

JUSTICE IN THE CONTEXT OF GLOBALIZATION AND DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION (A PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS)

¹B. Kiyekenova, ²K. Nurmukhametova*, ³K. Bolyssova

¹Al-Farabi Kazakh National University (Almaty, Kazakhstan)

²Almaty Technological University (Almaty, Kazakhstan)

³Astana International University (Astana, Kazakhstan)

¹ms.bk@internet.ru, ²karlygash_krmu@mail.ru, ³kuralai_2702@mail.ru

¹Б.Б. Киекенова, ²К.Ш. Нурмухаметова, ³К.М. Болысова

¹Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті (Алматы, Қазақстан)

²Алматы технологиялық университеті (Алматы, Қазақстан)

³Астана халықаралық университеті (Астана, Қазақстан)

¹ms.bk@internet.ru, ²karlygash_krmu@mail.ru, ³kuralai_2702@mail.ru

Citation: Kiyekenova B.B., Nurmukhametova K.Sh., Bolyssova K.M. Justice in the Context of Globalization and Digital Transformation (a Philosophical Analysis) // *Al-Farabi*. – 2026. – Vol. 25. № 2(94). – P. 107-119.

Abstract. The article presents a comprehensive philosophical analysis of the transformation of the category of justice in the context of globalization and the digital transformation of contemporary society. The study aims to identify structural changes in the normative foundations of justice under conditions of transnational economic processes, increasing global interdependence, and the expansion of algorithmic governance mechanisms. The research is based on a comparative-philosophical, normative, and analytical methodology, complemented by a hermeneutic interpretation of classical and contemporary theories of justice. Particular attention is paid to key issues such as algorithmic justice, the digital divide, data concentration, and the transformation of subjects of responsibility in digital environments. The findings demonstrate that classical theories of justice, developed within the nation-state paradigm, are insufficient for explaining emerging forms of social inequality in global and digital contexts. It is shown that digital infrastructures generate new forms of power asymmetry and resource redistribution, which require a fundamental rethinking of normative frameworks.

The scientific novelty of the study lies in the integration of global and technological dimensions into a unified theoretical model of justice and in substantiating the need to expand the normative paradigm beyond the limits of the nation-state. The study concludes that contemporary conceptions of justice must incorporate principles of global responsibility, transparency of algorithmic decision-making, and the protection of human dignity in conditions of technological modernization. The practical significance of the research lies in its potential application for the development of normative frameworks for digital governance and social policy regulation.

* Author-correspondent: K.Sh. Nurmukhametova, karlygash_krmu@mail.ru

Keywords: justice; globalization; digital transformation; algorithmic justice; global responsibility

Introduction

The category of justice occupies a central position in philosophical reflections on social order and political organization. Throughout the history of philosophy, justice has functioned as a fundamental normative principle regulating the distribution of resources, power, rights, and responsibilities. From classical antiquity to modern political theory, justice has been conceptualized as the cornerstone of legitimate social arrangements and institutional stability. Classical philosophical traditions, beginning with Plato's conception of justice as harmony within the state [1, p. 112–120], and later developed in modern political philosophy, including liberal distributive models [2, p. 3–10], conceptualized justice primarily within relatively stable and territorially bounded political communities, most notably the nation-state.

Within this classical paradigm, justice presupposed a centralized and coherent normative space in which institutional actors were identifiable, political authority was formally structured, and mechanisms of redistribution operated within stable governance frameworks. Justice was therefore closely associated with juridical order, political sovereignty, and institutional legitimacy.

However, contemporary transformations driven by globalization and digitalization challenge the adequacy of these traditional models. Globalization intensifies transnational economic flows, political interdependence, and cross-border institutional interactions, thereby weakening the exclusivity of state-centered normative frameworks. Economic and informational power increasingly operates beyond territorial boundaries, complicating traditional assumptions about distributive responsibility and political accountability. Contemporary debates on global justice highlight these transformations [3, p. 169–175; 4, p. 20–25; 5, p. 122–130; 6, p. 45–52].

At the same time, digital transformation introduces algorithmic governance, artificial intelligence systems, platform economies, and large-scale data infrastructures that mediate decision-making processes and influence access to opportunities. These developments do not merely modify administrative techniques but fundamentally reshape the conditions of social coordination and normative evaluation. As contemporary research in information ethics indicates, digital infrastructures function not only as technical systems but also as normative environments that structure social interaction, redistribute informational power, and redefine institutional practices [8, p. 134–140; 9, p. 230–240].

Furthermore, the expansion of platform-based economies and data-driven governance systems generates new forms of asymmetry in power and resource distribution. Algorithmic systems influence access to employment, financial services, and public goods, while data concentration creates new forms of structural inequality [10, p. 1–10; 11, p. 75–90; 12, p. 12–20; 13, p. 35–45].

The choice of this research topic is determined by the existence of a conceptual gap in contemporary philosophical discourse. While numerous studies address global

justice, digital ethics, and algorithmic governance separately, there remains a lack of a unified theoretical framework that integrates globalization and digital transformation within a comprehensive model of justice. This fragmentation necessitates a systematic philosophical synthesis.

The relevance of the study is determined by the growing global interdependence, the intensification of transnational processes, and the increasing role of digital infrastructures in political, economic, and administrative practices. The object of the research is the concept of justice within contemporary social transformations, while the subject of the study is the transformation of its normative foundations under conditions of globalization and digitalization. The aim of the study is to demonstrate that justice in the twenty-first century must extend beyond the nation-state paradigm and incorporate both global and technological dimensions.

Methodology

The present study is based on a theoretical and conceptual analysis of justice as a dynamically transforming normative category under conditions of globalization and digital transformation. Justice is approached not as a fixed moral principle, but as a historically evolving normative architecture shaped by institutional configurations, political sovereignty, socio-economic structures, and technological mediation. This perspective enables the analysis of justice as a structural element of social order embedded in broader relations of power, legitimacy, and institutional design.

The research is grounded in a corpus of more than forty scholarly sources selected for their theoretical relevance to the transformation of justice. The corpus includes classical philosophical works [1; 2; 14; 15], major contributions to global justice theory [3–6], and contemporary interdisciplinary studies addressing digital governance, artificial intelligence, data ethics, and platform economies [8–13]. The selection of sources was guided by the following criteria:

- conceptual relevance to justice theory;
- engagement with globalization or digital transformation;
- contribution to normative and structural analysis rather than purely technical description.

The methodological framework combines comparative-philosophical analysis, conceptual analysis, and normative theory construction. Elements of hermeneutic interpretation are applied to reconstruct classical and contemporary theories of justice. This methodological approach is justified by the nature of the research object: the study focuses on transformations in normative presuppositions, structures of legitimacy, and forms of responsibility rather than on empirical measurement or statistical evaluation.

A central methodological step consist in distinguishing between two historically differentiated normative configurations of justice:

- justice within territorially bounded sovereign political communities;
- justice within transnational, digitally mediated, and algorithmically structured environments.

In classical frameworks, justice is associated with centralized institutional authority, clearly defined structures of responsibility, and legal regulation within sovereign states. This model presupposes stable governance structures and predictable mechanisms of accountability [1; 2]. In contrast, contemporary global-digital conditions are characterized by the redistribution of normative authority across multiple levels, including supranational institutions, transnational actors, digital platforms, and algorithmic infrastructures [10–13].

Digital transformation introduces algorithmic mediation as a key factor shaping access to resources, opportunities, and decision-making processes. In this context, justice becomes embedded in technological infrastructures and data-driven systems that influence social coordination and institutional practices [8–9; 13]. The emergence of platform economies and data concentration further contributes to new forms of structural inequality and asymmetry of power [9–11].

To structure this comparative analysis, the study employs an analytical matrix distinguishing differences in spatial organization, authority structures, modes of mediation, forms of agency, and the core focus of justice. This matrix functions as an analytical tool that allows the identification of structural transformations in key normative categories such as responsibility, legitimacy, and distribution.

The central research question guiding the study is: how do globalization and digital transformation reshape the normative architecture of justice? The working hypothesis posits that these processes generate new forms of structural inequality and normative complexity that cannot be adequately explained within traditional nation-state-centered frameworks.

The research is conducted in four stages:

- reconstruction of classical justice paradigms;
- analysis of globalization as a transformation of distributive space and political authority;
- examination of digital transformation and algorithmic governance; and
- conceptual synthesis into an expanded model of justice incorporating global and technological dimensions.

The interdisciplinary dimension of the methodology allows the integration of political philosophy, global ethics, digital governance studies, and socio-technical theory. At the same time, the study maintains a normative orientation, focusing on justice as a principle of legitimacy and social regulation.

The novelty of the methodological approach lies in interpreting justice transformation as a shift in normative architecture rather than as a simple extension of distributive theory. The main limitation of the study is its conceptual nature, as empirical validation of digital inequalities and algorithmic effects lies beyond its scope. Nevertheless, the proposed framework provides a theoretical basis for further empirical research.

This methodological approach ensures the coherence of theoretical reconstruction and allows for a systematic comparison of normative transformations across different historical and socio-technical contexts.

Main Part (Results and Discussion)

The main part of the study integrates theoretical review and analytical discussion and is structured into several subsections reflecting key dimensions of justice transformation in the context of globalization and digitalization.

1. Classical and Modern Theories of Justice

The philosophical discourse on justice has historically evolved through several normative paradigms, each reflecting specific institutional, economic, and socio-political configurations. Classical philosophy conceptualized justice as a principle of structural harmony and proportionality within a well-ordered political community. In Plato's account, justice is understood as harmony between parts of the soul and the state, emphasizing internal coherence and functional differentiation [1, p. 120–125]. Aristotle further refined this conception by distinguishing between distributive and corrective justice, thereby introducing proportional equality as a criterion for fair allocation within a bounded polity [14, p. 95–105].

Modern political philosophy rearticulated justice within the framework of individual autonomy, legal rationality, and universal moral law. Kant grounded justice in rational autonomy and juridical universality, linking it to the legitimacy of legal institutions [15, p. 45–60]. In the twentieth century, Rawls reformulated justice as fairness, introducing the “veil of ignorance” as a mechanism ensuring impartiality in institutional design [2, p. 3–10]. Rawls's model presupposes a relatively closed and self-sufficient society and therefore situates justice within the institutional structure of the nation-state. While this theory remains foundational for liberal distributive justice, its limitations become evident under conditions of global interdependence and technological mediation.

2. Global Justice and Transformation of Normative Frameworks

The intensification of globalization in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries has fundamentally transformed the normative conditions under which justice operates. Economic interdependence, transnational institutions, and global flows of capital, labor, and information have challenged the assumption that justice can be confined within territorially bounded political communities.

Pogge argues that global institutional arrangements contribute to structural injustice by perpetuating economic inequalities between developed and developing societies [3, p. 169–175]. Sen, in contrast, shifts attention from ideal institutional design to comparative assessments of capabilities and freedoms, thereby expanding the evaluative framework of justice [4, p. 20–25]. Fraser introduces the concept of “scales of justice,” emphasizing that globalization destabilizes the traditional Westphalian model and requires a multi-level approach to redistribution, recognition, and representation [5, p. 122–130].

Nagel highlights the tension between state-based justice and global moral obligations, arguing that principles of distributive justice presuppose shared political

authority [6, p. 45–52]. Ypi further develops this discussion by examining the limits of global political responsibility and the challenges of extending justice beyond national frameworks [7, p. 60–70].

Together, these approaches demonstrate that globalization leads to the de-territorialization of justice and necessitates the development of multi-scalar normative frameworks capable of addressing transnational inequalities.

3. Digital Ethics and Algorithmic Governance

Alongside globalization, digital transformation introduces new dimensions to the discourse on justice by embedding decision-making processes within technological systems. Digital infrastructures, artificial intelligence, and platform economies reshape both procedural and distributive aspects of social organization.

Floridi conceptualizes the “infosphere” as a normative environment in which informational processes shape moral agency and institutional responsibility [8, p. 134–140]. Nissenbaum’s theory of contextual integrity emphasizes that information flows are governed by context-dependent norms, which are often disrupted by digital technologies [9, p. 230–240].

Pasquale highlights the problem of algorithmic opacity, describing contemporary society as a “black box” in which decision-making processes are not transparent to affected individuals [10, p. 1–10]. Zuboff’s concept of surveillance capitalism further demonstrates how data extraction and behavioral prediction generate new forms of economic and informational power asymmetry [11, p. 75–90].

Crawford examines the material and political costs of artificial intelligence infrastructures, revealing their dependence on global resource extraction and labor exploitation [12, p. 12–20]. Eubanks, in turn, shows how automated decision-making systems can reinforce social inequalities, particularly in public administration and welfare systems [13, p. 35–45].

These contributions indicate that digital transformation does not merely introduce new tools but fundamentally reconfigures the normative conditions of justice by embedding it within technological and infrastructural systems.

4. Structural Transformation of Justice in the Global Digital Context

The combined effects of globalization and digitalization result in a structural transformation of the normative architecture of justice. This transformation is not limited to the expansion of existing frameworks but involves a qualitative shift in the way justice is conceptualized and operationalized.

In classical models, justice is grounded in sovereign institutional structures characterized by centralized authority, clearly defined responsibility, and legal accountability. In contrast, contemporary global-digital conditions produce a redistribution of normative authority across multiple actors, including states, transnational corporations, digital platforms, and algorithmic systems.

This shift indicates not only a quantitative expansion of normative space but also a qualitative transformation of justice as a regulatory principle. Justice becomes

increasingly dependent on infrastructural mediation, where technological systems structure access to resources, opportunities, and information.

Algorithmic governance introduces hybrid forms of agency in which human decision-making is intertwined with automated processes. As a result, responsibility becomes distributed and often difficult to attribute, while transparency is replaced by epistemic opacity. Justice must therefore address not only institutional arrangements but also the design and regulation of technological infrastructures.

The structural transformation of justice also entails a reconfiguration of the relationship between power and normativity. In classical frameworks, power is institutionally bounded and normatively regulated through legal mechanisms. In contrast, within global digital environments, power is increasingly embedded in infrastructural systems that operate beyond traditional legal oversight. This shift results in the emergence of new forms of “infrastructural power,” where control over data flows, algorithmic design, and platform governance directly influences the distribution of opportunities and social outcomes. Consequently, justice must be reconceptualized not only as a normative principle but also as a regulatory response to technologically mediated power structures.

5. Case Study: Digital Transformation and Justice in Kazakhstan

The Kazakhstani case provides an illustrative example of how global and digital transformations interact within a transitional governance model. Digital modernization policies have led to the widespread implementation of e-government systems, significantly increasing access to public services and administrative efficiency.

These developments should be interpreted not merely as empirical indicators but as manifestations of deeper structural transformations in governance. Digital platforms reduce bureaucratic barriers and enhance procedural accessibility, aligning with classical principles of administrative justice.

However, the expansion of digital services does not automatically ensure substantive justice. Regional disparities in technological infrastructure, differences in digital literacy, and unequal access to digital resources produce new forms of inequality. Justice thus becomes contingent upon conditions of technological inclusion and digital competence.

Unlike models of surveillance capitalism dominated by private corporations [11], Kazakhstan demonstrates a hybrid system in which state institutions play a central role in coordinating digital infrastructures. This configuration modifies the distribution of normative responsibility and raises new questions concerning accountability, data governance, and institutional transparency.

In addition, the rapid digitalization of public administration in Kazakhstan raises important questions regarding long-term institutional sustainability and normative legitimacy. While digital platforms enhance efficiency and accessibility, they also create dependencies on technological infrastructures that may be vulnerable to systemic risks, including data breaches, algorithmic errors, and governance centralization. These risks highlight the necessity of developing regulatory frameworks that ensure

not only technological efficiency but also social trust, accountability, and inclusiveness in digital governance systems.

These considerations indicate that the Kazakhstani case should be understood not only as an example of digital modernization but also as a context in which new forms of normative complexity emerge. This provides a valuable basis for comparative analysis of justice models across different socio-political and technological environments.

6. Comparative Analysis of Justice Models

A comparative analysis of classical, global, and digital models of justice reveals fundamental transformations in key normative dimensions. Classical justice is grounded in territorially bounded sovereignty, centralized authority, and institutionally defined accountability. In this framework, justice operates within stable legal systems where responsibility is clearly attributed to state institutions and distributive mechanisms function within a coherent political order.

However, processes of globalization significantly expand the normative space of justice beyond national borders. Transnational economic relations, global governance structures, and supranational institutions reshape the distribution of responsibility and introduce multi-level accountability systems. Justice in this context becomes de-territorialized and operates across overlapping normative frameworks, requiring coordination between national and global actors.

Digital transformation further intensifies these shifts by embedding justice within technological infrastructures. Algorithmic governance, platform economies, and data-driven systems restructure access to resources, opportunities, and decision-making processes. As a result, justice increasingly depends on infrastructural conditions, including data availability, algorithmic transparency, and technological accessibility. This transformation introduces new forms of inequality, such as digital exclusion, data concentration, and algorithmic bias, which cannot be adequately addressed within traditional distributive frameworks.

Moreover, the transition from institutional to infrastructural mediation fundamentally alters the nature of accountability. While classical justice relies on identifiable institutional actors, digital environments involve hybrid forms of agency in which responsibility is distributed among state institutions, private corporations, and technological systems. This diffusion of responsibility complicates the attribution of accountability and challenges existing legal and normative frameworks.

The comparative perspective demonstrates that contemporary justice must be understood as a multi-level and dynamically evolving normative system that integrates distributive, procedural, and technological dimensions. These transformations also reflect broader philosophical interpretations of justice as a historically evolving and context-dependent concept context-dependent concept, as also discussed in contemporary philosophical studies [17].

Analytical Dimension	Classical Model	Global Context	Digital Context
Normative Space	Nation-state, territorially bounded	Transnational, multi-level	Networked, platform-based
Structure of Authority	Centralized state institutions	Supranational and distributed governance	Hybrid (state + platforms + algorithms)
Mode of Mediation	Legal and institutional procedures	Institutional and transnational coordination	Algorithmic and infrastructural mediation
Form of Inequality	Economic and distributive inequality	Global inequality and uneven development	Digital divide, data concentration, algorithmic bias
Mechanism of Governance	State regulation and legal frameworks	Multi-level governance systems	Algorithmic governance and data-driven regulation
Accountability	Clear institutional responsibility	Shared and diffused responsibility	Hybrid and opaque accountability structures

Table 1. Transformation of Justice Models

Source: compiled by the author.

The table illustrates that the transformation of justice is not merely an expansion of existing principles but a structural reconfiguration of its normative foundations. The shift from territorially bounded governance to transnational and digitally mediated environments requires a rethinking of justice as a principle capable of addressing complex interdependencies between institutions, technologies, and global processes.

Thus, justice in the contemporary global-digital context emerges as a multidimensional concept that must reconcile sovereignty shift, infrastructural mediation, and global interdependence. This reconceptualization provides a theoretical basis for developing normative frameworks capable of responding to the challenges of digitally mediated social order.

Importantly, the comparative analysis also demonstrates that no single model provides a universally adequate framework for addressing contemporary challenges. Instead, the transformation of justice necessitates a flexible and context-sensitive approach that accounts for variations in political structure, technological development, and socio-economic conditions. This implies that normative theory must move beyond universalist abstractions toward more adaptive and multi-level frameworks capable of responding to complex and evolving social realities.

Thus, Table 1 functions not merely as a descriptive summary but as an analytical instrument for identifying structural transformations in justice theory. It reveals that the evolution of justice is characterized by increasing complexity, hybridity, and interdependence, requiring a rethinking of core concepts such as responsibility, legitimacy, and fairness. In this sense, the comparative perspective provides a crucial foundation for developing a more comprehensive and integrated understanding of justice in the global digital era.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine the transformation of the normative foundations of justice in the context of globalization and digital transformation and to substantiate the necessity of expanding classical justice paradigms beyond the nation-state framework. Through comparative-philosophical analysis, conceptual reconstruction, and normative synthesis, the research has demonstrated that justice in the twenty-first century cannot be adequately conceptualized within territorially bounded and institutionally centralized models.

The findings confirm the central hypothesis that globalization and algorithmic governance generate structural asymmetries and reconfigure the normative architecture of justice. The transition from sovereignty-centered distributive frameworks toward multi-level, transnational, and technologically mediated environments fundamentally alters the conditions under which justice is articulated and institutionalized. Justice no longer operates exclusively within identifiable institutional hierarchies but increasingly within infrastructural systems that mediate access, visibility, participation, and opportunity.

The analysis of classical, global, and hybrid governance models has made it possible to identify several key dimensions of this transformation:

- Spatial reconfiguration of justice. Globalization destabilizes the territorial confinement of justice and necessitates a multi-scalar understanding of distributive responsibility extending beyond national borders.
- Emergence of infrastructural mediation. Digital transformation embeds normative decisions within algorithmic and data-driven systems, shifting justice from institutional procedures toward infrastructural architectures.
- Diffusion of normative authority. Responsibility for just outcomes is increasingly distributed among state institutions, transnational actors, and technological systems, requiring a reconsideration of traditional models of accountability.
- Rise of epistemic opacity. Algorithmic governance introduces new asymmetries in knowledge and control, challenging classical assumptions of transparency and rational deliberation.
- Contextualization in hybrid governance systems. The Kazakhstani case demonstrates that digital modernization within transitional institutional frameworks simultaneously produces procedural efficiency and new normative tensions, highlighting the importance of context-sensitive philosophical analysis.

The study contributes to contemporary political philosophy by integrating global

justice theory with digital governance analysis within a unified conceptual framework. By conceptualizing justice as a transforming normative architecture shaped by sovereignty shift, mediated agency, and infrastructural power, the research provides a more comprehensive understanding of justice in technologically mediated societies.

Importantly, the transformation identified in this study does not imply the obsolescence of classical justice principles. Rather, it underscores the necessity of their reinterpretation under new structural conditions. Fair distribution, institutional accountability, and moral autonomy remain foundational values; however, they must be applied within global networks and algorithmically mediated environments. Justice must therefore integrate distributive, procedural, technological, and epistemic dimensions into a coherent normative model.

The practical implications of this research relate to the development of normative frameworks for digital governance, artificial intelligence regulation, platform accountability, and socially balanced public policy. Digital infrastructures should be understood not as neutral tools but as constitutive elements of normative order. Ensuring justice in digital societies requires regulatory approaches that address transparency, accessibility, inclusion, and structural equality in an integrated manner.

Future research may proceed in several directions. First, empirical investigations of algorithmic governance across specific policy domains would deepen understanding of infrastructural justice. Second, comparative studies across diverse governance models could clarify how digital transformation interacts with different institutional traditions. Third, further philosophical inquiry into epistemic justice and technological mediation may refine and expand the theoretical framework proposed in this study.

Taken together, the analysis demonstrates that justice in the era of globalization and digital transformation emerges as a multi-dimensional normative principle requiring the reconciliation of sovereignty shift, infrastructural mediation, and global interdependence. The central philosophical task is not merely to extend classical distributive theory but to reinterpret justice as a structurally adaptive concept capable of addressing the complexities of contemporary socio-technical order. The present study represents a step toward such a reconceptualization.

Moreover, the transformation of justice in the global digital era underscores the need for interdisciplinary approaches that integrate philosophy, political theory, technology studies, and governance research. Only through such integration can justice be adequately understood as a dynamic and context-dependent principle capable of addressing the complexities of contemporary socio-technical systems. This perspective reinforces the importance of developing flexible normative frameworks that remain responsive to ongoing global and technological transformations.

List of references

1 Plato. The Republic / trans. by G. M. A. Grube, rev. by C. D. C. Reeve. – Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2007. – 416 p.

2 Rawls J. A Theory of Justice. – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1971. – 607 p.

- 3 Pogge T. World Poverty and Human Rights. – Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008. – 377 p.
- 4 Sen A. The Idea of Justice. – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009. – 496 p.
- 5 Fraser N. Fortunes of Feminism: From State-Managed Capitalism to Neoliberal Crisis. – London: Verso, 2013. – 240 p.
- 6 Nagel T. The Problem of Global Justice // Philosophy & Public Affairs. – 2005. – Vol. 33, No. 2. – P. 113–147.
- 7 Ypi L. Global Justice and Avant-Garde Political Agency. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. – 256 p.
- 8 Floridi L. The Ethics of Artificial Intelligence: Principles, Challenges, and Opportunities. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. – 256 p.
- 9 Nissenbaum H. Privacy in Context: Technology, Policy, and the Integrity of Social Life. – Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2010. – 288 p.
- 10 Pasquale F. The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information. – Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015. – 320 p.
- 11 Zuboff S. The Age of Surveillance Capitalism. – New York: PublicAffairs, 2019. – 704 p.
- 12 Crawford K. Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence. – New Haven: Yale University Press, 2021. – 336 p.
- 13 Eubanks V. Automating Inequality: How High-Tech Tools Profile, Police, and Punish the Poor. – New York: St. Martin's Press, 2020. – 288 p.
- 14 Aristotle. Nicomachean Ethics / trans. by W. D. Ross. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009. – 352 p.
- 15 Kant I. The Metaphysics of Morals / trans. by M. Gregor. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. – 512 p.
- 16 Allen D. Democracy in the Time of Coronavirus. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2020. – 120 p.
- 17 Gabitov T. Philosophy Basics. – Almaty: Lantar Trade, 2019. – 337 p.

Киекенова Б.Б., Нұрмұхаметова Қ.Ш., Болысова К.М.

Жаһандану және цифрлық трансформация жағдайындағы әділеттілік (философиялық талдау)

Аңдатпа. Мақалада жаһандану және қазіргі қоғамның цифрлық трансформациясы жағдайында әділеттілік категориясының өзгеруі кешенді философиялық тұрғыдан талданады. Ұлттық-мемлекеттік парадигма шеңберінде қалыптасқан классикалық әділеттілік теориялары жаһандық және цифрлық кеңістікте пайда болып жатқан әлеуметтік теңсіздіктің жаңа формаларын түсіндіруге жеткіліксіз екендігі негізделеді. Зерттеу трансұлттық экономикалық үдерістердің күшеюі, жаһандық өзара тәуелділіктің артуы және алгоритмдік басқару механизмдерінің кеңеюі жағдайында әділеттіліктің нормативтік негіздеріндегі құрылымдық өзгерістерді анықтауға бағытталған. Мақалада алгоритмдік әділеттілік, цифрлық алшақтық мәселесі, деректердің шоғырлануы және жауапкершілік субъектілерінің құрылымдық өзгерістері жан-жақты қарастырылады. Зерттеудің әдіснамалық негізін салыстырмалы-философиялық, нормативтік және аналитикалық тәсілдер, сондай-ақ классикалық және заманауи әділеттілік теорияларын герменевтикалық талдау құрайды.

Зерттеудің ғылыми жаңалығы – әділеттіліктің жаһандық және технологиялық өлшемдерін біріктіретін тұтас теориялық үлгіні ұсыну және нормативтік парадигманы ұлттық мемлекет шеңберінен тыс кеңейту қажеттігін негіздеу болып табылады.

Жұмыста цифрлық инфрақұрылымдардың билік асимметриясының және ресурстарды қайта бөлудің жаңа формаларын қалыптастыратыны көрсетіледі. Зерттеу нәтижесінде қазіргі заманғы әділеттілік тұжырымдамасы жаһандық жауапкершілік, алгоритмдік шешімдердің ашықтығы және технологиялық жаңғыру жағдайында адам қадір-қасиетін қорғау қағидаларын қамтуы тиіс деген қорытынды жасалады. Зерттеу нәтижелері цифрлық ортаны реттеудің нормативтік механизмдерін және әлеуметтік саясатты әзірлеуде қолданылуы мүмкін.

Түйін сөздер: әділеттілік; жаһандану; цифрлық трансформация; алгоритмдік әділеттілік; жаһандық жауапкершілік.

Киекенова Б.Б., Нурмухаметова К.Ш., Болысова К.М.

Справедливость в условиях глобализации и цифровой трансформации (философский анализ)

Аннотация. В статье представлен комплексный философский анализ трансформации категории справедливости в условиях глобализации и цифровой трансформации современного общества. Обосновывается положение о том, что классические теории справедливости, сформированные в рамках национально-государственной парадигмы, оказываются недостаточными для объяснения новых форм социального неравенства, формирующихся в глобальном и цифровом пространстве. Исследование направлено на выявление структурных изменений нормативных оснований справедливости в условиях транснационализации экономических процессов, роста глобальной взаимозависимости и распространения алгоритмических механизмов управления. Особое внимание уделяется анализу алгоритмической справедливости, проблеме цифрового разрыва, концентрации данных и трансформации структуры субъектов ответственности. Методологическую основу работы составляют сравнительно-философский, нормативный и аналитический подходы, а также элементы герменевтического анализа классических и современных теорий справедливости.

Научная новизна исследования заключается в интеграции глобального и технологического измерений в единую теоретическую модель понимания справедливости и в обосновании необходимости расширения нормативной парадигмы за пределы национального государства. В работе показано, что цифровые инфраструктуры формируют новые формы асимметрии власти и перераспределения ресурсов, требующие философского осмысления. Обосновывается вывод о том, что современная концепция справедливости должна включать принципы глобальной ответственности, прозрачности алгоритмических решений и защиты человеческого достоинства в условиях технологической модернизации. Практическая значимость результатов связана с возможностью их использования при разработке нормативных механизмов регулирования цифровой среды и социальной политики.

Ключевые слова: справедливость; глобализация; цифровая трансформация; алгоритмическая справедливость; глобальная ответственность.

Author Contributions. All authors contributed equally to the writing of the manuscript and the preparation of the article for publication.

Received 25.03.2026

Accepted 14.05.2026