers. The critical attitude to the transformation of the world was accompanied by the rejection of attempts to systematize it: the world not only does not lend itself to human efforts to remake it but also does not fit into any theoretical schemes. Anti-systematicity is a characteristic feature of the postmodern model, which arises as a result of the violation of the “purity” of such a phenomenon as art: it is assumed that in a post-industrial society with its infinite possibilities of technical reproduction, there is no original meaning generation in art, which goes back to the creative principle, the original creative act. In addition, the modern creator of culture, the artist, as a rule, does not deal with “pure” material - the latter has already been mastered in one way or another. His “work” is never primary, existing only as a network of illusions on other works. The artist’s activity shifts from “creativity” to compilation and “quoting.” The sign of the expressed cultural situation is the quotation marks that indicate the conventionality of any sign system. In the cultural and aesthetic aspect, postmodernism has led to blurring the lines between art and non-art, beautiful and ugly, etc.

The philosophical understanding of culture is comprehending its desire for the infinity and universality of human development. The ability of the world to “radiate” from itself a human meaning, which characterizes it as a cultural phenomenon - this is the philosophical dimension of culture. (Robertson, 2002)

1. The difference between culture and civilization has already been outlined by I. Kant, who in his essay “On the supposed beginning of Human History” in a polemic with J. J. Rousseau raises the question: what is civilization and whether a person has the right to abandon it? Kant believes that civilization begins with establishing rules of human life and behavior. Culture is an activity in which a person realizes his/her essence and subjectivity, the nature of the condition of his freedom. Culture consists of a person’s social value and the acquisition of the ability to set goals. The highest degree of cultural development is associated with

the development of human skills and moral perfection, which arises solely from respect for the moral law, and not only from the empirical inclination to fulfill it.

2. The philosophy of culture of the twentieth century is even more characterized by the "dilution" of the concepts of culture and civilization. Culture continues to be a symbol of the positive in the development of humankind. Civilization in most cases receives a neutral assessment, and not rarely and sharply negative. (Smith, 2000)
3. In this case, the concept of "culture" allows us to record both the general difference between human life activity and biological forms of life and the qualitative originality of historically specific forms of this activity in a particular geographical space and at different stages of social development, within certain epochs and civilizational formations. Since culture is an integral system in the historical and geographical area, surprisingly diverse and unique cultural worlds have co-existed, which give uniqueness to the cultural appearance of peoples, countries, and continents. This cultural diversity creates prerequisites for the correlation of different human communities in global space and time, which cannot be their purely speculative comparison. World cultures in the form in which we can observe and study them today are the product of a long historical development, in which the cultures themselves (as cultural and historical systems), both transformed, modified, and changed the internal structure, and influenced each other, which allows us to speak about both general and individual features of cultural and historical development.

Against the background of cultural and civilizational diversity, the effect of globalization becomes obvious. Several articles on globalization, presented in the "Encyclopedia of Globalism," emphasize the universal, planetary nature of the processes (economic, political, cultural in the direct sense of the word) that acquire world status and significance.

Thus, cultural production has assumed the form of a degraded collective "dispassionate spirit": it can no longer consider some imaginary real world, some reconstruction of a history that was once real. Instead, it should build our images of the past within a specific framework. In a way, we are condemned to search for history through our own pop images and representations of that history, which in itself remains unattainable. (Drach, 2016)

Here we agree with Jamieson to use the concept of schizophrenia given by Lacan because the description itself, and not the diagnosis, offers a particular aesthetic model. He describes schizophrenia as a break in the chain of meanings, i.e., as an interdependent syntagmatic series of denoting values that make up a statement or meaning. His concept of a meaningful chain assumes one of the basic principles (one of the most significant discoveries) the structuralism of Saussure, namely, the statement that meaning is not a one-to-one relationship between the signified and the signifier, between the materiality of language, between a word or name and its concept. What we usually call the denoted-meaning, or the conceptual content of the utterance, is now rather seen as a "meaning" - effect, as an objective mirage of meaning generated and acting as a relationship of denoting values to each other. When this relation is broken, when the links in the chain of meanings are broken, we have schizophrenia in separate fragments or unrelated denotable. The relationship between linguistic dysfunction and schizophrenia can be considered with a double judgment:

-first, personal identity itself is the result of a specific temporary association of the past and future with the present;

- secondly, such an active temporary association is itself a function of the language. Suppose we cannot combine the past, present, and future in a sentence. In that case, we are equally unable to connect the past, present, and future of our own biographical experience or spiritual life.

With the breaking of the chain of meanings, the person with schizophrenia is confronted with an experience of pure material designators, or, in other words, with a series of pure and unrelated moments of the present. In the present context, this experience means the following: the time gap suddenly frees this present from all the activities and intentions that could turn it into an established order (practice), so the isolated presence suddenly engulfs the subject with indescribable vividness, the materiality of perception – all-consuming, which dramatizes the power of the material-or rather, the literal-denoted in isolation. This presence of the world, or material signifier, appears to the subject with increased depth, bearing upon it a mysterious agitation, here described in negative terms of anxiety and loss of reality, but which can be represented in favorable terms of euphoria, of a high, intoxicating, or hallucinogenic degree.

This approach to schizophrenia and temporal organization brings us back to Heidegger's notion of the gap between the Earth and the World when explaining the differences in depicting peasant shoes by Van Gogh and Andy Warhol. In work "The Source of Artistic Creation," Heidegger suggests that a work of art appears in the gap between the Earth and the World. As Heidegger writes, Van Gogh's shoes contain "the silent call of the earth, its quiet gift of ripening grain, and the mysterious self-denial of an untilled field in winter." From the dark, trampled interior of the shoes, the world of hard work and heavy feet, belonging to the Land and preserved by the peasants, looks out at us. Van Gogh's painting reveals what hard peasant labor and the call of the Land really are.

In the center of Heidegger's analysis is the need for a renewed materiality of the work, transforming one form (the earth, its paths, and physical objects) into another (in the form of the materiality of the picture).

The postmodern experience of Andy Warhol destroys the integrity of perception. The work of art is no longer seen as organic and homogeneous; instead, it has become a chain of unrelated subsystems, raw materials, and various kinds of motivations. The observer of postmodern art is called upon to do the impossible, namely, to see all the screens simultaneously in their disordered difference.

So, the civilization of the globalizing world is killing culture, and this is nothing new. Spengler (2016) also wrote about this. But even a culture based on which civilization has not developed is not something that has occurred. The basic meanings of this concept lie in the ideas of the Romans and Greeks about polis-urban life according to law and justice. The state is a society in which the law rules. All people living in a given society are subject, so they are considered civilized, meaning they have civil rights and related virtues. (Chumakov, 2014) According to the Greeks, the peoples who did not know the law and did not obey the law, but the king (as was the case with the Persians), were deprived of the virtues of a free man-courage, justice, human dignity.

### **The nature of the relationship between personality and culture from the point of view of the concept under consideration**

This scheme, being the result of the isolation and generalization of the most critical (essential) aspects of the analysis of a culture in classical cultural and philosophical concepts, allows them to be systematically compared with modern cultural concepts, making it possible to identify the general trend in the development of contemporary cultural conceptualism. The concept of Yu. M. Lotman, in which human relations with the world are realized at the level of information, belongs to the tradition of "realistic symbolism"; the concept of French structuralism - to the tradition of "idealistic symbolism," which reflects the state of the subject in the framework of social communication. The significance of the considered concepts for the development of the cognitive theory of culture lies in the fact that the approach to

culture as a supra-individual unconscious mechanism that determines the existence of a person (K. Levi-Strauss, and R. Barth, and Yu. M. Lotman) considers culture as “supra-individual intelligence,” which allows us to view culture as a supra-individual determination of human existence and raises the question of studying the interaction of culture and individual thinking at the level of both conscious and unconscious processes.

In the concept of C. Geertz (1975), the symbol of consciousness and the symbol of culture are mutually conditioned, which allows us to rethink the gap between “realistic” and “idealistic” symbolism in understanding the interdependence of culture and human thinking through the inclusion of social action in the theory of symbolism, which is determined by conceptual structures. Geertz’s concept makes it possible to methodologically substantiate the cognitive approach to culture: culture is considered a supra-individual extragenetic set of control mechanisms that control the thinking and behavior of an individual.

Within the framework of cognitive anthropology, it became possible to overcome the confrontation between the understanding of the culture within the framework of “realistic” and “idealistic” symbolism, since there was a rethinking of the interdependence of culture and human thinking: culture is based on human thought, which, in turn, is culturally conditioned, and more often at the level of unconscious structures. The significance of cognitive anthropology for the formation and development of cognitive, cultural studies lies in the fact that culture, understood as a set of cognitive categories through which the process of cognition is realized, consisting in the comprehension and mental construction of reality, has become considered as the most important source of cognitive schemes. (Gobozov, 2013)

The processes of understanding the symbolism of culture that have taken place within the framework of the philosophy of culture over the past 200 years have gradually acquired an anthropological color, moving from abstractions of theoretical symbolism to anthropology. The separation of the semantic accents of theoretical knowledge and the knowledge of the ordinary allowed us to transfer the solution of the most complex issues of understanding symbolic processes in culture to the field of anthropological problems.

Within the cognitive approach to culture framework, the concept of a symbol is identified with a sign, i.e. it is considered a symbol of culture, and the actual cognitive functions of the symbol (the symbol of consciousness) are transferred to the concept as a mental structure. Understanding the manifested forms of culture has evolved from understanding any cultural form as symbolic to understanding the symbol of culture as one of the forms of culture. (Beck, 2001)

Understanding the symbol as the internal representation of the person who knows (Kant) is represented in cognitive cultural studies as a conceptual formation: the symbol in Kant is in the subject, but, passing through philosophical understanding in the concepts of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the symbol first finds its expression in the sign, and then gradually degenerates into a sign. Thus, the process has completed its “circle” of development from Kantian subjectivism to cognitive subjectivism. The meaning is associated with the concept, and the symbol remains only an external, symbolic expression of it.

In the course of the development of European culture, the relationship between the sphere of being and meaning is reinterpreted, just as the concept of culture itself is reinterpreted: from the reduction of the ontological status of culture, which does not go beyond nature and is considered as the ability of a person to take a holistic and symbolic understanding of the world, to the understanding of culture as a supra-individual system of “meta-regulations that organize all types of human activity,” as “hardware equipment of collective consciousness,” which ensures the effectiveness of individual consciousness, the worldview meanings-cognitive forms-artifacts that complement each other and jointly evolve as a self-organizing system. It morphs from

understanding culture as a means of natural adaptation to understanding it as a means of social adaptation. This approach allows us to consider the cognitive direction in the study of culture (cognitive cultural studies) as an opportunity to overcome the “split” of the world and consciousness (postmodernism), dialectically remove the contradictions of “realistic” and “idealistic” symbolism. (Chumakov, 2006)

“First of all, culture is a powerful mechanism of anthropological influence, a way of adapting the individual to the cultural needs of society and at the same time a form of individual realization of the accumulated ethnic and national experience and self-realization of the individual in the cultural space of the ethnic group. In this sense, culture is rooted in the depths of the generational level. Its vitality is a consequence of its uniqueness and uniqueness with all its traditions, skills, and national images. The cultural world is a single cosmos in which a person and the surrounding nature are merged, which affects the social psychology of an ethnic group, forms the national character and determines the direction of its practical activities.” (Chumakov, 2006: 70)

In this case, it is legitimate to consider culture as an independent entity reproduced over a long historical period. The ontology of culture includes a mechanism for the transfer of social experience through the development by each generation of the object world, skills and techniques of technological attitude to nature, and cultural values and patterns of behavior. At the same time, the specificity of culture is realized both in the type of social organization and in the kind of personality. The result is culture development’s technological and economic levels, represented by its social carriers (groups, classes, organizations). But even at this level, the integrating role of culture is such that it forms a single system of artistic, technological, and cognitive values and behavior patterns, i.e., civilizational integrity. (Ionin, 2016)

According to Spengler (2016), in this case, there remains the danger of a Eurocentric view of the historical development of civilization, understood based on European models of science, technology, and social relations. Civilization is understood as the culture of a particular region and a specific historical period. Culture (its institutions, norms, material achievements), existing ways and forms of education, spiritual life in general, and social relations are united into a single whole. This is the complex understanding of civilization. So, for example, we can talk in this sense about the civilizations of the ancient world (ancient civilizations).

The dynamics of culture in modern theoretical, cultural studies are given close attention. In the most general sense, the dynamics of culture refer to the changes in culture and the processes of describing these changes. This definition also includes those means, mechanisms, and processes that describe the culture change. The historiographical aspect of this problem shows that this problem was given considerable attention in the past, but unfortunately, this issue was given undeservedly little attention in more recent times. Also, this problem became particularly relevant in domestic and foreign humanitarian knowledge in the 19th century and at the turn of the 20th century.

The appeal to the problem of the dynamics of culture today, in our opinion, is associated with a complex, contradictory cultural situation that characterizes the existence of society both in our country and in the countries of Euro-Atlantic civilization. Such a concept as “postmodern” reflects the essence of this situation. Culturologists, in this regard, ask the question: What will be the future of humanity, what new foundations will culture come to? It should be noted that such questions in the history of European civilization, for example, do not arise for the first time.

In the dynamics of the culture of the countries of the specified region, specific periods with several unique characteristics can be distinguished; such periods should be defined as a cultural system. The basis of the development of culture is the spatial-temporal parameter, i.e. the criterion for selecting a new culture is the specific type of

each stage of European culture in the time continuum, from the origin of European culture to the present time. In this respect, the significance of socio-cultural transformation is determined by the fact that it is a transitional stage, in the process of development of which the specific characteristics of a given culture are deposed, and new ones are formed in their place. (Drach, 2006)

## Results

In the continuum of European culture, four cultures are defined, separated by socio-cultural transformations: antiquity, Middle Ages, modern times, (post)modernity. Here is an overview of what characterized the dynamics of European culture through the prism of socio-cultural transformations.

Antiquity is the first on the continuum of European culture. Its chronological framework is quite conditional – from the end of the Cretan-Mycenaean civilization to the 5th century AD – the era of the barbarian invasions of Europe and the fall of the Western Roman Empire in 476. The distribution of ancient culture is extensive and covers the entire Mediterranean region of Europe. Its specific characteristics are humanism, rationalism, individualism, agonism, the cyclicity.

However, at the stage of late Hellenism, the above characteristics begin to be replaced by new ones; often opposite, some of them are irrevocably deposed. This transition, the stage of late Hellenism, should be considered the First socio-cultural transformation in the continuum of European culture. This is explained by the fact that late Hellenism is an example of the gradual deposition of the characteristics of ancient culture, which we have mentioned above, and, secondly, the period of late Hellenism marked the transition to medieval culture.

The second one – the medieval culture, developed under specific conditions, which undoubtedly differed from the former, ancient cultural system's requirements. The feudal system was based on an agrarian, natural type of economy; the combination of significant land ownership with the small peasantry subordinated to it through extra-economic coercion; the underdevelopment of commodity-money relations; the class-corporate organization of society; and the dominance of religious values and structures.

The cultural dominant of medieval culture contains the following characteristics: the idea of perfection, linearity - a person needs constant unity with God, since only in this way can he get rid of his original sinfulness; here the critical idea of progress, development, spiritual elevation becomes; culture is understood as overcoming the limitations of a person, a person, the constant "cultivation" of their abilities, but only "natural," not naturally corrupted, which must be supplemented by faith. Rationality in this culture becomes unimportant. A person's happiness is seen not in the knowledge of nature, but only in God, in the consciousness of spiritual kinship with the Supreme. The Renaissance marked the transition to the New European culture.

The third European culture covered three centuries (17<sup>th</sup> – 19<sup>th</sup>). At this time, a human-made civilization is being formed, an established system of social relations that has existed in general, in a slightly modified form until today, as well as the formation of rationalistic and empirical thinking - this allows us to combine these three centuries into a single period. The basis for connecting all three centuries into a single European cultural system is their relative cultural and ideological stability of progressive development. The basis for the formation of this cultural system was the ideological basis of the Renaissance, which was interpreted peculiarly under the influence of cultural crises and was expressed in the development of the philosophy of the Enlightenment, breakthrough scientific discoveries, a variety of trends in art: Baroque, Rococo, Classicism, Romanticism, Realism, etc. However, in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, due to socio-economic reasons, these developing ideological bases reached such a level that changes only of a structural nature were not enough. In philosophy, for example, this was expressed in the formation of irrationalism –

changes in the system plan were required and had to be made after the socio-cultural transformation. In this regard, at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the New European culture system was completed.

The fourth European culture system covers the 20<sup>th</sup> century till the present time. This fourth stage in the continuum of European (Euro-Atlantic) culture presents a certain complexity for analysis, which is determined by two circumstances. First, the formation of a significant number of types of cultures in the system of European culture in the twentieth century does not make it possible to reduce all of them to single criteria, i.e. to classify them. Secondly, each national culture that forms the essence of European (Euro-Atlantic) culture is rich in different style parameters. It is also not possible to single out a single center.

The common characteristics of modern culture include the triumph of science, human intelligence, a lot of social upheavals, shocks, paradoxes. Modern society, forming high ideals of love for man, equality, freedom, democracy, at the same time gave rise to a simplified understanding of these values, so the processes taking place in modern culture are contradictory. (Jameson, 2014)

### **Conclusion**

Thus, the integrated model of promoting European culture in the global world is a necessary stage in the dynamics of culture. At this stage, culture is looking for new paradigmatic frontiers. At the same time, the search is associated with a variety of diverse, contradictory trends related to the presence in the culture of both new elements of the coming culture and those that characterize the receding culture. The proposed criteria for the typology of cultural concepts and the analytical scheme for studying modern cultural concepts can be used to identify the methodological foundations of contemporary cultural approaches in the theory of symbolism. (Malishevskaya, 2015)

Despite the abundance of different theoretical approaches, the concepts of culture, which are based on a symbol, can be attributed to the direction of either “realistic” or “idealistic” symbolism. The development of European culture from the point of view of philosophical thought took place and continues to develop within the framework of “realistic” symbolism. In contrast, American cultural studies develop within the framework of “idealistic” symbolism, although the cognitive paradigm makes sense of the interdependence of both approaches.

### **Bibliographic references**

- Bek, U. (2001). What is globalization? Moscow: Progress-Tradition.
- Chumakov, A. N. (2006). Metaphysics of globalization. Cultural and civilizational aspects. Moscow: Kanon.
- Chumakov, A. N. (2014). On globalization from an objective point of view. The age of globalization 2(14), 39-51.
- Drach, G. V. (2006). Kultura, in Globalistika. International Encyclopedic Dictionary. Moscow, St. Petersburg, New York: Elima, 468-471.
- Drach, G. V. (2016). “Culture, civilization, history”, in History of World Civilizations. Moscow: Infra-M, 6-20.
- Geertz, C. (1975). “On the Nature of Anthropological Understanding: Not extraordinary empathy but readily observable symbolic forms enable the anthropologist to grasp the unarticulated concepts that inform the lives and cultures of other peoples.” American scientist 63(1), 47-53.
- Gobozov, A. I. (2016). The state and national identity: Globalization or internationalization? Ionin L. G. Sotsiologiya kultura. Moscow: Logos.
- Jameson, F. (2014). Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism. New left review (146), 62-87.

- Malishevskaya, N. A. and G. V. Drach (2015). The subtle mechanisms of postmodern discourse: returning to Jamison. *Nauchnaya mysl Kavkaza* (3), 7-15.
- Ritzer, G. (2012). *The McDonaldization of Society*. London: SAGE.
- Robertson, R. (2002). *Globalization. Social Theory and Global Culture*. London: SAGE.
- Romakh, O. V. (2020). The interdependence of culture and creativity. *Analysis of cultural studies* (1), 20-30.
- Smith, A. D. (2003). Towards a global culture? In D. Held & A. McGrew (Eds.), *The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*. London, 278-286.
- Spengler, O. (2016). *Routledge Revivals: Man and Technics (1932): A Contribution to a Philosophy of Life*. New York: Routledge.
- Tarasov, A. N. (2013). The concept of “culture-system” in the aspect of the analysis of socio-cultural transformations in the continuum of European culture, No. 4-1. *Moscow: Logos*, 190-193.
- Wallerstein, I. (2000). Culture as the Ideological Battleground of the Modern World-System, in *Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity: a theory, culture & society special issue*. London: SAGE, 30-57.

*Words: 5 739*

*Characters: 37 791(21,01 standard pages)*

Prof. Absattarov Raushanbek, dr.  
Department of social and humanitarian sciences KazNPU named after Abay,  
Dostyk ave 13, 050001 Almaty,  
Kazakhstan  
rau.absat@bk.ru

Absattarov Galimzhan, cdt of political Sciences,  
Department of social and humanitarian sciences  
Kazakh University of international relations and world languages named after Abylai  
Khan, Satpayev street, 9  
Almaty, 050022, Kazakhstan  
absatg@bk.ru

Absattarov Marat, Candidate of legal sciences  
Sector of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan,  
Nur-Sultan, Satpayev street, 9  
Kazakhstan 010000  
marat.absat@bk.ru

Karimova Zhanna, PhD, Dr.  
Department of the Kazakhstan Institute for Strategic Research  
Satpayev street, 9  
Nur-Sultan, 010000 ,  
Kazakhstan  
z\_karim@internet.ru

Seisen Nailya  
Doctor of Political Science,  
head of science department  
Assoc. prof. International University of Tourism and Hospitality,  
Turkestan, Kazakhstan 161200  
n.seysen@bk.ru