

CULTURAL ADAPTATION OF KAZAKHS AND KYRGYZ: FROM TRADITIONAL SOCIETY TO MODERN CIVILIZATION

¹A. Gappassova, ²R. Stamova, ³M.K. Kakhimzhanova*, ⁴T.M.Sadykova

^{1,3,4}S. Seifullin Kazakh Agrotechnical Research University (Astana, Kazakhstan)

²A.A. Altyмышbaev Institute of philosophy, law and socio-political researches of the National Academy of Sciences of the Kyrgyz Republic (Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan)

¹aimana-84@mail.ru, ²stamrah@mail.ru, ³rita_k79@mail.ru, ⁴storgyn@mail.ru

¹А.Г. Гаппасова, ²Р.Д. Стамова, ³М.К. Кахимжанова, ⁴Т.М. Садыкова

^{1,3,4}С. Сейфуллин атындағы Қазақ агротехникалық зерттеу университеті (Астана, Қазақстан)

²Қырғыз Республикасының Ұлттық Ғылым академиясы, А.А.Алтымышбаев атындағы философия, құқық және әлеуметтік-саяси ғылымдар институты (Бішкек, Қырғызстан)

¹aimana-84@mail.ru, ²stamrah@mail.ru, ³rita_k79@mail.ru, ⁴storgyn@mail.ru

Citation: Gappassova A., Stamova R., Mambetova A. Cultural Adaptation of Kazakhs and Kyrgyz: from Traditional Society to Modern Civilization // Al-Farabi. – 2026. – Vol. 24. No.1 (93). – P. 169-184.

Abstract. This article examines the stages of civilizational transformation of the traditional societies of the Kazakh and Kyrgyz peoples, as well as the changes that occurred under conditions of modernization. Initially, the nomadic Eurasian civilization, due to its openness, prepared these peoples to assimilate elements of other cultures, laying the groundwork for subsequent transformations. The first significant phase of modernization began with the adoption of Islam, which influenced the social and cultural organization of society. Major changes occurred during the Russian Empire and Soviet periods, drawing the region into processes of globalization and leading to profound civilizational transformations. The Soviet government eliminated the nomadic way of life, introduced new legal and political institutions, established an industrial base, and promoted urbanization, thus laying the foundation for the formation of a mass society. Particular attention is given to the impact of mass culture on ethnic values, as well as to the contradictions between the need to preserve traditions and adapt to modern life. The authors emphasize the ability of Kazakhs and Kyrgyz to integrate external elements while maintaining their own cultural identity. In conclusion, the article highlights the importance of combining the preservation of traditional values with innovation for sustainable cultural development in the context of globalization.

Keywords: globalization, modernization, civilizational transformation, traditional society, nomadic civilization, Kazakhs, Kyrgyz, traditional values, mass culture.

* Author-correspondent: M.K. Kakimzhanova, rita_k79@mail.ru

Introduction

In the historical context, traditional societies represent worlds that exist in a distinct, decelerated rhythm of time. Their stability is ensured by centuries-old traditions, sacred norms, and an unbreakable connection to the natural cycle, which makes them highly resistant to change. Against this backdrop, the nomadic civilizations of the Kazakhs and Kyrgyz appear as a unique phenomenon. For centuries, they managed to preserve their cultural code not through isolation, but through their very mobility. The boundless steppe expanses of Eurasia served not as a wall, but as a buffer, allowing these peoples to avoid direct and destructive external pressures, thereby safeguarding the core of their identity, language, and worldview.

However, this self-sufficiency did not imply cultural isolation. On the contrary, the nomadic civilization, situated at the crossroads of great trade routes and geopolitical interests, was always open to dialogue. It absorbed and creatively reinterpreted elements of a wide variety of cultures. This shaped a distinctive, synthetic type of mentality, endowed with internal flexibility and an ability to adapt—qualities that became decisive in subsequent eras of radical change.

This work is devoted to the study of the profound transformations that have altered the traditional way of life of the Kazakh and Kyrgyz peoples. The article examines two key modernization projects that fundamentally changed their civilizational trajectory. The first was the gradual adoption of Islam, which integrated the steppe peoples into the global context of the Muslim world, enriching their culture with new spirituality and ethics. The second—and most comprehensive—stage was their incorporation into the Russian Empire and later the Soviet Union. This period was marked not merely by cultural influence, but by a complete restructuring of socio-economic foundations: the forced transition to a sedentary lifestyle, industrialization, the introduction of secular education, and the creation of new political institutions.

Today, at a new turn in history, following the attainment of independence, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan have faced the challenges of a third, globalization-driven stage. The collapse of the Soviet system left an ideological vacuum, giving rise to complex processes: on the one hand, there has been a revival of archaic clan-based structures; on the other, society has come under the powerful influence of global mass culture. The aim of this work is to trace this complex path, analyze the consequences of each stage of modernization, and reflect on the current position of these nations, which are seeking their own path of development balancing the preservation of national identity with their inevitable participation in the shaping of a global civilization.

Methodology

This study employs a comprehensive interdisciplinary approach, integrating comparative-historical, cultural, and civilizational analyses. The comparative-historical method enables the tracing and comparison of modernization processes among the Kazakh and Kyrgyz peoples, identifying their common stages, forms,

and outcomes. The civilizational approach allows for the examination of Kazakh and Kyrgyz societies as a distinct «nomadic Eurasian civilization». Particular attention is paid to the study of culture as a key factor in social development. The analysis considers external influences-most notably, the Russian cultural tradition and Soviet ideology which have shaped the traditional values, legal system, and public consciousness of the Kazakhs and Kyrgyz. The research is grounded in the principles of a systemic approach and historicism, which have enabled a holistic examination of the processes of modernization and cultural transformation within Kazakh and Kyrgyz societies.

Genesis of identity: early stages of kazakh and kyrgyz modernization

Traditional societies in world history change, as is known, exceptionally slowly. However, that they do not experience a long and significant external cultural influence from people or peoples who have primarily overcome the state stage of traditional society. As for the Kazakhs and Kyrgyz, they managed for a long historical time, mainly due to relatively free spaces and harsh living conditions in these spaces, to avoid such influence and thus preserve their original culture and mentality. Owing to specific historical circumstances, the Kazakh and Kyrgyz peoples remained largely detached from regional processes and cultural globalization throughout significant historical periods. On the other hand, since the Kazakhs and Kyrgyz, constantly moving across vast spaces, have never been in complete isolation from other peoples, their nomadic civilization developed independently while, over a long historical period, absorbing certain features of the cultures and traditions of neighboring peoples. This, in our opinion, has, to some extent, prepared them at least at the mental level, for a positive perception of many elements of other peoples' cultures at the present stage of development. In other words, the nomadic Eurasian civilization contained something that, in principle, can be defined as universalist beginnings, which later allowed and currently allow Kazakhs and Kyrgyz to perceive and absorb elements of other cultures relatively quickly and painlessly while preserving their own original culture and its essential elements.

A rather vivid and convincing example of how quickly and painlessly Kazakhs and Kyrgyz can perceive new cultural samples and forms is, in particular, the fact that new cultural forms and values introduced into the Kazakh cultural soil by representatives of Russian culture in the XIX and early XX centuries were promoted in the proposals and statements of a number of Kazakh educators. Chokan Valikhanov, Abai Kunanbaev and Ybyrai Altynsarin advocated a significant change in the basis of the country's economy - nomadic cattle breeding - through constant rationalization and gradual transition to sedentary life, as well as the development of agriculture, crafts, industry and trade. Having raised the issue of transformation of Kazakh society, enlighteners insisted on gradual and non-violent transformation processes. Thus, Ch. Valikhanov noted: «In our time, the most important and close for the people are considered to be economic and social reforms, directly related to the vital needs of the people, and political reforms are allowed as a means to carry out the necessary economic reforms, because each

person separately and all mankind collectively strives in its development ... to improve its material well-being ... Any reform, which has the purpose of public welfare, only then can achieve the intended goal, without being subjected to various accidents, to the development of the Kazakh society...» [1, p. 319].

The change of traditional forms of life took place earlier and is currently taking place, as already mentioned, in the form of modernization, which is a process of complete or partial change of the social system to accelerate development. Kazakhs and Kyrgyz, due to historical circumstances and geographical conditions, have gone through the same stages and forms of modernization, the first of which was the stage of modernization associated with the adoption of Muslimism by Kazakhs and Kyrgyz. This process began and ended in both our peoples at approximately the same time. However, by adopting the new faith and abandoning their former beliefs, the Kazakhs and Kyrgyz left many elements of their former beliefs, mainly related to certain customs, rites and rituals. The adoption of Muslimism by the Kazakh and Kyrgyz peoples was undoubtedly a significant step forward in terms of changing mentality and adapting to the changing world.

On the other hand, at the modern stage of modernization, as many facts testify, of all contemporary world religions, Islam and, accordingly, the people who preach the Muslim religion are the most difficult and slow to be transformed. This stage of modernization of traditional Kazakh and Kyrgyz society was in general, completed. But its results were, in fact, fundamental, as Kazakhs and Kyrgyz became part of the Muslim world and civilization, which quite noticeably affects the nature of modernization and the process of involvement of our peoples in global civilization.

In the 19th and early 20th centuries, Kazakhs and Kyrgyz underwent the eastern stage of modernization associated with the adoption of Islam by Kazakhs and Kyrgyz. The second stage was the Russian and Russian-Soviet stage, which began practically from the moment of the annexation of Kazakh and Kyrgyz territories to the Russian Empire. It should be emphasized that this annexation for both our peoples meant, in fact, their involvement in the process of globalization and the formation of global civilization. On the other hand, the involvement of Kazakhs and Kyrgyz in Russian culture and civilization led to their most significant civilizational changes. The decisive factor in the nature and extent of the influence of the Russian people and its culture on the traditional Kazakh and Kyrgyz cultures was the fact that Russia at the time of the entry of our peoples into the empire stood at a much higher stage of socio-economic development.

Before proceeding to the analysis of the nature of the impact on the traditional Kazakh and Kyrgyz civilization and the Russian culture, which, being the culture of the imperial people, was synthetic in nature, i.e. included many elements of different cultures, both Western and Eastern, let us draw attention to the fact that cultures, due to the very human nature, have the property of competing with each other, as a result of which we can observe many precedents of absorption in the history of mankind. If we turn, for example, to the history of Rome, we can recall the emergence, as a result of profound transformations, of French, Spanish, Portuguese and other Romanesque cultures, which are varieties of Roman culture, the synthesis of local Celtic, Basque, Spanish and other cultures with Latin.

In connection with the introduction of Russian culture into Kazakh and Kyrgyz culture, let us cite the thought of the famous Russian geopolitician and philosopher A.I. Dugin that «The political affirms, preserves, and changes the value systems of society. The political does not create value systems. Value systems come into the political sphere from other spheres. But never makes a value system - religion, culture, everyday life, customs, art, intellectual activity, beliefs, myths, rituals, rites, patterns of behaviour, etc. - does not become dominant in society bypassing the Political» [2, p. 49]. On the other hand, the «Political», invading «foreign territories», strives to establish its own domination on these territories, and for this purpose, as a rule, it uses the whole arsenal of means available to it, and these include «religion, culture, everyday life, customs, art, intellectual activity, beliefs, myths, rituals, rites, patterns of behaviour, etc.» - In a word, culture, understood in this case in the broadest sense of the word.

By expanding its own territories, the Russian Empire realized its own goals and solved geopolitical tasks, but in order to gain a full foothold in the newly acquired territories, it had to establish itself culturally, which in practice could mean mainly the absorption and assimilation of other cultures. A number of circumstances determined the specific means of realizing this task and the intensity of absorption. For example, the specificity of the absorbed culture, the political situation, the size of the assimilated ethnos, etc., were determined by a number of circumstances. Depending on the specific situation, they took different forms, but they never changed their real content, as well as the final actual goal.

The change of the socio-economic system in Russia in 1917, which made significant adjustments in virtually all spheres of the socio-political and economic life of the state, did not change its strategic objective related to the intention to establish its own domination of all lands it considered its own.

The invasion of Russian culture into the sphere of Kazakh and Kyrgyz culture initially implied the displacement and replacement of their own. This was no longer a matter of principle but only of time and specific means, which had to be tied to the current situation. The change of regime in the Russian state, of which Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan became a part, did not mean a change of the general political line of the state and its doctrine, which had been formalized over many centuries. «The doctrine of Moscow as the Third Rome became the ideological basis for the formation of the Moscow kingdom» points out N.A. Berdyaev. The kingdom was gathered and formed under the symbolism of the messianic idea. The search for the true kingdom is characteristic of the Russian people throughout its history. Belonging to the Russian kingdom was determined by the confession of the true Orthodox faith. In precisely the same way, belonging to Soviet Russia, to the Russian communist kingdom, will be determined by the confession of the orthodox communist faith» [3, p. 9].

After the October Revolution of 1917, only the means changed, according to the new political situation. In Russia, which had lost in the First World War, all the already underdeveloped democratic institutions were curtailed, the institution of private property was abolished, and liberal values were declared bourgeois and replaced by communal, collectivist ones, as a result of which the state became absolute. «One could make a comparison» writes N.A. Berdyaev, «between Peter and Lenin, between the

coup d'état of Peter and the coup d'état of Bolsheviks. The same rudeness, violence, imposition of known principles on the people from above, the same discontinuity of organic development, the denial of traditions, the same etatism, hypertrophy of the state, the same creation of a privileged bureaucratic layer, the same centralism, the same desire to dramatically and radically change the type of civilization» [3, p. 12].

Nevertheless, as Kyrgyz researcher Li Yu.V. notes in his article, «there is one significant difference between the Petrine and Bolshevik reforms: Peter created a new bureaucratic apparatus, and with it a new state, on the old social base and did not fundamentally change relations and forms of ownership, unlike the Bolsheviks, who began their transformations in full accordance with the idea of building a socialist state with the destruction of the institution of private property, which necessarily led to the eradication of entire social strata and to radical changes in the cultural life of the state and in public consciousness» [4, p. 63].

In connection with the revolutionary transformations in Russia, one more critical circumstance should be pointed out. «Russian communism is difficult to understand» wrote N.A. Berdyaev, «because of its double character. On the one hand, it is a phenomenon of the world and internationally, and on the other hand, it is the phenomenon of Russia and the nation. The Russian people in their mental structure people of the East. Russia is the Christian East, which the West strongly influenced for two centuries and assimilated all Western ideas in its upper cultural layer» [3, p. 46].

The features of the Russian people indicated by N.A. Berdyaev are fundamentally important for analyzing and reliably describing the cultural processes that took place in the Soviet Union, of which both our republics were a part. The certain belonging and at the same time the thorniness of Russian culture between East and West gave it a universal character, at least to a certain extent.

In Russia after the revolution, the state, due to radical socio-economic transformations, became, as in the East, omnipotent. But the paradox of the situation was that the technical superiority of the West and its close proximity, which, given Russia's rather perceptible technical lag, could have fatal consequences for it, up to the destruction of its statehood, forced the Russian state to intensively develop science and technology or, in other words, not to abandon under any circumstances the dynamic component of culture. As a matter of fact, the generalization of the means of production after the revolution was carried out to accelerate social and economic processes. Dynamism was thus an end in itself, but intensive development had to be realized by oppressive methods. Thus, the static and deeply conservative nomadic civilization of Kazakhs and Kyrgyz found itself inside the dynamic Russian civilization.

The Soviet system is usually defined as totalitarian. Totalitarianism is dominated by one official ideology, which is shaped by a ruling party headed by a leader. The party is fused with the state apparatus. Inevitably, an absolute concentration of power is established, which unites (in the absence of independent justice) the legislative and executive powers in one body. On the basis of state ownership of the means of production and subsoil, extreme centralism in management is established, establishing control over all spheres of public and private life of citizens [5]. Culture under totalitarianism inevitably becomes an object of special control and tutelage by the state.

The fierce and uncompromising struggle between capitalist and socialist states forced both sides to use the entire arsenal of means at their disposal, and culture, the elements of which are not only material objects but also a system of values, public and private ideals, and ideology, was the most important of them. In addition, socialist states, having introduced an equalized system of wages and depriving the population of economic incentives to work, had to use extra-economic forms of coercion to work on a large scale, and culture had a special role to play here.

In Soviet society, not only was the primacy and superiority of public interests over private interests proclaimed from the outset, but it was also persistently implemented by the state. The point is that the primacy of public interests is an attributive feature of traditional society, which, for this reason, did not contradict communist morality, which, as is well known, is based on collectivist principles. On the other hand, the imperative for accelerated economic development, driven by the hostile environment of leading capitalist countries, strongly stimulated the expansion of the Soviet education system and its spread among the population. This represented one of the most striking contradictions of Soviet culture and its socio-economic structure. While the state, as an integral component of this structure, sought to control all social and political life and restrict individual autonomy, it simultaneously promoted mass education. In this context, the «Russian communist kingdom» in the words of N.A. Berdyaev, used internationalism as a powerful instrument of both domestic and foreign policy. But mainly internal policy, which had as its ultimate goal the complete cultural assimilation of non-Russian peoples into Russian culture, which would become even more synthetic, but would nevertheless retain its basic elements and distinctive features, and most importantly - the language, within which the actual ethnic consciousness is formed, and with it, to a large extent, the original, natural spirit of the people.

Thus, in terms of assimilative purposes and processes, only the forms of exposure and absorption of other cultures changed after the fall of tsarism, but not the principle itself. And besides, the pace of the absorption process changed significantly, which should be emphasized, since the pace of transformations taking place within the new, introduced culture was and is one of the most important features. The material means of accelerating social time is developed industry, and the Soviet state tried to create it everywhere to the best of its ability, believing that a unified industrial base, which largely stimulated the migration of the Slavic part of the country's population to the national republics, would accelerate the formation of a unified culture, and with it, inevitably, the assimilation processes. However, it should be borne in mind that no modern state is possible without a sufficiently developed industry and its corresponding infrastructure. The absence of industry or even its underdevelopment is tantamount in the modern world to the loss not only of economic independence but also, in fact, of political sovereignty. Not to mention the fact that people in today's world in conditions of industrial backwardness can be deprived not only of the usual, but also of elementary conveniences. They are either doomed to subsistence or seek to migrate out of the country, and once settled in another state, they quickly lose many of their ethnic traits in the new culture.

Modern civilizational changes in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan are mainly associated with the rapid introduction of so-called mass culture into the culture of our peoples. The paradox and ambiguity of the situation lies in the fact that mass culture, despite the fact that it itself represents something aesthetically helpless, stupid, almost vulgar, vulgar, vulgar, alien to developed taste and high ideals of humanity (not for nothing did H. Ortega y Gasset write in his time about the dehumanization of art), is generated by forces that are not directly related to the phenomena of aesthetics and are themselves neutral in relation to them. Moreover, these forces - industry and all that is connected with it - can well be characterized as positive. Without them, the further development of mankind is not possible at all. We, like the majority of the peoples of the world who do not belong to the West, which has created and spread all the forms of mass culture that exist today all over the world, are attracted mainly not by its aesthetic and ethical values, but by technical achievements, which not only make life much easier, but also generally create normal conditions for human life. But it turns out that it is impossible to adopt and make use of these technical possibilities in practice without the value systems, which are themselves generated by these technical means, «sticking» to them. This is the paradox and at the same time the tragedy of the development of culture, which, obeying the rigid logic of the development of human intellect, which constantly expands human capabilities, eventually comes to the negation of its original ethnic forms.

As for the Soviet stage of the development of Kazakh and Kyrgyz Eurasian civilization and culture, it was at this stage that the most significant and far-reaching changes occurred to our peoples and their culture, which constitutes the core of civilization. Firstly, thanks to purposeful political, economic and social measures, in a historically short time the Soviet authorities managed to eliminate nomadic forms of life and economy, which were least suited for state-building. It is obvious that in the conditions of state existence the culture of an ethnos develops according to different laws than in the conditions of nomadic life. Moreover, it develops in a different rhythm and pace. Secondly, the Soviet legal system was introduced into state and public practice, and then into public consciousness, which, despite all its shortcomings, was much more effective than the system of customary law. It should be noted that the system of law is the most important element of the culture of the people, to a tangible extent influencing the nature and speed of its evolution. Thirdly, in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, with considerable financial, economic, and personnel assistance from the metropolis, a relatively developed industry and agricultural system with appropriate infrastructure or, in other words, an economic base, and with it a social base capable of self-reproduction. Fourthly, in parallel with industry, all the main political, social and administrative institutions were created, which, along with the education system and other components of social and cultural life, set the vector for the development of culture as a whole. In both our republics, cities have emerged, which are not only a symbol, a sign, but also the Centre, the real basis of the modern mass society with its inherent and inevitable mass culture. Urbanization and mass culture are two absolutely interrelated and mutually conditioning elements of modern civilizational development. It is in industrialized cities that the fullest development of modern democratic liberal values and the whole set of

political and social institutions and economic forms corresponding to them, which are of historically Western origin, was possible.

Geographically, the territory of both Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan is located on the border of the most significant modern civilizations. Moreover, geography has played one of the decisive roles in the fate of our peoples, who, possessing many specific features, not belonging entirely to any of the frontier civilizations and being relatively small in number, in principle can follow any path of civilizational development. External circumstances played a decisive role here. At a certain point in history, the Russian Empire became the most powerful force for Kazakhs and Kyrgyz.

As soon as Russia began to develop science and technology intensively and successfully, the same thing began to happen to it from the point of view of the evolution of civilization and culture as in the West. Rapid industrial growth was possible and, of necessity, was accompanied by the growth of the population of cities, which could maintain its normal existence only by intensifying production, and with it intensifying the production of culture itself, inevitably giving it a mass character. Russia thus followed the West in principle, but not because it wanted to, but because of the internal logic of development itself. The West, due to historical circumstances, was ahead of all other civilizations in its technical development at a certain historical interval of the development of mankind, as a result of which mass culture is inevitably associated with Western culture. In fact, the West has imposed on the majority of the peoples of the world its own dynamics of development, which is simultaneously the dynamics of the globalization process and the formation of global civilization.

Although in the Soviet Union, with its super-centralized economic and political system and the absence of market mechanisms, art and culture did not fit entirely into the system of commodity-money relations, this did not deprive them of their mass character. Mass culture is not determined by the dominance of purchase and sale relations in society. Its essence is its mass character, which is more quickly achieved through purchase and sale relations, but is not determined by the latter.

In a context where mass culture is driven by the pursuit of maximum profit, the simplified models it continuously and widely reproduces influence people in such a way that they themselves begin to simplify. As a result, art - like any phenomenon of an aesthetic nature - shifts from the realm of the spiritual to that of consumption, while individual consciousness is transformed to the point where, in the words of F. Beigbeder, «a person becomes homo consummatus - a consumer» [6, 304 p.].

The phenomenon of massiveness has formal signs, that is, it is observable, it is accessible to the eye, it can be seen. And all assurances that it does not exist, only on the grounds that a certain social structure and conditions are allegedly not favourable to its emergence, are groundless if we see them with our own eyes. J. Ortega y Gasset wrote in this regard: «Perhaps the best way to approach this historical phenomenon is to trust our eyesight and to identify the feature of the modern world that first catches our eye. It is easy to name, though not so easy to explain - I speak of the growing pandemonium, the herding, the universal overcrowding. Cities are overcrowded. Houses are overcrowded. Hotels are overcrowded. ... Is there anything simpler, more familiar than the obvious» [7, p. 44]?

Were not all these symptoms and external features also characteristic of Soviet society? True, they were not external features of Kazakh and Kyrgyz ethnic society, most of which in Soviet times lived in rural areas and existed essentially according to the laws of the rural community. But it is quite obvious that the first, but the most significant blow to traditional society and its corresponding traditional ethnic culture was dealt in Soviet times. And the blow was dealt precisely in the direction of giving it the features of mass culture.

It should be noted that long before the Soviet era, the nomadic societies of the Kazakhs and Kyrgyz possessed their own distinctive forms of mass culture. These included oral epic traditions, large-scale ritual performances, collective celebrations (such as Nauryz, wedding and memorial ceremonies), as well as traditional games and competitions that brought together large groups of people and served an important integrative function. This form of «mass culture» was organically connected to the nomadic way of life, the natural cycle, and the system of clan and tribal relations.

The Soviet period marked a radical transformation of these forms. The ideological principle of «culture that is national in form but socialist in content» assumed the preservation of the external elements of traditional culture while profoundly altering their meaning. Mass festivities and rituals were standardized, stripped of their sacred character, and transformed into tools of socialist indoctrination. Oral traditions were replaced by new channels of cultural influence: state - run clubs, theaters, cinema, the printed press, radio, and television - that created a unified cultural space.

On the other hand, it should be borne in mind that the seventy-year period of civilizational transformation of the traditional ethnic culture was not complete or, rather, was not complete. The state paternalism characteristic of the Soviet political and economic system, as well as the residence of the overwhelming majority of Kazakhs and Kyrgyz in rural areas contributed to a certain preservation of the old way of life in rural areas. The preservation of the traditional rural way of life contributed to the preservation of certain institutional forms based on the communal structure of the villagers, which was permeated by blood ties. The rural community, whose internal relations were built on the principles of a large family, supplied «cadres» to the local authorities, which naturally fit into the general system of state bodies, which, again due to the existing political culture, were entrusted with patronage and paternalistic duties and functions. The immigrant Russian-speaking population, which organized political institutions on different principles and a different system of relations, constituted the majority only in the cities. In the periphery, the rural community formed a common system genetically linked to local tribal and regional clan roots, which to a greater or lesser extent remained latent throughout the territory of both our republics. As a result, the archaic of traditional Kazakh and Kyrgyz society were combined with new elements introduced from outside. It was assumed that the latter would eventually displace many traditional elements of ethnic culture that could not fit into the new cultural industrial «landscapes». Indeed, under the new conditions, ever wider sections of the indigenous population were able to assimilate elements of the new culture. It should be noted that, despite the fact that the Soviet system failed to complete the modernization of traditional society, it still created

certain material, spiritual and cultural prerequisites for the transition of this society to a new cultural and civilizational state. Thus, a peculiar symbiosis of modernism and archaic and, accordingly, traditional and mass culture was created. And although elements of the latter were present mainly in the form of inclusions, the problem of the disintegration of traditional society and deep transformations of ethnic Kazakh and Kyrgyz cultures became a matter of time rather than principle. We do not claim that traditional society and its corresponding culture have already become a part of history or that this will happen in the foreseeable future. This process may take longer, but if we evaluate it from the perspective of historical time, this time will not seem like a long time. The ideas of democracy, civil society, market economy and many others, which, in principle, are in demand in modern Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, are the basis of modern culture, and the embodiment of these ideas in reality leads with necessity to the establishment of a new culture, which is mass culture in the modern world. The point, of course, is not in the attractiveness of these ideas and the culture that accompanies them, but in the material means by which this culture is established in people's lives and consciousness, and in the broad opportunities that materially developed culture offers. However, until the material means of the new culture are created, we will have a symbiosis of cultures in which, depending on a set of conditions, elements of the original ethnic and mass cultures will be represented in different proportions, and, if we take into account the modern globalization processes, elements of the latter will eventually prevail over elements of the former due to the enormous material superiority of states where mass culture has already established itself as dominant.

Sociocultural transformations in the post-soviet era

After the collapse of the USSR and the removal from power of the Communist Party, whose actions were based on communist principles and ideas, not only an ideological but also a political and cultural vacuum emerged in Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan. Although the new political forces claimed to be committed to democratic ideas and values, in reality they could only rely on what the cultural soil that produced them could provide.

The resulting structural, cultural and ideological vacuum in our republics was quickly filled by the traditional system of values based on kinship relations and ties. In the recent period of the history of Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, a renaissance of the kin system was observed, which, adapting to the new conditions of statehood, acquired the features of regionalism. It would be naive or overly optimistic to expect anything different from what has actually happened. The Western liberal rationalist value system and its corresponding economic relations and political-administrative institutions could only establish themselves here if there were certain cultural prerequisites, among which the material part was and is of decisive importance.

From the cultural point of view, it is in the system of tribal relations, which accompanied both our ethnos practically throughout its history, that the identity and independence of Kazakhs and Kyrgyz as an ethnos have been preserved for thousands of years. The fundamental principle of such relations, as is known, was the preservation

of identity, independence and material well-being of the tribe, clan and tribes by preserving traditions, responsibility of the clan for the deeds and fate of the kin, care for the upbringing of capable offspring, mutual help and mutual assistance of kin. The absence of common statehood among Kazakhs and Kyrgyz for many centuries made the defense of the independence and integrity of the clan or tribe a matter for tribal associations themselves. History shows that only those nomadic pastoralists, including Kazakhs and Kyrgyz, managed to preserve their ethnic independence and integrity who most consistently adhered to the principles of the clan in the absence of statehood.

At the present stage of modernization, as many facts testify, of all modern world religions, Islam and, accordingly, the people preaching the Muslim religion are the most difficult and slow to be transformed. However, let us say that the ability of a people or a group of peoples united by any essential feature to rapid cultural and spiritual transformation cannot be characterized as a positive or, on the contrary, a negative trait. In this case, we are talking not only about a certain context within which specific cultural and spiritual changes take place but mainly about the fact that too rapid transformations in this sphere may be unacceptable, as they may undermine the spiritual and value bases of society's existence, thus disorienting it and dooming it to degradation and disappearance, at least as spiritually and essentially integral and valuable. A reasonable dose of conservatism in such circumstances may prove salutary for society. On the other hand, the inability to adjust to the rapidly changing reality carries a real danger of becoming dependent on external forces in the form of other communities that find in themselves the ability to accelerate development. Finding a reasonable balance between conservatism and the innovative component of culture is a task that all Muslim states, including Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, are solving. However, the ability to do so is determined by a number of objective circumstances and prerequisites. The Muslim world is characterized by a typical number of traits that define its attitude to the innovative component of culture and its adaptive capacity. Thus, it is believed that of all modern world religions, the Muslim one is the most conservative and, therefore, the least able to perceive the innovative component of culture.

Many peoples of Islam are resisting the process of globalization in one form or another, especially when it comes to their value system. Virtually all Muslim peoples are characterized by a commitment to traditional institutions and values. S. Filatov writes the following in connection with Muslims' rejection of globalization: «One gets the impression that if globalization touches some root, deep aspects of life in Muslim societies, a reaction of rejection, embedded in the very genetic code of their culture, boils up in them» [8, p. 20]. L. Syukiyainen, an authoritative Russian expert on Islamic law, points out that the peoples professing Islam reject not science and technology as such and the innovative elements of culture accompanying them, but what certain circles and states try to introduce into the cultural soil in addition to technology. «Muslims» he writes, «see the essence of globalization primarily in the imposition of Western standards on them not only in technological, information and economic fields but also in the fields of culture, politics and law, including the foundations of the construction and functioning of state power and human rights» [9, p. 126].

According to A.A. Ignatenko, an authoritative specialist in the field of Islam, «many contemporary problems associated with Islam are largely due to the conflict between the needs of modernization and Islamic traditions, which have become a brake on progress» [10, p. 142]. On the other hand, the conflict «between the needs of modernization and Islamic traditions» is not only a source of tension, but also one of the central contradictions faced by the Muslim world (where traditionalism is still very strong) in the process of globalization, which in many respects is identical to the process of modernization. Of all modern world religions, Islam is more rooted in traditional structures than anywhere else, and for this reason, Islam has the highest inertia and, naturally, is less amenable to internal transformation than other world religions. Objectively, Islam, as well as its followers, is not predisposed to modernization, as the latter has a destructive effect on traditional forms of life and, with them, the original culture. Globalization significantly intensifies the process of cultural contacts and exchanges, in the course of which many traditional forms of life and ways of thinking inevitably disappear. The process of globalization has a pronounced tendency towards the unification of cultures and the formation of a global civilization.

Conclusion

The history of the Kazakh and Kyrgyz peoples is a testament to their profound cultural plasticity - a trait that has enabled them to navigate successive waves of transformational change. From the syncretism of steppe Islam to the paradoxical nation-building of the Soviet era and the current dialogue with globalization, these societies have consistently demonstrated an ability to absorb, adapt, and synthesize external elements while striving to preserve the core of their cultural identity.

Each stage of transformation has left its indelible mark. The nomadic past laid a foundation of openness and adaptability. Islamization wove the region into the global Muslim civilization, enriching its spiritual and intellectual life. Russian and Soviet modernization, despite its unprecedented brutality and trauma, created the institutional frameworks of modern nations - with defined borders, mass education, and an urbanized society. Finally, the post-Soviet period has confronted these young nations with the necessity of charting their own course in a complex and interconnected world.

Today, Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan face the central challenge articulated in the initial thesis: to find a sustainable balance between preserving the deeply rooted values of their heritage and embracing the innovations necessary to thrive in the 21st century. This is not a simple choice between past and future, but a complex process of creative synthesis. The ability to successfully manage the tension between tradition and modernity, between local identity and global integration, will be the defining feature of their future civilizational trajectory. Their historical experience demonstrates that they possess the necessary cultural resource for this task a capacity for adaptation and synthesis, which is, in fact, their principal legacy.

List of references

- 1 Valikhanov Ch. The Russians in Central Asia. – Stanford, CA: E. Stanford Press, 1865. - 552 p.
- 2 Дугин А.Г. Трансформация политических структур и институтов в процессе модернизации традиционных обществ. Дисс. ... док. полит. наук. – Ростов-на-Дону, 2004. – 346 с.
- 3 Berdiaev N.A. Origin of Russian Communism. – Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1959. - 92 p.
- 4 Ли Ю.В. Культурная трансформация кыргызского этноса в советский период истории // Проблемы современной науки и образования. – 2017. – №18 (100). – С. 61-65.
- 5 Матузов Н.И., Малько А.В. Теория государства и права. – М: Юрист, 2004. - 245 с.
- 6 Beigbeder F. 9.99. - UK.: Macmillan, 2002. – 304 p.
- 7 Ortega y Gasset, J. The Revolt of the Masses. – U.K.: Taylor & Francis, 2021. - 142 p.
- 8 Малашенко А., Филатов С. Религия и глобализация на просторах Евразии. - М.: Неостром, 2009. – 343 с.
- 9 Сюкияйнен Л. Исламская политико-правовая культура и демократизация в мусульманском мире: конфликт или совместимость? // Россия и мусульманский мир. – 2008. – №10. – С. 125–142.
- 10 Игнатенко А.А. Слово и дело (о многовековом противостоянии суннитов и шиитов) // Россия в глобальной политике. – 2009. – №2. – С. 141–144.

Transliteration

- 1 Valikhanov Ch. The Russians in Central Asia. - Stanford: E. Stanford Press, 1865. - 552 p.
- 2 Dugin A.G. Transformacija političeskikh struktur i institutov v processe modernizacii tradicionnyh obshhestv [Transformation of Political Structures and Institutions in the Process of Modernization of Traditional Societies]. Diss. ... dok. polit. nauk. – Rostov-na-Donu, 2004. – 346 s.
- 3 Berdiaev N.A. Origin of Russian Communism. - Michigan: University of Michigan Press, 1959. - 92 p.
- 4 Li Ju.V. Kul'turnaja transformacija kyrgyzskogo jetnosa v sovetskij period istorii [Cultural Transformation of the Kyrgyz Ethnos During the Soviet Period of History] // Problemy sovremennoj nauki i obrazovanija. – 2017. – №18 (100). – S. 61-65.
- 5 Matuzov N.I., Mal'ko A.V. Teorija gosudarstva i prava [Theory of State and Law]. – М: Jurist, 2004. - 245 s.
- 6 Beigbeder F. 9.99. - UK.: Macmillan, 2002. – 304 p.
- 7 Ortega y Gasset, J. The Revolt of the Masses. – U.K.: Taylor & Francis, 2021. - 142 p.
- 8 Malashenko A., Filatov S. Religija i globalizacija na prostorah Evrazii [Religion and Globalization in the Eurasian Space]. - М.: Neostrom, 2009. – 343 s.
- 9 Sjukijajnen L. Islamskaja politiko-pravovaja kul'tura i demokratizacija v musul'manskom mire: konflikt ili sovместimost' [Islamic Political and Legal Culture and Democratization in the Muslim World: Conflict or Compatibility] // Rossija i musul'manskij mir. – 2008. – №10. – S. 125–142.
- 10 Ignatenko A.A. Slovo i delo (o mnogovekovom protivostojanii sunnitov i shiitov) [Word and Deed: On the Centuries-Long Confrontation Between Sunnis and Shiites] // Rossija v global'noj politike. – 2009. – №2. – S. 141–144.

Author Contributions: **A. Gappassova**, developed the research concept and study design and was responsible for the methodology and the main analysis; oversaw data accuracy, drafted the core manuscript, and completed the final revision for submission. **R. Stamova**, contributed to the collection, selection, and systematization of materials and data; provided input on refining the empirical section, verified references, and contributed to manuscript review and editing. **M.K. Kakimzhanova, T.M. Sadykova**, participated in the study and assisted with structuring the data and presenting the results; contributed to the final revision and formatting of the manuscript.

Гаппасова А.Г., Стамова Р.Д., Кахимжанова М.К., Садыкова Т.М.

Культурная адаптация казахов и кыргызов: от традиционного общества к современной цивилизации

Аннотация. В статье анализируются этапы цивилизационной трансформации традиционных обществ казахов и кыргызов, а также изменения, произошедшие в условиях модернизации. Первоначально кочевая евразийская цивилизация благодаря своей открытости способствовала подготовке этих народов к восприятию элементов других культур, что создало основу для последующих преобразований. Первая значимая фаза модернизации начинается с принятия ислама, который оказал влияние на социальную и культурную организацию общества. Основные изменения происходят в период Российской империи и Советского Союза, вовлекая регионы в процессы глобализации и приводя к глубоким цивилизационным трансформациям. Советская власть ликвидировала кочевой образ жизни, внедрила новые правовые и политические институты, создала промышленную базу и стимулировала урбанизацию, что стало фундаментом для формирования массового общества. Особое внимание уделяется влиянию массовой культуры на этнические ценности и анализу противоречий между необходимостью сохранения традиций и адаптацией к современной жизни. Авторы подчёркивают способность казахов и кыргызов интегрировать внешние элементы, одновременно сохраняя собственную культурную идентичность. В заключение делается вывод о важности сочетания сохранения традиционных ценностей с инновациями для устойчивого культурного развития в условиях глобализации.

Ключевые слова: глобализация, модернизация, цивилизационная трансформация, традиционное общество, кочевая цивилизация, казахи, кыргызы, традиционные ценности, массовая культура.

Гаппасова А.Г., Стамова Р.Д., Кахимжанова М.К., Садыкова Т.М.

Қазақтар мен кыргыздардың мәдени бейімделуі: дәстүрлі қоғамнан қазіргі өркениетке дейін

Аңдатпа. Мақалада қазақтар мен кыргыздардың дәстүрлі қоғамдарының өркениеттік трансформациясының кезеңдері қарастырылады, модернизация жағдайындағы орын алған өзгерістері зерттеледі. Бастапқыда көшпелі еуразиялық өркениет өзінің ашықтығының арқасында бұл халықтарды басқа мәдениеттердің элементтерін қабылдауға дайындады. Модернизацияның алғашқы маңызды кезеңі исламды қабылдаудан басталады. Негізгі өзгерістер Ресей империясы және кеңес кезеңдерінде орын алды, бұл аймақты жаһандану процестеріне тартып, іргелі өркениеттік өзгерістерге әкелді. Кеңес өкіметі көшпелі өмір салтын жойып, жаңа құқықтық және саяси институттарды енгізді, өнеркәсіптік базаны құрып, урбанизацияны ынталандырды. Бұл

бұқаралық қоғамның қалыптасуына негіз болды. Сонымен қатар, бұқаралық мәдениеттің этникалық құндылықтарға әсері талданып, дәстүрлерді сақтау мен заманауи өмірге бейімделу қажеттілігі арасындағы басты қайшылықтар анықталады. Авторлар қазақтар мен қырғыздардың сыртқы элементтерді өздеріне сіңіре отырып, өз мәдениетін сақтау қабілетіне баса назар аударады. Жаһандану жағдайындағы тұрақты мәдени даму үшін дәстүрлі құндылықтарды сақтау және инновацияны үйлестірудің маңыздылығы туралы қорытынды жасалады.

Түйін сөздер: жаһандану, модернизация, өркениеттік трансформация, дәстүрлі қоғам, көшпелі өркениет, қазақтар, қырғыздар, дәстүрлі құндылықтар, бұқаралық мәдениет.

Received 30.04.2025

Accepted 14.02.2026