

Abuov Amrekul

Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, Turkestan, Kazakhstan.

E-mail: naukakaz@mail.ru

GLOBALIZATION AS A PHENOMENON OF CROSS-CULTURAL AND IDEOLOGICAL BASIS FORMATION

Abstract. The current era of globalization is a complex and multifaceted phenomenon. One of its most important aspects is "the gradual formation of a common human humanitarian: cultural, ideological, moral and ethical basis, which brings together nations and peoples with different civilizations, histories, traditions and cultures." In today's globalization, in particular, in the formation of its humanitarian foundations must use the cultural heritage of all civilizations, which will enrich each nation and the world community, but each nation will always preserve its language, religion and national values, distinguishing between cultures. Imitating the culture of another nation, which must remain, means inevitably kneeling. However, in recent times there has been a dominance of only one dominant power in world civilization. In other words, globalization of "Americanization", which relies on the financial and economic power of transnational corporations, is gaining momentum. Such a trend does not have a one-sided effect in developing countries, as well as in Europe.

Despite the fact that today the concept of globalization is widely known, D.V. Ivanov points out: "The first signs of a crisis in the global paradigm of change are obvious. By simulating economic integration, the formation of a transnational bureaucracy, and the growth of multicomunities, the theory of globalization does not describe similar new trends that emerged in the late twentieth century: the influence of simulations, as well as computer revolution and cyber.

In general, the concept of globalization in sociology includes a wide range of events and trends: the development of world ideologies, the intensive struggle for world order; increasing the number and influence of international organizations, weakening the independence of nation-states; emergence and development of transnational corporations, growth of international trade; mass migration and creation of multi-communities; the creation of global media and the invasion of Western culture in all regions of the world, etc.

Despite extensive research by sociologists in the field of the theory of globalization, modern foreign researchers show that economic and political concepts are widespread. These studies are often supplemented by an analysis of cultural opportunities, which is associated with the role of the state, the economy and the technological revolution.

Many authors also point out that global competition has negative consequences, even in the Western labor market. For example, the German sociologist Erich Veda noted that the restriction of world free trade does not benefit not only Western countries, but also non-capitalist countries. First, poor countries that have lost Western markets are "forced to feel hatred of the West." Second, globalization allows the West to shift some of its workers to higher-paying jobs in order to meet external demand. Third, for Western consumers, globalization means lower prices for many imported goods" [1].

In some of the works of recent years [2], it is hoped that the increase in prosperity will have an indirect effect on democracy and a direct reduction in the threat of war and conflict.

Key words: globalization, intercultural, ideological, basis, formation, phenomenon.

Introduction. The current period of globalization is characterized by the West's desire to dominate culture, especially politically, so it can be conditionally called Westernization. At its core is the Americanization, because in today's political arena, the United States occupies a leading position in the world, declaring its hegemony and avant-garde. In this regard, a number of authors talk about the current era of globalization, first of all, about the Americanization of the world. Russian researchers V.A. Lisichkin and L.A. Shelepin will consider in detail the means by which it travels [3]. In their book,

they oppose US policy, arguing that they are largely implementing a long-term program aimed at "organizing global power".

V.A. Lisichkin and L.A. Shelepin understand globalization as "the creation of a centrally managed global economic system." They see the United States as the "global empire of evil." Full coverage of world power involves the implementation of a long-term program for the whole world. As a means to achieve this goal, they use four weapons: informational, military, environmental and financial. Therefore, in addition to the main directions of globalization policy, it is necessary to pay attention to the use of the religious factor in the implementation of modern globalization projects.

And their military means are, first and foremost, to intimidate the world through their powerful armed forces, to acquire nuclear weapons, and to demonstrate their opposition to nuclear-weapon states through violence and intimidation. This is done with the aim of "preserving peace in the world." "Should peace be maintained through war?" the question arises.

And the information impact is reflected on different scales. For example, many political scientists and politicians emphasize that the world is pursuing a policy of provocation through information. The so-called "American culture" multiculturalism is not just a model of multiculturalism, but is associated with the ideologicalization of its values in the world. These values are sometimes incompatible with human well-being.

The next issue is the structural composition of global processes. Considering the efforts made to implement global projects, we can note a variety of aspects: military, religious, ideological, philosophical, legal, moral, economic, etc. In some cases, only one aspect, in other cases two, three or more aspects prevail. If we analyze the previous attempts at globalization in terms of speed, durability and longevity, we must take into account all the factors and considerations that guided at that time, in particular, the decision-makers.

Fernand Brodel points out that in any globalization there are four main aspects that shape the order of relations: the economic aspect, the social aspect, the cultural aspect and the political aspect. According to him, these aspects do not affect them individually, they should not be considered individually, as they together form a system, none of which can be isolated. We need to learn from the experience of the past - the economic aspect can not be considered in isolation.

Fernand Brodel emphasizes that it is not just a mistake to take into account the economic factor, it is a dangerous mistake. "The economic history of the world," he writes, "is the history of the whole world, based on the prism of economics, viewed from a single point of view, in particular from an economic point of view." Choosing this approach means using a form of one-sided and dangerous interpretation from the outset.

According to the Russian scientist R.F. Matveev, "in the past, military, religious and ideological considerations clearly prevailed over legal and moral considerations. Economic factors were not important in the past, which was due to the underdevelopment of the economy" [4]. This is one of the reasons for the instability and short-term nature of real global processes in the past. Today, in some countries, the economy has risen alongside military and ideological factors, which have become the leading factors in globalization. However, notes RF Matveev, - there are contradictory trends. On the one hand, "there is a tendency to internationalize economic and trade relations, which is in the interests of large enterprises, as well as the interests of all mankind, the successful development of machinery and technology, the interests of consumers who make up the majority of mankind" [4]. On the one hand, there are constant attempts by some states to gain significant economic, financial, as well as political unilateral advantages at the expense of competition and even at the expense of a partner.

This situation is, in fact, probably due to the fear that some or all of the utopian nature of the minority will dominate the majority. For example, it is argued that "their heads are full of fantastic fears or apprehensions of the 'world government' type, a government that they think is or is likely to rule us" [5]. Here A.S. Alekseev believes that such power is deceptive.

Even in modern sociology, the social processes of globalization are widely and discussed from different perspectives. This is also due to the lack of a comprehensive theory of globalization. There are theoretical views on some aspects of this diverse phenomenon. However, although globalization is a single complex that requires its own consistent approach, each of these theories lives in isolation from the others.

There are different approaches to globalization. For example, Western scholars such as Wallerstein, Meyer, and Robertson have differing opinions. According to Wallerstein's theory of the world system, the world is divided into centers (mature nations) that look over the peripheral regions (developing countries) [6], - suggests a negative view of globalization.

Meyer refuted Wallerstein's main argument about the structure of the world system, which consists of economically prosperous countries and their dependent peripheral countries. According to Wallerstein, the world system is not only the world of economics, but also the world of the global system of nation-states. Meyer's main argument is that "world building" is a system that works alongside the world economy, but is not significantly functionally dependent on it.

Next, we will focus on the views that are neutral on the phenomenon of globalization. Some of them emphasize the fate of nation-states and their place in the context of globalization. And while some look at its history, others see globalization as a utopia and need to be ignored. And some saw it as just a historical process.

Nation-states are not only connected with the world economy, they also influence the process of the global system. It is a process of globalization, which means that it consists of different societies that interact with each other to create a world system divided by national interests.

Roland Robertson also pays special attention to national societies. According to him, in order to create a "single space", the whole world will become more interconnected, where national societies will one day disappear. Because, in our opinion, many nations and peoples have disappeared or been swallowed up by others, even though there is no process of globalization to date. The same is true of the nations and ethnic groups in Russia that are losing their language and mentality. But we must not forget about the imperial policy and the fact that the nation can not be unique.

One of the directions that gives rise to a neutral or rational approach to globalization is historical. That is, it does not look at globalization from a positive or negative point of view, but from the perspective of integration in history, explaining that globalization, which began in the late twentieth century, is the next cycle.

For example, let's look at some of the views on this channel. In fact, the debate on globalization emerged in the mid-1980s, developed and promoted by Roland Robertson [7]. According to him, globalization is a long historical process, the beginning and formation of the preconditions of globalization dates back to the XV-XVI centuries [8]. M. Waters has the same opinion [9]. However, T. Turborn has found at least six "waves" of globalization throughout history, the first of which is the expansion of world religions in the III-VII centuries [10].

Russian scientist DV Ivanov, who disagrees with this view, notes that "globalization in terms of intensity and prevalence at the macro-social and micro-social levels clearly contradicts the processes that preceded it." Therefore, such models developed by theorists of globalization are not suitable for the analysis of trends in the past. Defining these processes as globalization processes, in the opinion of D.V. Ivanov, "contradicts history, because the patchwork of non-existent features, such as intensity and inclusiveness, obscures the concept of globalization" [11].

In fact, if we follow Robertson, Waters, and even Therbon, if we attribute any international, intercultural relations, and geographical discoveries of Europeans from the fifteenth century, and even changes from the third century, to globalization, we will define it by the concept of "globalization." The identification of phenomena with different properties on different scales makes "globalization" an abstract instruction that repeats the movement of people and the results of their activities around the globe from specific scientific concepts that reveal the specifics of modern processes.

Considering the social and cultural progress in human society in the twentieth century, D.V. Ivanov divides the theoretical research of the classics and modern researchers into subject areas, giving the concepts of "internationalization" and "globalization", respectively. He called "internationalization" the growth of a system of economic and political relations at the level of national institutions (states, intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental, but national organizations), an idea that dates back to the XIX century and aroused interest in classical theory of development. However, in any case, this description is not enough to describe the current processes that are qualitatively different from internationalization.

In fact, internationalization depends only on the national, national, mental nature of globalization, where it is economic, political, cultural, etc. industries are left out.

Wallerstein emphasizes the differences between local societies - traditional types of empires and the capitalist world - the economy that emerged in the XV-XVI centuries [12]. Within the world of economics, there are social groups in the center of the system, in the peripheral region and in the semi-peripheral region. Groups are divided by the nature of the connections, not by geographical proximity. In the capitalist world, there are corporations and competition in the economy. There is also a relationship of exploitation and dependence between the center and the periphery.

One of the neutrals of globalization is that he does not pay much attention to the concept, and some people criticize it rationally, but they do not have a very negative emotional outlook.

Proponents of the paradigm of the world system reject the use of the term "globalization", believing that it is enough to present it simply as a conjuncture [13]. We can explain it as follows: it means giving a special name to the natural processes that take place in any society, turning them into special terms and bringing them to the field of study. They don't think it's necessary.

Wallerstein proposes to interpret the empirically determined social changes as the transition of the capitalist world system to a period of crisis, the beginning of which dates back to 1967-1973. Models of globalization developed on the basis of criticism of the theory of the world system and the theory of the global system are an alternative to the models of the global system. Back in 1968, Roland Robertson argued that culture was crucial in "systematizing" the world, and in the mid-1980s, Roland Robertson proposed the following thesis: "Wallerstein's model of national economy and the global interdependence of states is one of the aspects of globalization. The second aspect is that the individual consciousness of individuals has a special role in the transformation of the world into a "single social place" [14].

Defining globalization as a series of changes that are determined empirically, but by the logic of transforming the world into a "single place" has allowed Roland Robertson to formulate a much wider range of this process than global system theorists. In this case, the unity of place means that the conditions and nature of social interaction are the same anywhere in the world. Events in the far corners of the world can be the only conditions or elements of social interaction. Simply put, the world automatically "accumulates." If there are no significant barriers to accumulation, it will have an indivisible integrity to specific areas of social space [15].

Robertson identifies two directions of globalization: global institutionalization of the living world and localization of globalization [16]. The global institutionalization of the living world is interpreted as the organization of daily local interactions and socialization through the direct macrostructural influence of the world order.

The second direction of Robertson's model of globalization is the localization of globalization not from "above" but from "below", ie through the localization of interactions with other states and cultures, the introduction of elements of other national, "exotic" local cultures into everyday life. to display. In multicultural communities, the categories of "international relations", "clash of civilizations", "transnational corporations" are practical manifestations of interaction.

In this regard, we can explain the essence of his idea as follows: Globalization - "international relations", globalization - "clash of civilizations", globalization - "transnational corporation", that is, globalization is just a combination of these former concepts.

Robertson's model allows us to formulate globalization not only as structural changes, but also as changes in the mood of consciousness and interpersonal interactions. At the same time, Robertson's view of globalization is fraught with the possibility of the existence of an opposition that both exploits and denies globalization. According to Robertson, the term "global" means not only "international" and "transnational", but also "transcultural" and "transnational". The concept of global includes all social, global and local phenomena.

Robertson's approach to globalization was warmly received by many researchers in the 1990s. For example, theorists such as W. Beck and G. Turborn, who are known for their peculiarities in the study of modernization, have developed individual models of global society [17]. "What is globalization?" In his work, Beck introduced the category of transnational social space [18], which basically corresponds to Robertson's concept of "single place". According to Beck, globalization means "the daily activities of the economy, information, ecology, technology, transnational conflicts and various dimensions of civil society".

In Goran Terborn's work "Globalization", the term "globalization" refers to the process of "world-wide spread of social phenomena, influence or awareness of the world about something among social factors" [19]. Thus, Terborn continued on the path taken by Robertson, combining global interdependence and global consciousness into a single model. Terborn proposes a model of global socialization that formulates change at two levels (macro and microsocial) and in two directions (individual globalization and localization of globalization). The theoretical models developed by Robertson, Beck, and Thorborne re-suggest the type of theory of globalization that is prevalent in sociology today. The spatial reference of the theory for this direction is the theory.

The third type of model of globalization was formed in the late 80s and early 90s of the XX century on the basis of a radically different understanding of the concept of "globalization" spatial referencing [20]. In 1990, Arjun Appadurai began to lay the foundations for this type of model with his article "Divisions and Differences in Global Culture and Economy" further developed in the book [21]. He sees globalization as deregulation - the elimination of the dependence of social processes on physical space [22].

In the process of globalization, a "global cultural flow" is formed, which is divided into five cultural-symbolic space-flows (landscapes): ethno-space (ethnoscapes) - with the flow of tourists, immigrants, refugees, migrant workers; financial space (finansscapes) - with capital inflows; mediascapes - with a stream of images; ideological space (ideoscapes) - is formed by the flow of ideology.

Malcolm Waters' work "Globalization" contains the logic of replacing the local / global dichotomy with the territorial / non-territorial dichotomy [9]. Globalization is interpreted as a set of processes associated with the dominance of symbolic exchanges, leading to the deregulation of social events. According to Waters, the foundation of the theory of globalization is the concept of the relationship between social organization and territory.

Waters analyzes globalization in the field of culture based on the concept of Appadurai. The "dimensions" of culture in Waters' theory are as follows: sacriscapes - defined by a simulated stream of religiosity; ethnoscapes - observed through simulations of ethnic similarity; economic space (econoscapes) - is reflected in the flow of value and capital simulators; mediascapes - information is represented by a stream of simulators; leiscapes - entertainment and impressions, for example, are created by tourist simulators [9].

Summing up the analysis of theoretical models of globalization, Ivan Ivanov proposed three types - the global system (Giddens, Sclera), global socialization (Robertson, Beck, Terborn), social deregulation (Appadurai, Waters). We see that the "formulation" generates three "waves" or "directions". Through this paradigm, he argues that "any empirically determined process of change is interpreted as an aspect, part, or a form of globalization." For example, Robertson, Appadurai and Terborn introduced into the concept of globalization the growth of separatism, cultural and religious fundamentalism, social movements against globalization, Waters - consumerism, Beck - the escalation of environmental problems. However, the expansion of the theory of globalization was achieved by eliminating the paradigmatic differences in the concept of "local / global".

There are also debates among experts about the main reasons for concern about globalization, such as "whether it is global free trade or the development of technology." In recent years, the reputation of those who believe that the development of technology is a more important factor than globalization is gaining ground [23].

Ә. Әбуов

Қ. А. Ясауи атындағы Халықаралық қазақ-түрік университеті, Түркістан, Қазақстан

ЖАҢАНДАНУ ИДЕОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ ЖӘНЕ МӘДЕНИЕТ АРАЛЫҚ НЕГІЗ ҚАЛЫПТАСТЫРУ ФЕНОМЕНИ РЕТІНДЕ

Аннотация. Қазіргі жаһандану кезеңі – күрделі әрі көпқырлы құбылыс. Оның маңызды аспектілерінің бірі – «әлдебір жалпы адами гуманитарлық: мәденитанымдық, идеологиялық, моральдық-этикалық негіздерді біртіндеп қалыптастыру, осы арқылы түрлі өркениетке әрі түрлі тарихқа, дәстүр мен мәдениетке ие ұлттар мен халықтарды жақындата түседі». Қазіргі жаһандану барысында, атап айтқанда, оның гуманитарлық негіздерін қалыптастыруда адамзаттың барлық өркениеттік ағындарының мәдени мұрасын пайдалануы керек, мұның өзі әр халықты және әлемдік қауымдастықты байыпта түсері анық, дегенмен, әрбір ұлт өз мәдениетінің аражігін ажырата отырып, тілін, дінін, ұлттық құндылықтарын мәңгі сақтап қалуы қажет өзге ұлттың мәдениетіне еліктеу – еріксіз тізе бүгу деген сөз. Алайда соңғы уақытта әлемдік өркениетте бір ғана үстем державаның басымдық танытуы байқалуда. Басқаша айтқанда, трансұлттық корпорациялардың қаржы-экономикалық қуатына арқа сүйейтін «америкаландыру» жаһандануы белең алып келеді: Мұндай үрдіс дамушы елдерде, сонымен қатар Еуропада да біржақты жақсы әсер тудырмайды.

Қазіргі таңда жаһандану концепциясының кеңінен танымал болуына қарамастан, Д.В. Иванов былай деп көрсетеді: «Өзгерістердің жаһандық парадигмасының дағдарысқа ұшырауының алғашқы белгілері көзге ұрынып тұр. Экономикалық ықпалдасу, трансұлттық бюрократияның қалыптасуы, мультиқауымдас-тықтардың өсу үрдістерін ұқсата үлгілей отырып, жаһандану теориясы ХХ ғасырдың соңына қарай

туындаған ұқсас жана үрдістерді, атап айтқанда, экономикадағы, саясаттағы, мәдениеттегі шынайы заттардың әрекеттердің орнын ауыстыратын образдардың – симуляциялардың әсер етуі, сонымен қатар, компьютерлік революция және кибермәдениеттің қалыптасуын суреттемейді.

Жалпы алғанда, әлеуметтанудағы жаһандану ұғымы оқиғалар мен үрдістердің кең ауқымын қамтиды: әлемдік идеологиялардың дамуы, әлемдік тәртіп орнату үшін қарқынды күрес жүргізу; халықаралық ұйымдардың саны мен әсерінің ұлғаюы, ұлттық мемлекеттер тәуелсіздігінің әлсіреуі; трансұлттық корпорациялардың пайда болуы мен дамуы, халықаралық сауданың өсуі; жаппай қарқынды көші-қон мен мультиқауымдастықтардың құрылуы; ғаламдық БАҚ құрылуы мен әлемнің барлық аймақтарына батыс мәдениетінің өктемдігі және т.б.

Әлеуметтанушылар тарапынан жаһандану теориясы саласында жүргізілген қомақты зерттеулерге қарамастан, қазіргі заманғы шетелдік зерттеушілер негізінен экономикалық және саяси тұжырымдамалардың таралғандығын көрсетіп отыр. Бұл зерттеулер, көп жағдайда, мәдени мүмкіншіліктерге жасалған талдау арқылы толығып келеді, мұның өзі мемлекеттің, экономиканың және техникалық революцияның рөліне байланысты болып келеді.

Сонымен қатар көптеген авторлар тарапынан жаһандық бәсекелестік, тіпті батыс елдерінің еңбек нарығында да теріс салдарға әкеліп отыр деген дерек келтірілді. Мәселен, неміс әлеуметтанушысы Эрих Веденің пікірінше, әлемдік еркін сауданы шектеу батыс елдерімен қоса, капиталистік емес әлем елдерінің де пайдасына аспайды. Біріншіден, батыс мемлекеттерінің нарығынан айырылған кедей елдер «Батысқа деген жек көру сезімін бастан кешуге мәжбүр». Екіншіден, жаһандану «Батыста жұмысшылардың бір бөлігін сырттан сұраныс болуы үшін жоғары жалақы төленетін жұмысқа ауыстыруға мүмкіндік береді. Үшіншіден, батыс тұтынушылары үшін жаһандану көптеген импорт тауар бағаларының төмендеуін білдіреді» [1].

Соңғы жылдардағы жұмыстардың кейбіреулерінде [2] әл-ауқаттың артуы демократияға жанама түрде әсер етіп, соғыс пен қақтығыстар қаупін тікелей сейілтуге ықпалын тигізеді деген үміт бар.

Түйін сөздер: жаһандану, мәдениаралық, идеологиялық, негіз, қалыптастыру, құбылыс.

А. Абуов

Международный казахско-турецкий университет
им. Ходжи Ахмеда Ясави, Туркестан, Казахстан

ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИЯ КАК ФЕНОМЕН ФОРМИРОВАНИЯ МЕЖКУЛЬТУРНОЙ И ИДЕОЛОГИЧЕСКОЙ ОСНОВ

Аннотация. Нынешняя эпоха глобализации является сложным и многогранным явлением. Одним из наиболее важных аспектов является «постепенное формирование общей гуманитарной: культурной, идеологической, моральной и этической основ, которая объединяет нации и народы с разными цивилизациями, историями, традициями и культурами». В условиях современной глобализации, в частности, при формировании своих гуманитарных основ необходимо использовать культурное наследие всех цивилизаций, которое обогатит каждую нацию и мировое сообщество, но каждая нация всегда будет сохранять свой язык, религию и национальные ценности, различая культуры. Подражать культуре другой нации, которая должна остаться, означает неизбежно становиться на колени. Однако в последнее время в мировой цивилизации доминирует только одна сила. Другими словами, глобализация «американизации», которая опирается на финансовую и экономическую мощь транснациональных корпораций, набирает обороты. Такая тенденция не имеет одностороннего эффекта в развивающихся странах, а также в Европе.

Несмотря на то, что сегодня концепция глобализации широко известна, Д.В. Иванов отмечает: «Первые признаки кризиса в глобальной парадигме перемен очевидны. Моделируя экономическую интеграцию, формирование транснациональной бюрократии и рост многообщинных сообществ, теория глобализации не описывает аналогичные новые тенденции, появившиеся в конце двадцатого века: влияние симуляций, а также компьютерная революция и кибернетические процессы».

В целом понятие глобализации в социологии включает в себя широкий спектр событий и направлений: развитие мировых идеологий, интенсивная борьба за мировой порядок; увеличение числа и влияния международных организаций, ослабление независимости национальных государств; возникновение и развитие транснациональных корпораций, рост международной торговли; массовая миграция и создание мультиобществ; создание глобальных СМИ и вторжение западной культуры во все регионы мира и т. д.

Несмотря на обширные исследования социологов в области теории глобализации, современные зарубежные исследователи показывают, что экономические и политические концепции широко распространены. Эти исследования часто дополняются анализом культурных возможностей, что связано с ролью государства, экономики и технологической революции.

Многие авторы также отмечают, что глобальная конкуренция имеет негативные последствия даже на западном рынке труда. Например, немецкий социолог Эрих Веда отметил, что ограничение мировой свободной торговли выгодно не только западным, но и некапиталистическим странам. Во-первых, бедные страны, потерявшие западные рынки, «вынуждены чувствовать ненависть к Западу». Во-вторых, глобализация позволяет Западу переводить некоторых своих работников на более высокооплачиваемые рабочие места для удовлетворения внешнего спроса. В-третьих, для западных потребителей глобализация означает снижение цен на многие импортируемые товары» [1].

Можно надеяться, что в некоторых работах последних лет [2] увеличение благосостояния окажет косвенное влияние на демократию и приведет к прямому снижению угрозы войны и конфликта.

Ключевые слова: глобализация, межкультурный, идеологический, базис, формирование, феномен.

Information about author:

Abuov Amrekul, the actor of culture, of The Republic of Kazakhstan doctor of philosophical sciences, professor The vice president on the social support and upbringing issues «Akhmet Yassawi International Kazakh-Turkish University, Turkestan, Kazakhstan; naukakaz@mail.ru; <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4408-3923>

REFERENCES

- [1] Vede Erich. Power shifts, the struggle of cultures and globalization // *Internationale Politik*. N 6, 1997.
- [2] John R. ONeal and Bruce M. Russet, *The Classical Liberals Were Right: Democracy, Interdependence, and Conflict 1950 - 85* // *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 2, 1997. P. 214-263.
- [3] Lisichkin V.A., Shelepin L.A. *Global Evil Empire*. M., 2001. 214 b.
- [4] Matveev R.F. Methodological and theoretical problems of globalization // "New" Russia: national interests in a global context. Materials of the Russian inter-university scientific conference "New" Russia: national interests in a global context: December 7-8, 2001, M., Russian State Humanitarian University, 2001. 3 p.
- [5] Alekseev A.S. Globalization: Are New Empires Possible // *Science and Life*, N 3, 2008, P. 3-11 (11 p.).
- [6] Eshleman J. R. Cashion, B. G., Basinco L. *Sociology and Introduction*, Third Edition. Harper Collins Publishers, USA, 1988.
- [7] Robertson R., Lechner F. *Modernization, Globalization and the Problem of Culture in the World-Systems Theory* // *Theory, Culture & Society*. 1985. N 3.
- [8] Robertson R. *Globalization Theory and Civilization Analysis* // *Comparative Civilizations Review*. 1987. Vol. 17.
- [9] Waters M. *Globalizacao*. Oeiras, 1999.
- [10] Therborn G. *Globalizations: Dimensions, Historical Waves, Regional Effects, Normative Governance* // *International Sociology*. 2000. N 2.
- [11] Ivanov D.V. The evolution of the concept of globalization.: www.ecsocman.edu.ru/db/msg/1804
- [12] Wallerstein I. *The Modern World System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European world-economy in the Sixteenth Century*. New York, 1974. 15 p.
- [13] Abu-Lughod J. *Going Beyond Global Babble* // *Culture, Globalization and the World-System*. Ed. by A.D. King London, 1991, 28 p.
- [14] Wallerstein I. *Globalization or the Age of Transition?* // *International Sociology*. 2000. N 2. 250 p.
- [15] Robertson R. Lechner F. *Modernization, Globalization and the Problem of Culture in the World-Systems Theory* // *Theory, Culture & Society*. 1985, N 3; Robertson R. *Globalization Theory and Civilization Analysis* // *Comparative Civilizations Review*. 1987, Vol. 17.
- [16] Robertson R. *Mapping the Global Condition: Globalization as the Central Concept* // *Global Culture*. Ed. by M. Featherstone. London, 1990. P. 15-17.
- [17] Beck W. *Risk Society: Toward a different Art Nouveau*. M., 2000; Therborn G. *European Modernity and Beyond: The Trajectory of European Societies 1945-2000*. London, 1995.
- [18] Beck U. *Was is Globalisierung?* Frankfurt a. M., 1998, 55 p.
- [19] Therborn G. *Globalizations: Dimensions, Historical Waves, Regional Effects, Normative Governance* // *International Sociology*. 2000. N 2. 154 p.
- [20] Appadurai A. *Disjunctive and Difference in the Global Cultural Economy* // *Global Culture*. Ed. by M. Featherstone. London, 1990.
- [21] Appadurai A. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis, 1996.
- [22] Appadurai A. *Disjuncture and Difference*, 301. p.
- [23] Paul Krugmann, *Pjp Internationalizm*, Cambridge, MA, 1996.