

Spatial development: crisis, visions and strategies

Viktor Shcherbyna

E-mail: svn6414@gmail.com

Doctor in Sociological Sciences, Professor

Kyiv Institute of Business and Technology, Head of Sociology Department

(Kyiv, Ukraine)

ABSTRACT

The article deals with the problem of theoretical understanding of spatial development, as well as the author's concept of its study and approach to the formation of relevant policies.

The author proposes to distinguish between "developed" societies, capable of purposefully shaping their own space, and "undeveloped" ones, capable only of adapting to spontaneous changes in their own space.

The article highlights two strategies for spatial development – revolutionary and evolutionary. According to the author's approach, it is necessary to study the socio-cultural environment in a particular territory as a unique composition of social practices, historically self-reproducing on the basis of typological cultural patterns – traditional, modern, communicative.

The author comes to the conclusion that spatial development strategies focused only on one of the cultural patterns lead to the fact that part of the population perceives the policy of implementing spatial development programs as alien to itself, and this creates additional tension in the processes of transformation of societies. Therefore, in the process of forming spatial development projects, along with economic studies of the characteristics of social space, it is necessary to conduct studies of the cultural patterns that are inherent in the people who form it.

The author believes that the harmonization of social practices that are formed on the basis of and within the framework of various cultural patterns is one of the tasks of the policy of spatial development and a factor in the sustainability of society. Therefore, cultural policy should imply comprehensive support for the development of all cultural patterns on the basis of a dialogue of cultures. Regulators from different modes provide social communication and exchange on the scale of family and tribal, communal integrity, the nation state and on the scale of global communities.

KEYWORDS: social theory, spatial development, cultural patterns, globalization, cultural policy

Received : 28/03/2023

Revised : 09/06/2023

Accepted : 11/06/2023

1. Introduction. One of the acquisitions of social transformations of the last quarter of the twentieth century was the trend of globalization (Modelska, Devezas, Thompson, 2007). Globalization meant an increase in the homogeneity of the economic world order, the likely result of which in the distant future was to be the transformation of the world economy into a system with uniform economic conditions. In the process of theoretical reflection of globalization as a historical phenomenon, various conceptual approaches have developed (Stanford Encyclopedia, 2023).

Economists (Ambrosius, 2013) have focused on the formation of global markets, supranational financial and economic institutions, the free movement of capital and labour outside national borders. Sociologists have associated the emergence of globalization with the emergence and evolution of capitalism and its immanent processes of modernization (Harvey, 1989), and have also drawn attention to other aspects of this process (Giddens, 1990).

Political scientists have described globalization as a process of qualitative change in the nature of international relations, world politics, where, along with nation-states, new subjects of interaction have emerged. At the same time, in general, the process called globalization has formed a sense of a new community of space in which humanity lives. Along with the image of a common physical space familiar to the mass consciousness for several centuries, images of the same common economic, political and cultural spaces arose.

This period lasted for more than 30 years and ended in a crisis in the mid-twentieth – we see how the previously created structures of international and intra-national communication are disintegrating, many countries are locked in their own agendas for further development, the opportunities for free travel and change of residence are curtailed for the masses. Globalization of the second half – the end of the 20th century. are beginning to be interpreted as a passed stage, after which the prospect of a “new autarkization” arose. For example, experts at the Davos Forum in 2022 assessed the current state of affairs as a period of crisis for the traditional driving forces of globalization and the beginning of a new phase of the structural reset of the global system.

They presented four scenarios for the further development of globalization: globalization 5.0: reunification; analogue networks: virtual nationalism; digital dominance: flexible platforms and an autarkic world: systemic fragmentation (Four Futures, 2022). All of these scenarios involve changes in the social space. The international division of labor and globalized trade made it possible to produce the livelihoods of the planet's growing population – despite the fact that even in these conditions, hunger and poverty remained recognized as global problems. The prospect of the collapse of global production chains and their closure on the human and natural resource base of national and bloc communities leads to a decrease in the level of productivity and related shocks. At the same time, the global pandemic became a catalyst for these processes and very quickly showed that the path to the “pre-global” state of closed societies is the path of decline.

The crisis of spatial development lies in the fact that the trends of its change, which are taking shape both at the international and national levels, contradict the objectively existing needs of the spatial interaction of countries and peoples, which were formed in the conditions of the development achieved in the second half of the 20th century. international level of the division of labour and kept the quality of life based on its level of productivity.

The notion of a common fate in a common civilizational space is being critically rethought. In the practices of public life, a request for a vision of the further existence (new security) and development (new economy) of existing societies objectively arises (Arezki, 2022).

All this, in particular, actualizes the problem of the spatial development of societies in the new socio-historical conditions. What approaches can be taken to understand the already ongoing transformations of the social space and on what theoretical basis to develop policies for the development of societies in connection with this?

The emerging disintegration of the global space is leading to a crisis of all local societies in the form in which they have developed, since their effectiveness was determined to a large extent by the participation of the most demanded clusters of national economies in the system of international division of labor historically established by the end of the 20th century. However, it was on this basis that the changes generated by the stage of globalization in the world economy, people's ways of life, new communication environments and technologies arose. As before in history, the new system gave birth to a new reality, which became the basis for its transformation.

It is in the context of globalization that the world's population has reached 8 billion people (UN, 2023) and it is becoming increasingly difficult to meet their diverse needs within the framework of the previous model of the world order. Since 2008, we have been witnessing the unfolding of the economic, political, military phases of the crisis of this model of the world order. At the same time, the deepening of the phases of the crisis gives rise in some minds to the idea of the possibility of solving at the former local, country level, many of those problems that have not been solved at the global level. In turn, as a reaction to this idea, the idea that the state as a form of social organization should become a thing of the past and a new world of united humanity should also develop. All this significantly affects the ideological landscape of modernity.

In the context of growing contradictions, new solutions are needed – answers to how, after a period of decline in the global space, the crisis of the structures of global social (economic, political, cultural) communication created in the 20th century, societies can continue to exist and develop, the needs and productive forces of which were formed in the conditions of the former globalization. In particular, this implies a rethinking of the previous ones, the development of new theoretical ideas about spatial development and the creation of spatial development practices on their basis.

In the proposed article, we will consider some aspects of understanding spatial development, a possible approach to its study and the formation of appropriate policies based on the author's concept of cultural patterns. In the process of data collection, the method of describing and analyzing political, cultural, sociological theoretical concepts, which are set out in the scientific literature, was used. The methods of generalization and typification, as well as the method of hypotheses were also used in the work.

2. How to understand spatial development?

The level and quality of human life that are possible in a society depend on what kind of processes of joint activity of the people that form it are able to provide. Societies differ in the historical character of culture and lifestyles formed in them; quality of management; human potential, which they are able to unite due to their structure; on the natural resources to which they create access in order to satisfy the vital needs of the people who form them.

All these components have a spatial definition of society – a social space that can be studied and changed through the implementation of appropriate policies.

Spatial development is one of the factors in the formation of society – the more developed its space, the more attractive it is for life in it and the more stable it is. Concrete natural conditions "contain" society in themselves – since it arises from nature and exists in it as its component. Mankind, in the course of its progress, has become one of the forces that create nature; it does not exist in our time outside of its activity. This position is conceived by us as a paradox – society contains nature, which contains society. Going formally beyond this paradox, we find ourselves in an insurmountable situation – it is impossible to connect what is initially understood as separate. The way out of this paradox is to look at society and nature procedurally, as different sides of the same process of historical development of the practices of human life. The universal categories of space and time simultaneously characterize both nature and society in their development – just as there is no "space" outside of society, so society does not exist outside of its specific space.

Policies of conscious spatial development are the most important component of social development, transitions to new political, technological and socio-cultural forms of life. When we talk about the "development of society", we mean the development (qualitative change) of social space – that special kind of reality in which a person becomes a person (socializes) and lives, realizes himself in this capacity. This reality is always changing, because the processes of interaction between people that form it change. This interaction includes everything that does not belong to human nature, which has a socio-natural character. The practical question is what are the boundaries, direction and effectiveness of these changes, as well as how exactly people act on them according to the needs of their lives.

3. How to study spatial development?

In sociology, there are several typological approaches to the concept of "spatial development" – it is understood as a characteristic of the system, the processes of structuring activities, and also as a characteristic of interaction flows.

The idea of the possibility and necessity to represent the whole variety of processes and phenomena occurring in society placed in a special, social space was first expressed in the 20s of the 20th century P. Sorokin (Sorokin, 2000). From his point of view, the peculiarity of this space is that it is fundamentally different from the geometric one. This space is a set of social relations (connections) that any individual enters into with other individuals, groups and society as a whole. The social coordinates of such a space are set by social groups and nothing else, and the social position is revealed through the totality of social ties with all groups, it reflects the population, not statuses. In the work "Social stratification and mobility" he defines space as "the population of the Earth" (Sorokin, 1992, pp. 297–299), but another definition in the context of the idea of "social space is more important: population groups, within each of these groups, i.e. with its members" (Sorokin, 1992, p. 299). In this case, we are talking about space as an order of social positions. It is relatively stable in time, hierarchical and can be graphically depicted. Each individual can be defined as a point having a certain distance from another individual in this diagram. Representatives of the Chicago School approach the study of space with a traditional emphasis on empirical research for this school. In the spatial distribution of the population (primarily urban), they see a material expression, an indicator of social trends, structures, and relationships. Regularities and interrelations of changes in the spatial and social characteristics of human settlement are being studied. The dramatic approach of I. Gofman (Gofman, 2000), which is closely related to the structuring of the space of social practices with the allocation of the proscenium and the backstage zone of interaction, has become widely known. P. Bourdieu uses this concept to designate an abstract space that is created by an ensemble of subspaces or fields that arise in the processes of structuring the unequal distribution of certain types of capital. From this point of view, the space (including the physical one) in which we live is socially designated and constructed, it is a social structure in an objectified state, an objectification of past and present social relations. Geographical and social spaces never completely coincide, however, as the scientist notes, the effects characteristic of the former, for example, the allocation of the centre and the periphery, can indeed be called distance in social space, since this is due to the difference in the distribution of various types of capital. In addition, Bourdieu speaks of space as a status structure, emphasizing that any society is inevitably hierarchical, which leads to reflection in physical space: "Social space is not physical space, but it tends to be realized in it more or less completely and accurately" (Bourdieu, 2007, p. 35).

M. Castells, proceeds from the fact that in the process of development of society, "places" have changed their meaning in sociality. He analyzes the "space of flows" as a combination of three layers of material support: 1) a chain of electronic impulses that form the material basis of communication, creating opportunities for flows, exchanges; 2) nodes and communication centers; 3) the spatial organization of

the dominant elites that perform managerial functions, around which an organized space is built (Castells, 2000).

Society as a developing socio-natural unity historically develops and updates the regulators of relations that correspond to these qualitative aspects of reality in the form of culture – value ideas, norms, organizational practices. This complex is acquired by a separate person (individual – “indivisible”), who is in the specific conditions of his life, in the process of life and to some extent changes – where such a change is possible and necessary. (This process is commonly referred to as socialization.) Changing the social space as one of the aspects of their life is the subject of activity of many people. This activity can be different in content, it can be organized in various forms and degrees, aimed at pursuing goals that are perceived in a certain way.

According to this criterion, it is possible to distinguish between “developed” societies, capable of purposefully shaping their own space, and “undeveloped” ones, capable only of adapting to the spontaneous changes that occur with their spaces. This is a relative characteristic, since all social systems change spatially – only in different ways and with different results for the people who form them. The boundaries and qualitative content of changes in the social space are determined by many factors – natural processes, the objective nature of the era (the problems that are solved in it) and its subjective “spirit” (the existing cultural and ideological ideas). This space can expand and contract depending on the processes of social life, which leads to qualitative changes in it. The activity of people to reproduce and change the quantitative and qualitative characteristics of society is directly organized under the influence of political institutions and finds its expression in the policies of spatial development. In different eras, these policies were different, but any organized society developed them and the peoples supported them or hindered these policies.

Social space is associated with specific activities – in one respect it can be developed, in another – not. The development of the social space of a particular society is its characteristic in terms of the possibility of realizing a certain type of civilizational development in it. An “undeveloped” society in one respect may look like a “developed” society in another, and vice versa.

In the political sense, the task of spatial development is to form, through a complex impact on society, stable systemic integral formations of joint life activity. In the modern world, these formations must comply with the logics of the implementation of national projects for the development of human capital, a comfortable environment for life and economic growth, linking the country into a single whole socio-cultural space, where the historically formed civilizational foundations of the life of the people are realized. Accordingly, “undeveloped” space is understood as one where the conditions for the full life support of a person belonging to a certain civilizational whole have not been formed. The policy of spatial development thus defines the horizon of possible social practices – their quantitative and qualitative characteristics.

The task of spatial development is solved simultaneously in two paradigms: as the creation of new socio-natural complexes of life support and as the re-development of the former in new historical

conditions. Accordingly, various goals are also formed – from gaining access to new resources to updating the system resources available to people for arranging life.

In addition, two strategies can be used in spatial development – revolutionary (to go "through" creating new socio-natural environments) and evolutionary, socio-ecological (to connect all historically formed components at a new level of complexity by introducing a new technological, organizational and cultural basis of life). The first path gives quick results, but it is traumatic, in the long term it produces the energy of the opposite effect, this is the path of tactical decisions. The second path is strategic, it is aimed at cultivating a new socio-natural space capable of sustainable self-reproduction in accordance with the characteristics of a new level of socio-natural development.

In all cases of development, there are natural, technological, social, cultural components that must be studied and changed in accordance with the logic and objectives of deploying spatial development projects in a particular area. To do this, it is necessary to proceed from the nature and scale of the project – in their physical and human quantitative and qualitative dimensions.

4. Problems of spatial development in the paradigm of cultural multiple structure

In order for the tasks of spatial development not to be empty dreams (or a cover for state corruption), but to be practically realizable, it is important to take into account the characteristics of the existing socio-cultural environments that are the object of the projects. On this basis, it is possible to develop operational approaches to seeing how these environments (created by people in their activities) correlate with the tasks of territorial development projects – which existing components should be developed and supported, which ones should be changed and supplemented.

For example, the concept of "support frame" is relevant in solving the problem of rational use of the economic potential of large cities. In this case, the mechanism for regulating the growth of a large centre can have different options: the formation of agglomerations; directed development; priority development of the "second" city; development of selected (limited number) cities – "balances"; development of subdistrict centres; activation of small and medium-sized cities (outside the agglomeration) (Uchida, Nelson, 2010; Shibusawa. 1999; OECD, 2016). However, this approach does not take into account the structure of the socio-cultural space. To take into account this most important aspect of development, an appropriate conceptual and instrumental base is needed for conducting research on social processes and phenomena. These tools should be sensitive to various socio-cultural aspects of the social environments of spatial development. The knowledge obtained in this way can serve as one of the bases for the development and implementation of cultural policies at the regional level, taking into account exactly how the population understands spatial development.

This will create additional potential for legitimization and energy to support projects in the mass consciousness of the inhabitants of a particular region. Without this, any project will generate rejection and the potential for political tension in society. Along with existing approaches, the concept of the cultural

diversity of society can be used as a tool for analyzing socio-cultural environments (Shcherbyna, 2019). This approach involves the study of the socio-cultural environment in a particular territory as a unique composition of social practices, historically self-reproducing on the basis of typological cultural patterns – traditional, modern, communicative. Each society and its spatial characteristics have dimensions in the horizons of these cultural structures, contain the practices of social communication corresponding to them.

From this point of view, social spaces are historically emerging dynamic constructs that are characterized by a certain composition of features of various cultural patterns in the physical, socio-organizational and spiritual-practical dimensions.

The cultural patterns (structure) in this concept is a historically developed stable type of the organization and implementation of social activities, the content of the normative value constructs inherent in social groups and individuals in the process of ensuring their life. Sociology can use this concept as an ideal type that allows one to study the specific features that influence the ways in which individuals master the elements of the living environment and how they construct social space. All this is understood and perceived differently in the optics of different ways, despite the fact that objectively individuals are in a single process of social life. Various types of social activity imply a “generalizing” orientation of the individual towards one or another cultural structure, however, this realization in life practices does not always occur, which leads to contradictions in mutual understanding and even conflicts.

The traditional cultural way is characterized by a distinguished system of value ideas, which is isolated in the array of culture as a special out-of-position component. This system is presented in the form of “external” mythological constructs containing the structure of the subjective determination of social interactions in an abstract personal and group form. Society is understood as a self-existing, eternal, special reality – an order of relations between people created by an external force in relation to a person, a “cathedral of unity” of all people. The social system and processes of social interaction are understood as existing independently and originating outside of man – in God, the Cosmos, the laws of nature. The system of normative-value regulators, formed within the framework of the traditional way of life, makes it possible to effectively streamline social communication within the framework of communities of tribal and communal scale and quality of life.

The modern (industrial) cultural structure is characterized by social interaction mediated by joint production activities, including the rational production of generally significant value constructs and joint rule-making. Society is understood here as a unifying situation of joint activity, as a necessary means produced by people themselves in the context of satisfying their needs and realizing their essential properties. To do this, they need to change the natural and social conditions of life, including spatial ones. The social system is understood as developing historically in this context. The system of normative value regulators, formed within the framework of the traditional way of life, makes it possible to effectively streamline social communication within the framework of communities of a generic national state scale and quality of life.

The communicative cultural structure is characterized by social interaction based on open communication (creation of common spaces) in a network form, the absence of an institutionalized system of value-normative regulation, self-referential communities formed on the basis of individualized symbolic self-identification. Culture and society are understood in this optics as a space of interpersonal communication, the purpose and meaning of which is the self-realization of the individual in the process of communication as a game.

Social institutions are seen within the framework of this mode as forms of communication flows formed by people, and the content of social life is game interaction in which individuals actualize and realize themselves in the context of the emerging "games of life creation". The system of normative-value regulators, formed within the framework of the traditional way of life, makes it possible to effectively streamline social communication within communities of a transnational, global scale and quality of life.

Cultural patterns are interconnected and interdependent, in their unity they represent a specific historically formed society, their specific combinations determine the emerging types of personality, social roles, the nature and boundaries of social interaction, including spatial.

Individuals socialize in different environments where one or another cultural mode dominates, "reading" and mastering all social ideas and components of the socio-natural conditions of their lives in a manner appropriate to this mode.

On this basis, in society, groups and strata can be distinguished that are focused on social activity in accordance with the specifics of various ways, therefore they perceive the same cultural phenomena and processes in different senses and scales. According to these meanings and scales, both social attitudes, social activities of various individuals united in groups, and expectations from it are formed. Depending on the various tasks of spatial development, in a particular case, either a monopoly implementation in the system of organizing the social environment of one of them, the creation of a social environment with the dominance of one mode, or their harmonious combination can be assumed. This is a view from the point of view of the task – in reality, all modes are always present, the only question is in what specific combination.

According to the ways of social practices based on them, they suggest various subjectively understood ways (modalities) of perceiving space, operating and interacting with it.

Each cultural structure creates opportunities for the realization of a certain type of social integrity – both in qualitative and quantitative terms. Thus, the forms of association that exist with a dominant traditional way of life are significantly inferior in terms of quantitative (population) and qualitative (types of activity) characteristics to the forms of association based on the modern way of life. Policies of spatial development, formed within the horizons of the traditional way of life, where the basic structure of social life is understood as a tribal and local settlement community, contradict the processes of life support for the number of population corresponding to the scale of the national state formation, nepotism and corruption flourishes on the basis of community ties. In turn, the absence of a policy of spatial

development of the modern type, where the industrial and production community acts as the basic structure, sets restrictions on the scale of the association and the set of activities possible in it, the economy degrades in qualitative and quantitative terms, archaic types of economic activity arise and are associated with socio-political interests, there is a technological decline in the life support environment.

By studying the modalities of understanding and perception of space inherent in different cultural patterns, as well as the meanings and methods of its development associated with them, it is possible to form socio-cultural policies for influencing the process of adoption by the population of development programs so that spatial development is the most sustainable and holistic.

Along with purposeful processes, the development of social space also has dynamics that does not depend on the needs and efforts of a person – socio-natural processes are historical, associated with circumstances that are objective for the current generation of people, independent of their desires and intentions. Among these circumstances is the dynamics of changes in the phases of the development of social space.

In accordance with our hypothesis, this dynamics has a dual character. Formally, it represents a change of four phases, in which different cultural structures dominate in the life of society – the phase of holding space forms, the phase of their destruction, the phase of the emergence of new ones, the phase of their total development, followed again by the phase of holding forms. In terms of content, it represents a change in the processes of social (socio-natural) life support of various types, based on the dominance of a certain way of life.

Accordingly, at the phase of retention of forms, the traditional way of life dominates, at the phase of breaking – communicative, at the phases of emergence and development – modern.

Within the framework of the traditional way of life, spatial development is understood as an expansion of physical space containing various kinds of resources – natural and human. The category of "social space" in the classical sociological theory is taken as close as possible to the physical meaning – as the location of social groups and socially significant events (Djurkheim, 1995). Therefore, spatial development as the goal of social development is conceived here in the form of territorial expansion, control and retention of space in its "physical", natural sense. Here space is a place of stay, the attitude towards it is the protection of one's territory from strangers. By means of sociology, it is possible, by defining this group, to study what kind of territory those oriented towards this way of life consider theirs, who are strangers (social distances, the image of "alien" – a non-Christian, a different citizenship, a generation, etc.), what exactly they see as the means and effectiveness of such protection (administrative arrangement, borders, etc.).

Within the framework of the modern way of life, space is a prospect for the development of certain types of life activity, changes in living conditions in accordance with changing needs. The concept of social space is associated with the socio-political characteristics of society. The development of space is understood as a transition to such a social organization that allows more people to interact with a greater

qualitative diversity of their life activity. Sociology can study what objects and resources are considered in a given society as a means of development, what are the ideas about the horizons and qualitative measurement of development results for the population of a given territory.

Within the framework of the communicative way of life, space is seen as a conditional, situationally determined characteristic of significant choices that affect the outcome of social interaction with open ambiguous results. The development of space here is conceived as a process of expanding the possibilities of choice. The space here is a matrix of alternative values in which the player feels the opportunity to make a choice, and this choice affects the outcome of the game. It is the space of possible alternatives that have meaning. In order to create a choice, you need to create an alternative that also has a value.

The communicative mode dominates in the transitional phases of social systems, in the transitions from one era to another, because of this, its dominance has a dual direction. On the one hand, spatial development is conceived as new options for using the existing potential – playing around with new options for the same thing, "playing with the past." On the other hand, it is conceived as a search for qualitatively new socio-natural foundations – "playing with the future". Within the framework of this way of life, there is a denial of past forms of organization of public space. This is not a "pure negation", but a negation of a certain content and it bears its imprint – therefore it does not have a creative character. Actually, the creativity of the new begins at the next stage, when the modern way of life dominates.

The disintegration of social space is a reaction to unsolvable problems; it does not in itself solve the problems that give rise to it. However, new integration and spatial development require their own positive object, they cannot occur on the basis of reaction. Spatial development policies do not require approaches to "remove restrictions", but approaches to the formation of new life support resources – technological, organizational, spiritual and moral.

5. CONCLUSIONS. 1). Spatial development is one of the urgent tasks of the formation of a modern sustainable and productive society. It arose in the process of the unfolding crisis of the global world order and requires a new agenda for the further development of societies changed by globalization. The practical complexity of spatial development policies lies in the need to create conditions for the simultaneous implementation of different types of needs associated with differences in ideas about spatial development that are formed within different cultural patterns. Spatial development strategies focused exclusively on one of the cultural patterns lead to the fact that part of the population perceives the policy of implementing spatial development programs as alien to itself. This complements the tensions arising in the process of changes in the social structure that impede its implementation.

2). In the process of forming spatial development projects, one should take into account its qualitative socio-cultural characteristics. For this, along with economic studies of the characteristics of social space, it is also necessary to study the cultural patterns that are inherent in the people who form it. The type of social space produced determines the quality of social connections possible in it, respectively the quality and standard of living in a particular society and, ultimately, the attractiveness of the social order.

3). Harmonization of social practices that are formed on the basis of and within the framework of various cultural patterns is one of the tasks of the policy of spatial development and a factor in the sustainability of society. In this vein, the tasks of cultural policy can be formed in the direction of creating by the state a comprehensive support for the development processes in society of elements of traditional, modern and communicative cultural patterns on the basis of a political platform for the dialogue of cultures.

4). The qualitative level of development of social space determines the possibility of including communities of various scales and types of activity, the depth of the division of labor into a single process of social life. Regulators of the traditional way of life ensure social communication and exchange of activities on the scale of family, tribal and communal integrity, modern – of the national state, communicative – on the scale of global communities. All these types of communication are necessary for the self-reproduction of society as an integral and original system of people's lives. The degradation of the quality of social space leads to the inability of the system to provide communication related to vital needs

and leads to degradation of the integrity of the social system.

The prospect of further research involves a theoretical study of the specifics of the relationship between the types of cultural space that is produced and the types of religious ideas and scientific worldview.

References

Ambrosius G. (2018). Globalisierung. Geschichte der internationalen Wirtschaftsbeziehungen. Wiesbaden, Springer Verlag. 479 S.

Arezki, Rabah. (2022). What will happen to the economy in the new era of national security. [Что будет с экономикой в новую эпоху национальной безопасности]. Forbes, 05/2022. (In Russian). https://forbes.kz//life/opinion/ekonomika_v_novyyu_epohu_natsionalnoy_bezopasnosti/

Bourdieu, P. (2007). Physical and social spaces. [Физическое и социальное пространство]. Moscow: Institut eksperimentalnoi sotsiologii; St. Petersburg: Alteya. (In Russian).

Castells, M. (2000). Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture. [Информационная эпоха: экономика, общество, культура]. Moscow: GU-VSHE. (In Russian).

Djurkgejm, Je. (1995). Sociology and social sciences. [Социология и социальные науки]. Djurkgejm, Je. Sociology. Its subject, method, purpose. [Социология. Иео предмет, метод, предназначение]. Moscow: Kanon. 350 p. (In Russian).

Four Futures for Economic Globalization: Scenarios and Their Implications. (2022). White Paper. May 2022. World Economic Forum. Geneva. https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Four_Futures_for_Economic_Globalization_2022.pdf

Giddens, A. (1990). The Consequences of Modernity. Stanford University Press. 186 p. https://www.academia.edu/23125640/_Giddens_The_Consequences_of_Modernity

Gofman, I. (2000). Presenting yourself to others in everyday life. [Predstavleniie sebia drugim v povsednevnoi zhizni]. Moscow: KANON-Press-C, Kuchkovo pole. 304 p. (In Russian).

Harvey, David. (1989). The Condition of Postmodernity, Oxford: Blackwell.

Modelska, G., Devezas, T., Thompson, W. R. (eds). (2007). Globalization as Evolutionary Process. Modeling Global Change. London; N. Y.: Routledge.

OECD Territorial Reviews. (2016).
https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/urban-rural-and-regional-development/oecd-territorial-reviews_19900759

Shcherbyna, V. (2019). Multiculturalism or cultural diversity? [Multikulturalizm ili kulturnaia mnogoukladnost?] (In Russian). <http://sg-sofia.com.ua/multikulturalizm-ili-kulturnaia-mnogoukladnost>

Shibusawa, H. (1999). Agglomeration diseconomies of traffic congestion and agglomeration economies of interaction in the information-oriented city economy. *Journal of Regional Science*, 39 (1), pp. 21–49.

Sorokin, P. A. (2000). Social and Cultural Dynamics: A Study of Change in Major Systems of Art, Truth, Ethics, law and Social Relationships. [Sotsialnaia i kulturnaia dinamika: Issledovanie izmenenii v bolshih sistemah iskusstva, istiny, etiki, prava i obshchestvennyh otnoshenii]. St. Petersburg: RKhGI Publ. 1055 p. (In Russian).

Sorokin, P. A. (1992). Social stratification and mobility. [Sotsialnaia stratifikatsiia i mobilnost]. *Chelovek, Tsivilzatsiia, Obschestvo*. Moscow: Politizdat. pp. 297–299. (In Russian).

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. (2023). First published Jun 21, 2002; substantive revision Jan 9, 2023. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/globalization/>

Uchida, H., Nelson, A. (2010). Agglomeration index: towards a new measure of urban concentration. *Working paper*, 29. United Nations University. 18 p.
<https://www.wider.unu.edu/sites/default/files/wp2010-29.pdf>

UN. (2023). Day of Eight Billion. <https://www.un.org/en/dayof8billion>