

Spirituality as a phenomenon of culture

© 2019 г. Abdumalik Nyssanbayev^{1*}, Serik Nurmuratov^{2**}

^{1, 2} *Institute of Philosophy, Political Science and Religious Studies, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, 29, St. Kurmangazy, Almaty, 050010, Kazakhstan.*

* *E-mail: medina74@bk.ru*

** *E-mail: s.nurmuratov@mail.ru*

Received 06.09.2019

Spirituality cannot be the result of non-spiritual States, but only the awakening of spiritual power, the actualization of possibility. The spirit is a liberating and transforming power, but we can never determine where true spirituality is found. Spirituality is an indivisible state of consciousness, the core of the spiritual life of society and the spiritual world of man. It cannot be decomposed into components. As, for example, deed or state of faith, on Kierkegaard, impossible to develop aesthetically or ethically, and unfolding on these components elements. According to Berdyaev, spiritual life is not objective and objective reality, but even less so it is subjective reality. These definitions are attached to the spiritual being in its naturalistic understanding. The reality of the spiritual world does not correspond not only to the phenomena of the natural and social world, but also to any reality of spiritual experiences. The reality of the spirit is spiritual experience.

Key words: spirituality, revival, philosophy, morality, evolution, legacy, culture, world outlook. science, postmodernism.

DOI: 10.31857/S004287440007365-6

Citation: Nyssanbayev, Abdumalik, Nurmuratov, Serik (2019) "Spirituality as a phenomenon of culture", *Voprosy Filosofii*, Vol. 12 (2019), pp. 204–211.

Духовность как феномен культуры

© 2019 г. А.Н. Нысанбаев^{1*}, С.Е. Нурмуратов^{2**}

^{1,2} *Институт философии, политологии и религиоведения Комитета науки министерства образования и науки Республики Казахстан, Республика Казахстан, Алматы, 050010, ул. Курмангазы, д. 29.*

* E-mail: medina74@bk.ru

** E-mail: s.nurmuratov@mail.ru

Поступила 06.09.2019

Духовность не может быть результатом недуховных состояний, а лишь пробуждением духовной силы, актуализацией возможности. Дух есть освобождающая и преображающая сила, но мы никогда не можем определить, где обнаруживается подлинная духовность. Духовность — неделимое состояние сознания, сердцевина духовной жизни общества и духовного мира человека. Ее нельзя разложить на составляющие. Как, например, поступок или состояние веры, по Кьеркегору, невозможно освоить эстетически или этически, и разложить на эти составляющие элементы. Согласно Бердяеву, духовная жизнь не есть реальность объективно-предметная, но еще менее она есть реальность субъективная. Эти определения прилагаются к духовному бытию при натуралистическом его понимании. Реальность духовного мира не соответствует не только явлениям мира природного и социального, но также и никакой реальности душевных переживаний. Реальность духа есть духовный опыт.

Ключевые слова: духовность, философия, нравственность, эволюция, наследие, философствование, культура, мировоззрение, наука, пост-модернизм, развитие.

DOI: 10.31857/S004287440007365-6

Цитирование: *Нысанбаев А.Н., Нурмуратов С.Е.* Духовность как феномен культуры // Вопросы философии. 2019. № 12. С. 204–211.

The development of culture along the way of specialization resulted in *reductio ad absurdum*, when the very soul of a man specializes. The disengagement of a person from the whole culture has led to the fact that the person himself does not understand himself, lost the ability to communicate with his own self. “The building of culture has become spiritually empty”, stated Pavel A. Florensky. It will still be built, but “those who will be behind us, not denying anything, not opposing the subtlety of scientific distinctions and the elaboration of artistic techniques, etc. etc., will say the fatal “no need”, and the entire complex system of debased civilization will collapse as the multi-complex structure of astrology collapsed at one time, as scholasticism collapsed, as great empires collapsed and collapse as useless” (*At the watersheds of thought*).

Spirituality as a phenomenon of culture and quintessence of the era

Jacques Derrida offers to realize a completely indisputable fact: in modern culture, there is a layer of mediators stretching between a man and truth, pushing the region of the immediately given and undoubted into the infinitely distant horizon. All that is available to us in the world of becoming is *traces* and *traces of traces* of the presence of being. Ontologically, the traces are connected by an unhindered game of interchange of elements within the structure. This game does not tolerate the beginnings of hierarchy and centering, i.e.

logocentrism as a principle of Western culture and metaphysics. In terms of the picture of the logocentrism world, the existent – directly given, simple, complete, self-identical, accessible “here and now” is available, given and self-evident.

The correlation of self-erasing traces is such that within the framework of the classical schemes of thought it is impossible, as a matter of principle, to determine what correlates with what. Logocentrism is interpreted by Derrida as an absolutely indisputable initial postulate of metaphysics. Its forms are onto-, teleo-, anthro-, theocentrism. In the space of traces game, the problem of beginning set by Plato and the whole ancient culture of thinking is meaningless or takes a completely different meaning. But it is precisely this problem that created the disciplinary space, or *topos*, a place of Western metaphysics. Therefore, in the discourse of Derrida, rift cracks (logical, poetic, psychoanalytic) penetrating the conceptual monoliths of traditional metaphysics become (*must become*) visible and represented as the subject of reflection.

Spirituality is an internal affair and task of philosophy, which understands and realizes itself as the spiritual quintessence of the epoch. But if the epoch represents its own quintessence on the model of Luc Besson’s film “The Fifth Element”, then what should be the philosophy of this epoch? “In the old days, the road to perfection was narrow and lonely, traveling along it was constantly disturbed by wanderings, subjected to robber sin-attacks, pursued by arrows of the past, which were as dangerous as arrows fired by the hordes of the Scythians; now, one goes to excellence by rail, in pleasant company, and before a man can say a word about it, he has already arrived” (Kierkegaard, *The Concept of anxiety*). Technological advances of recent times have allowed us to create a special reality with computer means – the virtual world of cyberspace. Accordingly, with the modification of the object, the types of perception and judgment are modified. This world is not penetrated by its reflection and interpretation, but by interactive simulation, an experiment-game with artificial reality. In the virtual world, the meaningful disappears, as in the Castalian “glass bead game”, where the subject is the rules of ideally harmonic orderliness. Specific virtual stereotypes of behavior are developed in the virtual world. For example, creativity without assuming responsibility and without claiming truth: creativity for trial for show, for fun [Хоружий 1997, 67]. Postmodernism is a philosophical *experimentum crucis* with spirituality: is it possible and what is the philosophy from which the transcendence plan, i.e. vector of spirit movement, is removed.

In classical philosophy, the model of spirituality as a vertical, “earthly-heavenly”, and not a plane motion vector is universally significant. That is, transcendence, and not spatial distribution, acts as an ontological and semantic structure of spirituality. Accordingly, a person, fulfilling his spiritual mission, should build a value-semantic hierarchy of his own life as a whole, where the highest spiritual interests obey to themselves and form the lower levels. Kierkegaard says: we are all a synthesis with our spiritual mission. This is our structure. But, Kierkegaard suggests, let us imagine a multi-stored building, each floor of which would have a definite number of tenants. “It’s ridiculous and pitiful, but don’t most people prefer a basement in this house?” (Kierkegaard, *The Sickness unto death*). He likes to live there, although the upper floor is free and awaits him - but after all, in the end, such a man believes, the whole house belongs to him, and he has the right to settle where he likes! A man is free not to climb the ladder of his own spirit, but this decision does not change the immanent architectonics of spiritual reality, but only leaves it an empty opportunity.

Defining the plan of philosophical thought as the image by which the modern philosophy imagines what it means to think, move within the meanings of its own thinking, Giles Deleuze and Felix Guattari argue: the plan of immanence of philosophical thought as the only container of concepts, territory of philosophical events is not reflection, contemplation, or communication, but a desert populated by nomadic tribes. Meanwhile, as in the paradigm of the philosophy of classical type (*What is philosophy?*).

This movement, in contrast to the postulated compulsory rationality of the Cartesian type, does not imply either an objective frame of reference or a moving element that would experience itself as a subject and as such would desire or need to be infinite. Unlike the old existential territorialities of philosophical reflection, postmodern conceptualism in principle leaves no room for the spirit in the interval between thought and being (between them is “just a fold”), postulating instantaneous flash-like lightning-fast interoperability of truth and

thought. Multiple infinite movements are enclosed in one another, they are bent one inside the other, and this immense shuttle weaves the plan of immanence as a continuous extension without breaking between the concepts. For various movements of infinity are so intertwined with each other that they do not break the Totality of the plan of immanence at all, but only form its variable curvature.

Each movement runs through the whole plan, immediately returns to itself, each movement bends, but at the same time it bends the other ones, generating feedback. The plan of immanence is always the only one (this is why creative concept philosophy represents a “mighty Unity”), and is a pure variation (this is why this infinite Wholeness – *Omni-tudo* – of philosophy is unfragmented and open), but in history one and other endless movements compete, are selected and replaced. They are more likely to emerge from throwing bones than to form a mosaic. After all, an event of meaning is a *superficial effect*.

Spirituality in postmodernism and in classical philosophy

In the postmodern discourse, traditionally, there is a tangible element of shocking, intellectual Fronde. In fact, the philosophical nomad is a conceptual character in postmodern discourse, and it has a symbolic meaning only when comparing deconstruction strategies with its own principles of organizing deconstructed metaphysics. It is all the more interesting to trace the presence of generative models of deconstruction in the classical texts themselves.

Starting the presentation of his *Philosophy of the Spirit* as the third part of *The Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences*, Hegel warns that the knowledge of the spirit is the most concrete, the most true and highest, but also the most difficult. The highest definition of the absolute is its definition as the spirit, and therefore the spiritual is something that is *ontologically genuine* in a man and a state, society and nature. The spirit is essentially what it knows itself. In all that is in heaven and on earth, in all plans and regions of being, the spirit knows itself, for the spirit is essentially original and teleologically finite. And since there is no absolutely other thing in relation to the spirit, the question of the nature of the spiritual can only be asked by the spirit itself.

In classical philosophy, since the time of the Neo-Platonists, the methodological paradigm has been established, according to which the context of philosophical reasoning about spiritual entities should be built in the manner of reflexive structures that exclude basic epistemological distinctions. “The true greatness of the spirit lies in its integrity” (Plotinus, *Against Gnostics*). The spirit always and in each of its acts is invariably identical with itself. The intelligent Spirit, when thinking, always thinks of itself, dwelling in each of the *eidola* inseparably but in its entirety, “and, thus, is a whole and thoughtful subject, a conceivable object, and the very idea of oneself only”. Therefore, the act of his thinking and the awareness of this act are the same in it. Thus, it is unacceptable to multiply the primary entities by discriminating in the Spirit of the thinking and the one who thinks the thinking.

At the same time, in Neoplatonism, the metaphysical context of the problem of the spirit also receives transcendental inversion. According to Plotinus, the All as a spiritual and ontological principle is present wherever one is able to communicate with it, and is absent for someone who is not capable of it. The All is not outside of us, but always with us, only we do not notice; people themselves become outside of it and separate themselves from it to the same extent as they do from themselves, and, of course, cannot achieve what they are running away from, just as they cannot attain true-existence, having lost themselves. This principle has received the utmost acute formulations in the teachings of the early Protestant mystics. Here a transcendental inversion of the myth of creation occurs: The Word, enabling God to be God, is born in the soul of a mystical subject.

The Spirit is not only freedom in God, but also freedom from God for certain personalities. In this absolute and groundless freedom only spiritual reality can exist and be revealed. It is impossible not to see in Meister Eckhart's mystical personalism a typological analogue or prologue of the dialectical logical unfolding of the absolute unity of the self-consciousness of transcendental idealism. The philosophical idea of God is part of, the birth and conclusion of the philosophical system and exists only in connection with all the ideas of the teachings and this connection. Of course, philosophical thinking is formed in a certain cultural-historical atmosphere, in a certain “spiritual situation of time” and cannot be free of the religious prejudices that they determine. But for philosophy, God is a problem, not a

given, and therefore it is free of any kind of religious experience, and only in thought is that light in which God, man, and the world arise logically. Philosophy in its essence “does not depend on the Christian faith, neither in its subject matter, nor in its principles, nor in its methods” (Maritain, *On the Christian philosophy*).

In the soul that has reached the last depth of selfhood, an absolute freedom of self-identification, i.e. in a soul that is in absolutely negative self-conception, God destroys Himself (“Be sure, this is the most essential property of God!”), and the soul itself reaches the state when it does not need to have God anymore. Spirituality is defined as a unique act of philosophizing, or a symbol of some limiting conditions of conscious life, about which it is impossible to have rational *knowledge* by definition. Here, the problem of faith is posed in all its seriousness and paradoxes. In accordance with the unshakable principle of the Christian doctrine of the soul, the human I must lose himself in order to be reborn in spirit and truth. Kierkegaard analyzes the situations when I want to be himself, but it is said to begin with the loss of himself. In these situations, the simulacrum of the infinite movement of becoming devoid of spiritual orientations is generated.

Spirituality is the ontological structure of the self-transcendence of consciousness, I, the soul. A concrete I contains some necessity, some limitations, there is a specific certainty, coupled with his own capabilities. The infinite I is the most abstract of all possible forms. And with the help of an infinite form, that is, a negative I, a human being gets into his head to transform this whole, in order to extract I according to his taste, with a desperate effort to create his own I. And after this he wants to be himself. But no derivative I can, looking at himself, give himself more than he has. A person may start over whenever he wishes. In the movement of distinction, in the game of signifiers, so cherished by modern humanist studies, there is no provision for the appearance of a real individual. Everything here depends on arbitrariness. And therefore rebellion at any moment is legitimacy. Kierkegaard shows that the absolute movement of an establishment is actually accomplished either in the face of certain objective values and meanings as perspectives and orientations of this movement, or in the plane of absurdity.

In any form – artistic creation, philosophical reflection, moral self-legislation – a person selects and asserts existential values. Kierkegaard places this choice on the trajectory of faith movement, calling it “the movement of infinity”. Only for the one who made this movement, his continued stay in the end does not show any trace of the forced, fearful dressage, of teaching the soul to the fear of finitude. Faith cannot be a direct movement of heart, but only a paradox of real existence, looking into the eyes of impossibility. Movement of infinity, or the infinite becoming, is a “constantly lasting leap” in the real existence, i.e. its transcendence, not mediation by reflection or any cultural form. If a person fails to achieve such a concentration of all the content and meaning of his life in a single movement, then he will always be in a hurry to rush into his petty life matters, never having risen into eternity.

The spirit, in order to set itself in motion as a whole, must preliminary curl into point simplicity (Hegel). Kierkegaard says that he can fully understand and realize the philosophical form of movement towards an absolute sense, the basis of which is self-denial of all finite meanings and values. But the movement of religious faith is absolutely incomprehensible for any type of reflection. Faith cannot be mastered aesthetically or ethically; it remains an eternal paradox for thinking. Believing is not the same thing as recognizing something as absolute truth. You cannot believe in the multiplication table or chemical formulas. Ivan Karamazov knows incontrovertibly and for certain that there is no God, but he cannot but believe in his existence. Faith is not just the most paradoxical of all that can be conceived, but it is so paradoxical that it cannot be thought of at all. Faith becomes flawed, feigns itself if it fancies itself the knowledge. Proving the truth of faith as a certain state of mind is psychologically and logically absurd.

If the soul is not concentrated in isolation and separation, but is split in various ways, then it is not self-sufficient, and therefore not capable of complete surrender of self-denial as the only way to carry out infinite movement. Infinite surrender is the last stage, immediately preceding faith. Infinite self-denial is a philosophical act by which I repudiate everything temporary for the sake of finding the eternal. This requires enough human courage.

Spirituality as an ontological structure of consciousness

The spirit is the prohibition of the identity of a person with himself in any final object, existing or conceivable, as well as in any abstract universality. Therefore, the analytics of the objectified forms of the existence of spiritual reality cannot serve as a way of movement according to its specific logic. In this sense, Hegel considers the truth of Christianity as a religion of the spirit. The spirit as the absolute unity of divine and human nature in religion appears in the form of comprehension of the substantial content in the subjectivity of direct self-consciousness, or in the form of faith. Religious faith provides not an apodictic proof of an objective structure, but only a hermeneutical model of the spiritual plane of being. The movement of self-identification in the space of faith is understood as a movement from valuables that are not subject to criticism to the experience that certifies them. Religious consciousness must create in itself a semantic structure, in which the truth of spiritual sense-images becomes directly reliable experience as a personal way of ideological affirmation in faith.

Ontological realities were dispersed, decomposed, being integrated into conditional, sign-symbolic, rhetorical spirituality of confessional religions. The virtual reality of such symbolism is not the immediacy of the presence of the spiritual beginning, but the projection of the unconsciousness. The projection is presented to the consciousness itself, the *Ego*, as something coming to it from a sacred object, something like a radiance emitted by it.

In Nikolai Berdyaev's positions, Hegel's philosophical principle is repeated: the spirit exists only for the spirit. It is impossible to raise the question of his nature from outside the spiritual. "Spiritual life is not a reflection of any reality, it is the reality itself" (*Philosophy of free spirit*), not only not reducible to any other type of reality, but also reality in another sense. Spiritual reality is not reality along with natural and psychological reality. Spirituality is the existential reality of freedom as the highest quality value. Berdyaev, developing the doctrine of *mystical realism* or *panontologism*, argued that rationalistic thinking is a painful state of being itself, a break in it. "The Cave Empiricism" (V. Ern), the worldview of the cave prisoners of Plato's myth corresponds to the heteronomy of the layers of being, the absence of their internal connection. Good, Truth, Beauty are "super-cave" entities, they are located in the space of solar freedom. In the mystical eternal dialectic, time, space, matter, the laws of logic are not the states of the subject, but the states of being itself, but painful states. Only a cognitive subject, detached from an object cut off from being, can be tempted to be a mirror, a reflection of reality. Knowledge is the self-disclosure of being, its dismemberment and appearance. In the act of self-knowledge, being itself is enlightened and shaped. A cognizing subject living in the depths of being itself can only have a desire to actively create values in being itself, to develop being to perfection.

Lowness and lack of spiritual life cannot serve as evidence that this life does not exist. The spirit is equally both all the fullness of being and none of the existing. The spirit gives a meaning to all existing, but it is also non-rational, irrational, super-rational. The logical form of thinking about the spiritual reality becomes Bonaventure's syllogism: "If there is no God, then there is God." How is it possible to prove and substantiate the very existence of spiritual reality? It is impossible to expect that spiritual realities will be given and opened to us like the objects of nature, psychological states or substances of spiritualistic metaphysics. The material of the philosophy of the spirit is the cultural and historical spiritual experience of mankind, creations and monuments of the spirit. But one should not forget that this world of history and culture is also distracted from the existential subject, but spirituality is not symbolic, it is ontological, it is the reality of enlightenment and transformation.

The theoretical level of the worldview puts a person in front of fundamental questions that are usually denoted as "eternal": does the universe and human existence have a final goal, an absolute sense, an objective purpose? A glance at the universe and himself sub specie aernitatis inevitably entails a search for guarantees, or at least the possibility of man's overcoming of one's own finitude. Failure to find them is the source of what in the Romantic language was called *Weltschmerz* – world-weariness. Absolute not-being, in which death immerses us, is ethically unbearable, even if it is ontologically immutable. About this true and genuine riddle, about the fundamental feeling of the mystical unity of being present in all religions, we can talk in modern language of psychology. But this does not mean that the language of depth psychology is the last and quite adequate instance of the interpretation of human spirituality.

Modern philosophy, following Rousseau, Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, neo-Kantianism, existentialism, sharpens the problem of tragic contradiction of life and culture. On one side is life, on the other - the realm of ideal, self-sufficient and objective values. The “cooled forms” (G. Simmel) of the spirit begin their own independent existence, limiting the seething vitality and inner responsibility of the soul for free self-establishment. In turn, the self-conscious *ego* cannot independently control the life of an individual. To do this, it needs a “mythical” dominant, but such a thing cannot be arbitrarily invented, and then believed in. And the further the culture process moves, the greater the creation turns out to be the enemy of its creator. N.A. Berdyaev makes the tragedy of cultural creativity (“objectification”) a model of eschatology and the source of existential philosophizing.

Hegel said that, turning to Ancient Greece, the Spirit finds itself in its homeland. In Greece, the spirit is neither categorically nor terminologically isolated from a set of concepts describing an ideally spiritual world. The first philosophers, such as Thales, saw the presence of gods, demons and souls in everything. Plato places spiritual entities in the speculative space – Hyperuranion. And only Christianity places the spiritual principle on the other side of image and form: simultaneously in divine transcendence and in the immanent space of soul. The dialectic of the spirit formation principle is such that personality had to become in respect of separation from the state-political whole, so that its correlate appeared in the form of a spiritual modality of worldview. If we apply the techniques of an ideally-typical approach to cultural phenomena, then it can be stated that an individual’s spiritual and moral self-determination can be in two extreme forms of relationship with the perception of the meaning and teleology of social and political life: rational and direct, or irrational and inverse matching. Of course, in their pure form, these relations appear only in theoretical abstraction, but in reality there are always many mixed and transitional forms. However, as methodological constructs, these two types of personality-socium relations can play a heuristic role in research on hermeneutics of cultural categories. The polis way of life can be considered a classic example of this type of consciousness, when the values and norms of a social whole are directly and immediately the virtues of personal life, the strategy of self-construction of the individual soul.

Similar positions are held by the great Kazakh thinker Abay Kunanbayev. The main principle of his teaching *Adam Bol* (“Be a man”) expresses the focus of his worldview orientations on fundamental bases of holistic being of a person. Humaneness is the form of commonality, which expresses the essence of traditional Kazakh society as integrity, where the forms of communication of people with each other were leading, where human relations, rather than economic, political, defined moral norms and traditions, thereby determining the characteristics of traditional Kazakh society, special spirituality.

The value principle *Adam Bol!* makes it possible to understand the meaning of the embodiment of mind in the sphere of moral relations, because it fixes and characterizes human communication not only from the perspective of outward orientation from person to person, but also from the position of inner orientation of a person towards himself, the voice of conscience inside each person in a particular society. Moral behavior, according to Abay, always implies that a man acts not only in accordance with an inner will, consciously subordinate to his own reason. Reasonable, rational behavior is therefore truly human behavior, moral behavior is rational behavior. Thanks to education, culture, knowledge enrichment, a person must improve his natural inclinations. This is the main semantic attitude of Abay’s educational concept [Нысанбаев 2000, 45].

Conclusion

Reflection of culture is made by philosophy as the transcendence of its content to certain transcendental conditions for the possibility of performing a philosophical act. In the Hegelian scheme, being and nothingness, fullness and emptiness, logos and chaos, etc., are placed in a single space. All of these philosophical categories have a reliable position and clear prospects in a good, i.e. rationally organized system. The post-Hegelian philosophy represented by Kierkegaard challenged the thesis about the essential unity of Good, Truth and Beauty in existential modality of ontology. Kierkegaard proclaimed the principle that opened the way to postclassical philosophizing: the territory, where existential truths can be placed, cannot be the sphere of all-encompassing unity of Good, Truth and Beauty, or the sphere of harmony of ethical, aesthetic and theoretical relationship.

Deleuze and Guattari consider the creation of still absent land and people, which have no place in Western democracies, as a correlate of philosophical creativity in the new socio-cultural reality. In our opinion, the potential of classical forms of philosophy, for which spirituality is both the ontological structure of consciousness and the condition of their own possibility, is far from being exhausted. The resolution of the aporia of culture and spirituality is that socially conditioned forms of communication, within which and according the logic of which identification strategies are built, must succumb to semantization in terms of hermeneutics of irrelevant spiritual and ontological realities. For this ontological self-assertion, an overwhelming obstacle is only that the foundations of our reality accepted by ourselves are not true. Socio-humanistic science in modern conditions discovers and makes the spiritual dimension of being, the transcending totality of all immediate definiteness of consciousness binding for itself. The true (infinite) form of human self-consciousness consists in the completely free relationship of an individual and the absolute infinity of the spirit. The meaning of spiritual self-determination is always objective for us and is realized as the conceptual transformation of being.

Ссылки – References in Russian

Нысанбаев 2000 – *Нысанбаев А.Н.* Становление исламской философии в Казахстане. Алматы: ИФПР КН МОН РК, 2000.

Хоружий 1997 – *Хоружий С.С.* Род или недород? Заметки к онтологии виртуальности // Вопросы философии. 1997. № 6. С. 53–68.

References

Horuzhiy, Sergei S. (1997) “Notes to ontology of virtuality”, *Voprosy filosofii*, Vol. 6 (2007), pp. 53–68 (In Russian).

Nyissanbayev, Abdumalik (2000) *Formation of Islamic philosophy in Kazakhstan*. Institute of philosophy and political science CS MES RK, Almaty (in Russian).

Сведения об авторах

НЫСАНБАЕВ Абдумалик Нысанбаевич – Академик НАН РК, доктор философских наук, профессор, академик-секретарь Института философии, политологии и религиоведения КН МОН РК.

НУРМУРАТОВ Серик Есентаевич – Доктор философских наук, профессор, заместитель директора Института философии, политологии и религиоведения КН МОН РК

Author's information

NYSSANBAYEV Abdumalik – Academician of NAS RK, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, professor, Academician-secretary of the Institute for Philosophy, Political Science and Religion Studies CS MES RK.

NURMURATOV Serik – DSc in Philosophy, professor, Deputy Director of the Institute for Philosophy, Political Science and Religion Studies CS MES RK.