ФИЛОСОФСКИЕ НАУКИ

УДК 32(075.8):004
DOI 10.58649/1694-9099-2026-1-393-397

Ван Шулян
Түндүк-Батыш педагогикалык университети, Марксизм колледжи
Ван Шулян
Северо-Западный педагогический университет, колледж Марксизма
Shuliang Wang
College of Marxism, Northwest Normal University

САНАРИПТИК ИНТЕЛЛЕКТУАЛДЫК САЯСИЙ МАДАНИЯТКА СЕРЕП
ОБЗОР ЦИФРОВОЙ ИНТЕЛЛЕКТУАЛЬНОЙ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОЙ КУЛЬТУРЫ
OUTLINE OF DIGITAL-INTELLIGENT POLITICAL CULTURE

Кыскача мүнөздөмө: Санариптик интеллектуалдык саясий маданият, саясий маданияттын жана интернет маданиятынын ичиндеги кесилишкен субмаданият катары, экөөнүн тең мүнөздөмөлөрүнө, ошондой эле өзүнүн уникалдуу өзгөчөлүктөрүнө ээ. Анын субъекттеринин чындыктагы жана виртуалдыктагы кош окшоштугу, санариптик интеллектуалдык трансформациясы жана билимдеги саясий объектилердин так берилиши, ошондой эле анын өнүгүшүн калыптандырган "борбордон ажыратылган көп өлчөмдүү адам – компьютердик өз ара аракеттенүү" модели – мунун баары анын мүнөздөмөлөрүндө жана таасиринде башка саясий субмаданияттарга салыштырмалуу олуттуу айырмачылыктарга өбөлгө түзөт.

Аннотация: Цифровая интеллектуальная политическая культура, как интерсекциональная субкультура в рамках политической культуры и интернет-культуры, обладает характеристиками обеих, а также своими уникальными особенностями. Двойственная идентичность её субъектов в реальности и виртуальности, цифровая интеллектуальная трансформация и точная передача в познании политических объектов, а также модель «децентрализованного многомерного взаимодействия человека и компьютера», формирующая её развитие, — всё это способствует существенным различиям в её характеристиках и влиянии по сравнению с другими политическими субкультурами.

Abstract: Digital-intelligent political culture, as an intersectional subculture within the form of political culture and internet culture, possesses characteristics of both while also having its own unique features. Its subjects' dual identity in reality and virtuality, the digital-intelligent transformation and precise delivery in the cognition of political objects, and the model of "decentralized multi-dimensional human-computer interaction" that shapes its development, all contribute to distinct differences in its characteristics and influence compared to other political subcultures.

Негизги сөздөр: санариптик интеллектуалдык саясий маданият; коннотация; калыптанышы, мүнөздөмөлөрү; таасири.

Ключевые слова: цифровая интеллектуальная политическая культура; коннотация; формирование; характеристики; влияние.

Keywords: digital-intelligent political culture; connotation; formation; characteristics; influence.

Political culture is not monolithic. In addition to the mainstream political culture, there are numerous political subcultures within it. Digital-intelligent political culture, as an emerging political subculture in the AI era, not only differs significantly from "real-world" political culture but also, due to the advantages of convenience, openness, and speed of digital information networks, has the potential to greatly influence the entire political cultural system. Therefore, this paper explores several fundamental issues regarding the connotation, formation process, characteristics, and influence of digital-intelligent political culture, with the aim of providing theoretical support for the construction of digital-intelligent political culture.

I. The connotation of digital-intelligent political culture

Digital-intelligent political culture isn't just a simple superposition of "digital intelligence" and "political culture", nor is it a mechanical complex of "cyber politics" and "culture", nor is it the politicization of "cyber culture". Instead, it has its own unique connotations.

Since the modern American political scientist Almond first put forward the concept of "political culture" in 1956 [1] , political terms that describe in-depth cognition, attitudes, thoughts, emotions,

psychology, motivations, and concepts about politics among members of society have gradually been incorporated into the "political culture" framework. The development of the internet has given rise to "cyber political culture", and with the internet entering the era of artificial intelligence, "digital-intelligent political culture" has become the latest form of political subculture. Currently, there are mainly three understandings of the connotation of "digital-intelligent political culture". he digital-intelligent "transformation" of real political culture, the "political culture" shaped by the digital-intelligent online environment, and the cultural form bred by "digital-intelligent politics" practices. The "transformation theory" is essentially still rooted in real-world political culture, with digital cyberspace merely serving as a transition empowered by artificial intelligence technology. The "edification theory" is essentially an external imposition of "environmental determinism". Understanding the connotation of "digital-intelligent political culture" should be based on the fundamental path from political practice to political consciousness, political psychology, and political culture. Therefore, it is essential to first clarify the foundational concepts of "digital-intelligent politics**",** and then construct the basic theoretical framework of "number intelligence political culture" on the basis of the practice of "number intelligence politics".

American scholar Mark Slouka's The Great Conflict: Cyber Space and High Technology as Threats to Reality [2] Alvin Toffler's Information Politics [3], Kevin Hill and John Hughes' Cyber Politics [4] Chris Toulouse and Timothy Luke's The Politics of Cyberspace [5] and Australian scholar David Holmes' Virtual Politics [6] and so on. These findings discuss the "virtualization" of real politics and make certain predictions on the form of virtualization. Chinese scholars' research focuses on defining the concept of "cyber politics" and the influence of the internet on real politics. Li Bin believes that cyber politics in a broad sense "refers to political phenomena involving state power and specific interests on the internet. In a narrow sense, it specifically refers to objectively existing political phenomena on the internet that are closely related to social and political life, such as those concerning political power"[7]. Wu Haijing clearly pointed out that "cyber politics is an emerging discipline that studies the interrelationship and mechanisms of action between network technology and politics, with the influence of network technology on politics being its main research focus" [8]. In this regard, Yang Weimin and Wu Xianqing also agree that "cyber politics is a political phenomenon formed by the mutual penetration of the internet and politics" [9]. It can be seen that domestic scholars' research on "cyber politics" in general is mostly based on the perspective of real politics, generally focusing on the influence of the new tool on real political life.

At present, there are not many definitions of "digital-intelligent political culture", most of which are based on the connotation definition of cyber political culture. Li Bin holds that: "cyber political culture refers to the sum of spiritual phenomena that are based on computer technology and communication technology as material support, exist in the network, to send and receive information as the core, derive from human reflection on their own political values, political lifestyles, political way of thinking, and are related to political phenomena in real society and network society"[10] This definition affirms the objectivity of online media, but it understands the formation of cyber political culture as "self-reflection" rather than the " breeding and shaping" of the online political environment, thus downplaying the effectiveness of the internet. Ye Min and Tang Yalin believe that "cyber political culture refers to the sum total of attitudes, emotions, and evaluations toward the real political system that people gradually develop during online political activities as humanity enters the internet era" [11]. This definition largely follows Almond's concept of political culture, but it doesn't go as far as the internet era requires in understanding the subject and object of cyber political culture.

Digital-intelligent political culture refers to the sum of relatively universal spiritual products such as political attitudes and political emotions, which are formed when political netizens, based on their own value preferences, cognize and evaluate the political reality carried by specific types of digital political information under the cyber political environment of artificial intelligence, through long-term influence of the digital political environment and political practice, and then internalize them into the subjective consciousness through continuous accumulation.

II. The formation process of cyber political culture

The digital-intelligent network environment has changed the patterns of how "non-cyber" political cultures are formed. The asynchronous interactivity, equality and other characteristics of networks have led to a "pluralistic, decentralized interaction" among the subjects and objects of political culture within society, as well as between different subjects and between different objects. The value biases inherent in the "political information" disseminated through digital networks result in a lack of an internal "evaluation" process among netizens, that is, the "cognition-attitude-emotion" model is not fully operational.

Political culture formation generally follows four basic steps of "cognition, evaluation, attitude, and emotion". The significant differences between digitally intelligent political culture and real-world political

culture in the formation process are mainly reflected in the “content” orientation of each link and the lack of specific links (evaluation).

In terms of cognition, digitally intelligent political culture primarily focuses on digital political information as its object of perception, while insignificant online political participation and virtual political life are not the main stimulus sources of the cyber political culture. In terms of evaluation, political information contains not only the political events themselves but also the evaluations and attitudes of the information “processors”, and may even include “column commentary” and “comments” posted by ordinary netizens. This results in more netizens being influenced by “pre-existing evaluations” before they've even formed their own judgments when receiving political information, leading to a certain degree of absence of an evaluation process among information recipients. In terms of attitude, netizens’ political attitudes exhibit extreme instability, stemming from their lack of thorough cognition and in-depth evaluation, as they’re instead assimilated by the attitudes embedded in existing digital political information. Emotionally, the massive amount of political information in the digital cyberspace makes it difficult for netizens to form a stable emotional attribution. While homogeneous “political emotions” struggle to aggregate, there’s also a polarization of “political empathy”. Thus, the formation of digitally intelligent political culture exhibits a “dualization” process. that is, the digital virtualization of real politics generates “digital information”, and the substantiation of virtual virtual digitally intelligent political culture forms a “reverse consciousness”. In the interaction between the dual dimensions of reality and virtuality, both real and digitally intelligent political cultures gradually lead to a “dual structure” within the overall political culture system.

III. Characteristics of digital-intelligent political culture

Digital political culture, as the latest “subculture” within the political culture system, not only possesses the general characteristics of digital-intelligent culture but also has unique features, which are determined by differences in its subjects, objects, and formation processes.

1. The virtual nature of digital-Intelligent political culture

The virtual nature of digital-intelligent political culture subjects. Netizens possess both real and virtual identities, with the virtual identity being more reflected as online. In cyber social life, a set of codes or a symbolic role becomes the identifier of a netizen, rather than being a real citizen. This allows them to exist as relatively free “virtual political agents”. The virtual nature of digital-intelligent political culture objects. As a space for information production, processing, dissemination, and storage, the network virtual world allows netizens to form certain attitudes towards “real politics” through digitally reconstructed versions of it, without having to personally experience or witness it firsthand. “Digital reinvention of politics” has become the direct object of understanding in digital-intelligent political culture. The virtual nature of digital-intelligent political life. With the gradual rise of digital-intelligent politics, real politics has got rid of the constraints of time and space. Political life has shifted from “real” to “virtual”, changing from interactions between “citizens and political subjects” to a tripartite interaction model of “citizen-computer-political subject”, with “virtual scenarios” becoming the new form of the digital-intelligent political field.

2. The diffusiveness of digital-Intelligent political culture

Every culture has the dual attributes of outward expansion and inward cohesion at the same time, but no culture has spread faster, more powerfully, or more widely than digital-intelligent political culture. There are mainly two types of diffusion of digital-intelligent political culture. First, in digital virtual environments, “high-level political netizens” represented by internet influencers and celebrities have a “siphon effect” on ordinary netizens, leading to “jungle confrontation” among netizens and eventually converging consensus. Second lies in the interactive influence across the “heterogeneous spaces” between digital-intelligent virtuality and reality. The integrated nature of netizens’ dual identities in virtual and real life determines that digital-intelligent political culture inevitably influences real-world political culture through the transformation of netizens’ identities. In other words, the political culture formed online becomes “realized” as netizens switch from virtual to real identities, and it can erode other types of culture.

3. The homogeneity of online political culture

Although digital-intelligent political culture consists of many “subunits” due to the different preferences of political netizens, the inherent characteristics of digital intelligence mean that these subunits with relatively small differences converge into a political culture with a high degree of homogeneity. Compared to other types of political subcultures, the homogeneity of digital political culture is easier to form because digital online information allows mainstream political attitudes to more easily dominate cyberspace and continuously assimilate other political attitudes. Most netizens are easily influenced by online public opinion, leading to a “herd mentality”, and the “precision-targeted delivery” of digital intelligence information makes the “information cocooning” effect more obvious among specific groups. In the formation of a highly homogeneous digital-intelligent political culture, the “assimilation” role of online

mainstream public opinion plays an important role, absorbing and integrating heterogeneity to continuously enhance homogeneity.

4. The intuitive explicitness of digital-intelligent political culture

Culture is implicit, and it seems that it can only be observed through the external minister of the cultural carrier. However, digital-intelligent political culture has, to some extent, achieved "self-explicitness". Due to the virtual and anonymous nature of its subjects, netizens tend to directly express their political attitudes through symbols such as language and text. If all netizens can express their political views, then digital-intelligent political culture becomes much more "intuitive". The self-disclosure of netizens has given digital-intelligent political culture the characteristic of being "intuitive explicit". It's clear that digital-intelligent political culture has shifted from "passive observation" to "active presentation", from being "implicit" to being "explicit".

IV. The influences of digital-intelligent political culture

The influence of digital-intelligent political culture on the political culture system. As a highly pervasive cultural form, digital-intelligent political culture not only affects other political subcultures but also influences the entire political culture system. This impact is reflected in two aspects. On one hand, during the process of its dissemination and diffusion, digital-intelligent political culture, due to its strong appeal, influence, and infectivity, causes other types of political culture to passively or actively adopt similar characteristics, finally leading to homogenization. On the other hand, mutual influence between diverse political cultures is normal, but for such influence to completely transform one culture, it doesn't happen overnight. The inherent cohesion, heterogeneity, and strong stability of political cultures mean they tend to produce exclusion in the face of other types of foreign political culture "invasion", and the extent of this exclusion depends on factors like the degree of heterogeneity between the cultures and their own level of stability. While digital-intelligent political culture has an assimilative effect, it also faces the possibility of heterogeneous political cultures developing in the opposite direction, that is, "cultural center contraction". On the whole, as a culture more closely connected to real politics, digital-intelligent political culture's assimilative function is significantly stronger than its alienating function.

The influence of digital-intelligent political culture on real politics. With the help of the Internet, the digital-intelligent political culture subtly changes people's political perceptions, and then affects people's political behavior, even the whole social life. The influence of digital-intelligent political culture on the political system is manifested in three aspects. First, the impact on the output value of the political system. Individuals exposed to diverse information online are easy to form negative political cultures, which can severely undermine the government's credibility, legitimacy, and authority. Second, the impact on the operation of the political system. The negative and passive aspects of digital-intelligent political culture can reduce administrative efficiency, leading to poor policy implementation, administrative setbacks, increased social management costs, and diminished effectiveness, which in turn reinforces such digital-intelligent political cultures. Third, it will alter the traditional power structure of "strong country and weak society". New virtual social organizations such as "digital communities" and "online communities" are forming a pattern of super-traditional social groups that challenge the political system through "digital associations",and gradually moving towards a situation where virtual society and traditional state "power" compete with each other.

Digital-intelligent transformation is not only a new scenario in human political life but also a complete change of content and essence. In the foreseeable future, with the rapid development of generative artificial intelligence, digital-intelligent politics will become a major trend in human political life, and the breeding "digital-intelligent political culture" will also seize the practical opportunity for rapid development.

Reference

1. Gabriel A. Almond. Comparative Political Systems. The Journal of Politics, 1956,Vol. 18, No. 3,p391—409.

2. Mark Slouka. The Great Conflict: Cyberspace and the Threat of High Technology to Reality. Translated by Huang Peijian. Nanchang: Jiangxi Education Press, 1999.

3. Liaoning Academy of Social Sciences Research Group on New Technological Revolution. Selected Works of Alvin Toffler [M]. Shenyang: Liaoning Science and Technology Press, 1984.

4. Kevin A. Hill, John E. Hughes. Cyberpolitics: Citizen Activism in the Age of the Internet (People, Passions, and Power). Rowman & Littlefield, 1998.

5. Chris Toulouse, Timothy Luke. The politics of cyberspace: A New Political Science Reader. Routledge, 1998.

6. David Holmes. Virtual Politics: Identity and Community in Cyberspace. SAGE Publications, 1998.

7. Li Bin. A Political Science Analysis of Cyber Politics[J]. Socialism Studies, 2003(03): 46.
8. Wu Haijing. Objects, Contents, Technical Routes and Other Aspects of Cyberpolitics Research[J]. Journal of Hubei Administration Institute, 2004(06): 14.
9. Yang Weimin, Wu Xianqing. On the Establishment and Development of Cyber Politics in China[J]. Study & Exploration, 2004(05): 31.
10. Li Bin. Introduction to Cyberpolitics [M]. Beijing: China Social Sciences Press, 2006: 264.
11. Ye Min, Tang Yalin. On the Rational Construction of Cyber-Political Culture in China[J]. New Horizon, 2009 (04): 35.

Рецензент: д.и.н., профессор Эсенкулов Н.Ж.

УДК 327(574)
DOI 10.58649/1694-9099-2026-1-397-404

Иванов И.П.
Казакстан-Немис университети
Иванов И.П.
Казахстанско-Немецкий Университет
Ivanov I.P.
Kazakh-German University

ORCID 0009-0009-7558-9052

КАЗАКСТАНДЫН АЗЫРКЫ ТЫШКЫ САЯСАТЫНДА ИНТЕГРАЦИЯ ФОРМАТТАРЫ
ИНТЕГРАЦИОННЫЕ ФОРМАТЫ В СОВРЕМЕННОЙ ВНЕШНЕЙ ПОЛИТИКЕ КАЗАХСТАНА
INTEGRATION FORMATS IN KAZAKHSTAN'S CONTEMPORARY FOREIGN POLICY

Кыскача мүнөздөмө: Бул изилдөөнүн максаты - азыркы Казакстандын тышкы саясатында интеграциялык форматтардын маанисин баалоо. Документте Казакстандын Евразия Экономикалык Биримдиги (ЕАЭБ), Шанхай Кызматташтык Уюму (ШКУ), Жамааттык Коопсуздук Келишим Уюму (ЖККУ), Азиядагы өз ара аракеттенүү жана ишеним чаралары боюнча кеңешме (CICA) жана Кытайдын «Бир алкак жана жол» демилгеси сыяктуу негизги экономикалык жана аскердик-саясий бирикмелерге катышуусунун негизги багыттары каралат. Талдоо көрсөткөндөй, бул форматтарга катышуу Казакстандын эл аралык аброюн бекемдөөгө өбөлгө түзөт. Изилдөө тышкы саясатты экономикалык, саясий жана инфраструктуралык механизмдер аркылуу улуттук кызыкчылыктарды ишке ашыруунун куралы катары караган геоэкономикалык мамиленин теориялык принциптерине негизделген. Эмпирикалык бөлүгү расмий документтерге, аналитикалык баяндамаларга жана Казакстан, Россия жана Борбор Азия өлкөлөрүнүн илимий журналдарындагы басылмаларга негизделген. Жыйынтыктар Казакстандын интеграциялык форматтарга катышуусу ага экономикалык прагматизмди көп векторлуу тышкы саясий стратегияны ишке ашыруу менен айкалыштырууга мүмкүндүк берет деген тыянак чыгарууга негиз сунуштайт. Бул интеграциялык форматтарга катышуу Казакстандын эл аралык аренадагы беделин бекемдейт.

Аннотация: Целью исследования является оценка значимости интеграционных форматов во внешней политике современного Казахстана. В работе рассматриваются основные направления участия Казахстана в ключевых экономических и военно-политических объединениях, таких как Евразийский экономический союз (ЕАЭС), Шанхайская организация сотрудничества (ШОС), Организация Договора о коллективной безопасности (ОДКБ), Совещание по взаимодействию и мерам доверия в Азии (СВМДА) и китайская инициатива «Пояс и путь». Анализ показал, что участие в данных форматах способствует укреплению международной субъектности Казахстана. Исследование базируется на теоретических положениях геоэкономического подхода, в рамках которого внешняя политика рассматривается как инструмент реализации национальных интересов через экономические, политические и инфраструктурные механизмы. Эмпирическая часть основана на официальных документах, аналитических отчётах и публикациях в научных журналах Казахстана, России и стран Центральной Азии. Полученные результаты позволяют сделать вывод о том, что участие Казахстана в интеграционных форматах обеспечивает ему возможность сочетать