

# Prospects for The Development of Asian Civilization in New Geopolitical Conditions

Djurayeva Nigora Avazovna

PhD, Senior Lecturer, Doctoral Candidate (DSc) of the Department of Philosophy, NUUz, Uzbekistan

**Received:** 10 April 2025; **Accepted:** 06 May 2025; **Published:** 08 June 2025

**Abstract:** This paper explores the prospects for the development of Asian civilization in the context of the rapidly changing geopolitical landscape of the 21st century. Special attention is given to the cognitive processes that shape Asia's perception of its own future, including issues of identity, cultural distinctiveness, and spiritual orientations. Existential aspects are examined through the lens of changes in the socio-economic structure, traditional life models, and social relations. In the context of contemporary geopolitical realities, where Asia is poised to play a key role on the global stage, the processes of internal adaptation and overcoming contradictions between tradition and modernization are analyzed. The paper emphasizes the importance of integrating cognitive and existential factors in the context of sustainable and harmonious regional development, as well as the significance of combining traditional values with modern governance models for the sustainable development of the Asian space. The author investigates key challenges facing the region, including political instability, environmental threats, and demographic changes, and suggests possible scenarios for Asia's future development, concluding that the region's growing civilizational influence on global processes is inevitable.

**Keywords:** Asian civilization, geopolitics, cognitive processes, existential aspects, cultural identity, globalization, modernization, global challenges.

**Introduction:** In Asian civilization, with its immensely rich cultural, historical, and philosophical traditions, has significantly influenced the development of humanity for millennia. In the modern era, its role is once again coming to the forefront. The 21st century is rightfully referred to as the "Asian Century" [1] — the region is experiencing rapid economic, technological, and political development. Against the backdrop of global shifts such as the relocation of the world's economic center toward the East, the growing influence of China, India, and other Central Asian countries, and the transformation of international relations, the study of the future of the Asian civilizational paradigm in new geopolitical realities becomes especially relevant.

It is also important to recognize that the contemporary world is undergoing a period of profound transformation. The intensification of global competition, the crisis of traditional paradigms of international security, and the changing balance of

power are all shaping new conditions under which the Asian region is developing. The rise of Asian powers is accompanied by a revival of cultural identity, the strengthening of regional cooperation, and the formulation of alternative approaches to the international order. In this context, a comprehensive analysis of the prospects for the development of Asian civilization as an independent and influential actor in the global historical process becomes particularly timely. Studying this issue not only provides deeper insight into the internal logic of transformations in Asia but also allows us to anticipate potential future scenarios of the world order, in which the Asian model of development could become one of the leading frameworks. This issue reflects not only scholarly interest but also practical significance in the context of shaping a global strategy for sustainable development and ensuring international stability.

## METHODOLOGY

The study of the prospects for the development of

Asian civilization in contemporary conditions is grounded in a broad spectrum of scholarly sources, encompassing both theoretical approaches to civilizational analysis and empirical data on political and economic transformations across Asia.

A significant contribution to the understanding of civilizational paradigms has been made by scholars such as Samuel Huntington, who introduced the concept of the “clash of civilizations” [2], and Arnold Toynbee, who viewed civilizations as dynamic historical organisms [3]. Contemporary authors seek to reconceptualize Asia’s role in the global context, emphasizing the region’s cultural distinctiveness and its capacity for independent geopolitical agency. For instance, Mohammed Ayoob, in his book *Identity and Politics in Central Asia and the Caucasus* [4], examines how post-Soviet Central Asian states construct their national identities and how these identities influence their foreign policies and security strategies. Ayoob treats identity as a multidimensional factor that informs state behavior, highlighting the interplay between domestic, regional, and international forces in shaping these identities. His work also explores how Russia, with its unique position in the region, influences the evolution of post-Soviet states through the prism of its own identity.

Another influential scholar, Pierre Chabal, in the collective monograph “*Evolving Regional Values and Mobilities in Global Contexts*” [5], analyzes the gradual convergence of Europe and Asia into a Eurasian dynamic that integrates both institutional and identity-related dimensions. Chabal and his co-authors argue that regional processes can no longer be understood in isolation, and must instead be viewed as part of a broader Eurasian subsystem.

Research by scholars such as V.I. Maslov [6], V.V. Islamov [7], and D.S. Ermakov [8] reflects a growing interest in the civilizational paradigm of Central Asia. Maslov investigates regional security challenges within the context of post-Soviet transformations in newly independent states; Islamov focuses on the socio-ontological and methodological aspects of Eurasian civilization while Ermakov provides a philosophical foundation for constructing a Eurasian civilizational model, revealing its potential as an alternative developmental paradigm for the region.

Particular attention is given to works analyzing the strategic behavior of key regional powers — including China, India, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and others — in the face of emerging challenges such as multipolarity, economic competition, climate change and digital transformation. Researchers are also actively engaging with concepts such as “Asian values,” the interplay

between Eastern and Western models of modernization and regional integration processes (e.g., within the frameworks of the SCO and ASEAN).

This interdisciplinary approach, integrating political science, international relations, cultural studies, and philosophy, enables a comprehensive and nuanced understanding of the shifting landscape of Asian civilization.

The methodological foundation of this article is based on the civilizational approach, which enables the analysis of Asia not merely as a collection of states and economic systems, but as a cultural-historical unity with deep-rooted structural characteristics. Within this framework, particular attention is given to the mental, value-based, and institutional features of Asian civilization, allowing for a more profound understanding of its unique developmental trajectory.

The study also employs the comparative method to identify both the differences and commonalities between Western and Eastern paradigms of development highlighting the distinctiveness of Asian socio-political and cultural models in contrast to Western modernization theories.

In addition, geopolitical analysis is utilized to determine the position and role of the Asian region in the emerging world order. This approach helps to contextualize Asia’s rising influence within global power shifts, multipolarity and strategic competition. Lastly, elements of systems analysis are applied for a comprehensive examination of the interactions between political, economic, and cultural factors that shape the region’s development. This integrative perspective ensures a holistic view of the processes driving the transformation of Asia within the global context.

## RESULTS

In the context of rapidly changing geopolitical realities of the modern world, the question of the future development of Asian civilizational paradigms is becoming increasingly relevant. Asian countries, endowed with unique cultural and historical traditions, are entering a new phase of development that is closely tied to the transformation of the global political and economic environment. An onto-epistemological analysis of this process necessitates a focus on the essential changes occurring within the structures of social and cultural interaction, as well as on new forms of worldview reflection emerging in response to the challenges of globalization. This approach enables a deeper understanding of the ways of knowing and interpreting these transformations, including the emerging paradigms in the study and conceptualization of phenomena associated with Asian states.

In this light, it becomes evident that the Asian civilizational paradigm, under new geopolitical conditions, represents not merely a set of political and economic changes, but rather a complex process of searching for new forms of knowledge and identity, which will define its future place in the global context. With their substantial economic potential, cultural diversity, and strategic location, Asian countries are increasingly becoming centers of new geopolitical processes. Understanding their development trajectories and modes of interaction with other global actors is therefore critical for ensuring both global stability and long-term resilience.

In his work A.A. Kazantsev offers a set of forecasts concerning the geopolitical future of Central Asia in both medium- and long-term perspectives [9]. His article can be evaluated as a conceptually rich and analytically rigorous attempt to describe the possible trajectories of geopolitical transformation in the region. However, as with any scenario-based forecast, the analysis is built upon a number of assumptions and limitations that require critical reassessment in the light of evolving global and regional trends, particularly with respect to key regional actors such as Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan.

It is important to highlight several strong aspects of Kazantsev's approach. Firstly, he employs a multi-scenario methodology, skillfully applying scenario analysis to present five divergent models of the future — from integration to disintegration: "Sinocentric World", "Reintegration of the Post-Soviet Space", "Central Asian Integration", "Caliphate" and "Complete Collapse" [9]. This reflects a methodologically grounded effort to navigate the complexities of unstable regions.

Secondly, Kazantsev successfully links external and internal factors of development. He examines both global dynamics (e.g., the geopolitical "Great Game") and internal structural issues within Central Asian states, such as identity politics and ethnic fragmentation.

Thirdly, he realistically acknowledges the complexity of regional integration. Kazantsev expresses justified skepticism toward efforts to create a robust regional architecture modeled on the European Union, suggesting that such an outcome remains unlikely under current conditions.

This analysis demonstrates that while Kazantsev's scenarios offer valuable insights into the possible futures of the Central Asian region, they must also be balanced with a deeper consideration of regional resilience, institutional consolidation, and the growing strategic agency of key states such as Kazakhstan and

Uzbekistan.

However, in our view, there are a number of debatable assumptions in Kazantsev's analysis — most notably, an overestimation of the likelihood of the collapse of the Central Asian paradigm. It is important to consider key aspects of the region's historical resilience. Despite internal tensions, not a single state in the region has disintegrated since 1991. On the contrary, the institutional consolidation of statehood in countries like Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan has significantly strengthened over the past three decades.

Another questionable assumption lies in the scenarios of "Caliphate" and "Complete Collapse" which presuppose the weakness of national states and rely heavily on the Afghan model. These scenarios overlook the growth in administrative and infrastructural capacity, advancements in digital governance, and the emergence of stable political elites within the republics.

A further critical point that requires adjustment is the oversimplified interpretation of Chinese influence. Kazantsev views China's growing presence as a linearly increasing process, without adequately considering the rising anti-Chinese sentiment among local elites and societies — particularly in Kazakhstan. The analysis also underestimates the role of competing powers, including Turkey's renewed interest in the region and the strategic pivot of Central Asian countries toward diversification, with increasing engagement from India, South Korea, and the Gulf States.

We are also convinced that Kazantsev overstates the fragility of Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan. While these countries undeniably face serious challenges, both continue to function as internationally recognized states, actively participating in regional integration frameworks such as the SCO, CSTO and EAEU and demonstrating adaptive mechanisms in response to ongoing crises.

In the current era, special attention should be paid to the integration of Asian states into the global economy, as well as to overcoming internal contradictions and challenges they face in the realms of social justice, environmental sustainability, technological development, and security. Geopolitical developments — such as the rise of China, India, Japan, and other regional powers, shifts in global trade routes, and the formation of new alliances — require a deeper analysis within the context of Asia's cultural and philosophical traditions, which are beginning to exert a growing influence on contemporary global politics.

On the political stage of Asia, new alliances and strategies of interaction are emerging. First and foremost, this concerns the increasingly competitive

and strategic relationship between China and the United States. China is striving to strengthen its position as a global leader and promoter of an alternative model of political and economic stability, which, in turn, raises concerns among Western countries and contributes to growing geopolitical tensions.

In addition, the Asia-Pacific region is witnessing the strengthening of the military and political positions of countries such as Japan, South Korea, India, and Australia, leading to the formation of new alliances such as QUAD (Quadrilateral Security Dialogue — India, Japan, Australia and the U.S.). Conflicts such as territorial disputes in the South China Sea, instability on the Korean Peninsula, and the continuing influence of external powers in South Asia demand new approaches to regional security management.

The Asian civilization, with its centuries-old history and rich cultural heritage, is now facing the challenge of adapting traditional values to the realities of globalization. Many Asian countries are actively reviving and reinterpreting their cultural traditions while seeking ways to integrate their unique philosophical, religious, and socio-economic models into the global context. In this regard, a new phenomenon has emerged — the so-called “Asian Renaissance” where ideas and concepts previously confined to the region are now becoming significant in global discourse. Examples include increasing cultural and educational exchanges, the growing interest in Eastern philosophies, and the development of new cultural paradigms such as China’s model of social harmony, India’s concept of “Vedic democracy” and Japan’s “wabi-sabi” aesthetic in design and lifestyle.

Technological progress, especially in countries like China, Japan, and South Korea, has become a key factor in the development of Asia as a civilization. Asian nations are emerging as leaders in artificial intelligence, robotics, advanced technologies, and the digital economy. This positions Asia as a global hub of innovation, with countries in the region playing a crucial role in the transformation of global production processes. The advancement of technologies such as 5G, renewable energy, biotechnology, and the Internet of Things is likely to reshape the structure of the global economy and create new challenges for states seeking to strike a balance between technological development and the protection of privacy and human rights.

However, alongside its economic and political achievements, Asia also faces a number of significant challenges. Serious problems persist in the form of environmental threats, such as climate change, environmental pollution, water scarcity, and the loss of

biodiversity. To ensure the sustainable development of the region, a transition to green technologies and an inclusive economy is essential.

Internal social issues, such as inequality, poverty, urbanization, and migration, also demand attention. The uneven distribution of wealth across different social groups and regions can lead to social instability and negatively affect long-term development.

## DISCUSSION

Examining Central Asia’s Paradigm Shifts and Development Prospects (focus on Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan). The increasing competition among major powers is unlikely to lead to direct military conflict in the Central Asian region. Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan are expected to maintain their sovereignty and stability through institutional strengthening and prudent foreign policies. The region’s geo-economic significance will grow amid logistics restructuring, including new land corridors, energy initiatives, and green technologies.

Scenario 1 «Regional Stability and Pragmatic Multivectorism» envisions the preservation of relative political neutrality while engaging in multiple integration projects (China, EAEU, OIC). The aim is to establish a stable regional macro-system attractor where Central Asia, particularly Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, functions as a nonlinear, dissipative system capable of self-organization amidst external fluctuations. Political neutrality serves as a stabilizing mechanism in a multifactorial geopolitical field, preventing abrupt shifts into chaos. Simultaneous participation in various integration projects reflects a polycentric interaction configuration where multiple external linkages provide sources of energy flows and information, aiding in maintaining system order.

Diversifying foreign economic ties (Turkey, India, Saudi Arabia, Japan, etc.) enhances systemic resilience, reducing dependence on a single center of gravity and thereby increasing adaptability, determining growth parameters, redistributing internal resources to growth points, and reducing entropy from external dependencies.

Infrastructure connectivity, especially through the Trans-Caspian Transport Corridor, creates new synergistic effects via spatial and logistical reorganization of the region, fostering stable connections between economic subsystems.

Digitalization, development of green technologies, and the introduction of hydrogen energy create bifurcation points where a transition to a new development phase is possible—from raw material dependence to an innovative, sustainable economy. These elements act



as initiators of emergent structures capable of radically altering the internal architecture of the socio-economic system. “Regional Stability and Pragmatic Multivectorism” is not a static equilibrium but a dynamically stable state in a nonlinear and fluctuating global environment, where adaptive mechanisms and strategic multipolarity are key parameters of order.

Within Scenario 1, Kazakhstan’s status as a regional technological and logistical hub reflects the formation of a stable attractor in the trans-Eurasian space, positioning the country as a concentration point for resource flows, information, and innovations that ensure a stable configuration of the regional macro-system. The development of civic identity and political pluralism functions as an internal mechanism of autopoiesis, enhancing internal coherence and reducing political system entropy. Expanding export directions to the European Union and Southeast Asian countries via the Caspian transport corridor manifests as a manifestation of synergistic nonlinear diffusion, ensuring multidirectional dissemination of economic ties and enhancing the overall resilience of the foreign economic system through multiple stable interaction channels.

Kazakhstan’s continued course of open economic reforms reflects a phase transition of the system to a new state with a higher degree of openness and nonlinear interaction with the global economic environment—essentially a departure from the previous local attractor and movement toward a more flexible, self-organizing model.

Kazakhstan’s leadership in regional integration initiatives, particularly in water-energy cooperation, serves as a process of cooperative resonance formation between Central Asian subsystems. This can lead to the emergence of stable structures of interstate interaction based on the synergistic effect of coordinated management of transboundary resources—both in terms of energy exchange and redistribution of managerial impulses.

Strategic orientation toward industrial localization and strengthening food security can be interpreted as the formation of local centers of attraction (attractors) that increase the system’s autonomy, its resilience to external shocks and its ability to adaptively self-organize in the face of global fluctuations such as price instability or geopolitical turbulence.

The Central Bank notes that ongoing global geopolitical crises may lead to further price increases for raw materials and foodstuffs. Specifically, rising global food prices will intensify pressure on prices in Uzbekistan. In the energy sector, planned increases in electricity and natural gas tariffs for legal entities in April 2025 may

subsequently lead to higher production costs and accelerate inflation expectations.

From the perspective of Central Asian development prospects amid a transforming geopolitical landscape, the risks highlighted by the Central Bank of Uzbekistan represent not only current challenges but also indicators of deep structural changes affecting the region's economic stability.

Firstly, ongoing volatility in global commodity and food markets—due to prolonged geopolitical conflicts, trade restrictions, and the restructuring of global logistics chains—heightens the vulnerability of Central Asian economies, including Uzbekistan, to external price shocks. This is particularly critical in the context of high import dependence for certain food items and energy equipment. Increased price pressure from abroad potentially limits the capabilities of regional central banks to conduct soft monetary policy and requires a flexible, adaptive macroeconomic strategy.

Secondly, the identified internal factors, especially in the energy sector, indicate a transition to a phase of structural correction in tariff policy aimed at reducing the state's fiscal burden and stimulating energy efficiency. However, in the short term, tariff increases for legal entities may transform into higher production costs, intensify inflation expectations, and, consequently, exert pressure on consumer prices. This presents an economic policy challenge of balancing the need for reforms with social stability.

From a regional development perspective, Uzbekistan and other Central Asian countries find themselves in a situation requiring a comprehensive response:

- diversification of supply sources and localization of production chains become priorities in the context of global fragmentation;
- development of renewable energy and sustainable infrastructure can reduce dependence on external energy pricing and create incentives for investment inflows;
- deepening regional economic cooperation, including within the frameworks of the SCO, CSTO, and the “Middle Corridor” initiative can strengthen collective resilience to geo-economic shocks.

Thus, in the new geopolitical conditions, the resilience of Uzbekistan and the region as a whole will depend on the ability to adapt to post-liberal multipolarity by implementing pragmatic reforms in energy, industry, and agriculture while simultaneously strengthening institutional and infrastructural foundations of regional integration.

Scenario 2 “Fragmented Integration” describes the formation of cluster-based self-organization in a

context where the region is unable to develop a unified integration attractor. Instead of a coherent macro-system, a structure of partial cooperative frameworks emerges—local subsystems interacting with one another based on the principle of selective resonance.

Coalitions such as Kazakhstan–Uzbekistan–Azerbaijan–Georgia represent stable autopoietic units capable of internally reproducing managerial and economic functions, while more fragile states in the region remain on the periphery of this process, forming zones of high entropy and weak structural coherence.

The strengthening role of sub-regional alliances, built on shared interests in transport, energy, and security, reflects a movement toward dissipative adaptation, where resilience is achieved not through centralized unity but through a multitude of connections between functionally compatible elements. Such formations possess increased resilience due to their flexibility and ability to locally reproduce order amid global and regional fluctuations.

Scenario 3 “Hybrid Dependency” is less desirable but plausible scenario represents a paradoxical synergetic configuration in which the regional system loses its capacity for coherent self-organization and falls into the orbit of externally imposed attractors driven by various centers of power. Economic dependence on China, technological dependence on the West, and raw material dependence on Russia form a multifaceted heteronomous governance structure, whereby the region loses its functional integrity as an autopoietic system and becomes subject to dissipative control from the outside. In this state, Central Asia operates more as an open subsystem embedded in external cycles of capital, resource and technology reproduction.

Financial, investment, and cultural expansion by external powers contributes to the erosion of internal sovereignty, undermining mechanisms of internal coherence and shifting the center of self-identification—from endogenous to exogenous orientations. Against the backdrop of weakening political institutions and the inability to achieve systemic stabilization, the region experiences growing fluctuations in the form of social and political conflict, potentially pushing the entire system into a zone of chaos.

In this context, the region loses its capacity for self-reflection and reorganization, becoming a reactive system governed by the vector of external impulses.

## CONCLUSION

In the context of growing global turbulence, Central Asia finds itself at the intersection of major geopolitical, economic, and civilizational vectors. The scenarios

presented—from “Regional Resilience and Pragmatic Multi-Vectorism” to “Hybrid Dependency” are not only outline possible development trajectories but also reveal the underlying dynamics of regional macro-system transformation through the lens of synergetic and autopoietic analysis.

Scenario 1 illustrates the most stable and desirable configuration, in which Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, acting as nonlinear and self-organizing systems, form a stable attractor of development and stability. Political multi-vectorism, economic diversification, and technological modernization act here as key parameters of order, strengthening the region’s resilience and its capacity to adapt to external fluctuations.

Scenario 2 represents a shift toward a more fragmented yet adaptive structure, where local cooperation clusters become the primary units of stability. This model is potentially sustainable but lacks the necessary synergetic coherence to produce a unified regional identity and strategic direction.

Scenario 3, by contrast, highlights the risks of losing regional agency and becoming an externally governed zone, devoid of autopoiesis and internal reflection. It represents a critical trajectory in which Central Asia becomes the object of multi-layered dependency, vulnerable to exogenous shocks and internal destabilization.

Systemic analysis shows that the key factor for regional resilience lies in the capacity for self-tuning and reproduction of internal coherence within a polycentric world. With developing institutions, strategic geographic positioning, and economic potential, Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan have the capacity to become centers of gravity for regional self-organization. However, this requires a systemic approach to development—one that includes not only economic and political modernization, but also intellectual and cultural reflection on their own civilizational trajectory.

The future of Central Asia will be shaped not only by the actions of external actors but also by the maturity of its internal adaptation mechanisms and its capacity to generate knowledge, strategies, and models for sustainable existence within a multidimensional global system.

## REFERENCES

Международные отношения в Южной Азии: взгляды России и Шри-Ланки. –Электронный ресурс: <https://russiancouncil.ru/activity/policybriefs/mezhdu-narodnye-otnosheniya-v-yuzhnoy-azii-vzglyady-rossii-i-shri-lanki/>. –Дата обращения: 02.06.2025.

Хантингтон С. Столкновение цивилизаций. –М.: АСТ, 2014. – 571с.

Тойнби А. Постижение истории. –М.: Прогресс, 1991. -730с.

Ayoob M., Ismayilov M. Identity and Politics in Central Asia and the Caucasus. – London: Routledge, 2015. - 224p.

Chabal P., Alix Y., Baizakova K. Evolving regional values and mobilities in global contexts. –Bruxelles: 2020. -372 pp.

Маслов В.И. Региональная безопасность: История и проблемы Новых Независимых Государств Центральной Азии. –Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата политических наук. - 2001.

Исламов В.В. Евразийская цивилизация: социально-онтологический и методологический аспекты исследования. –диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата философских наук. –Уфа, 2002.

Ермаков Д.С. Социально-философские основания евразийской цивилизационной парадигмы. – Владивосток, 2005.

Казанцев А.А. Центральная Азия: комплексный кризис и сценарии будущего // Ежегодник ИМИ МГИМО МИД России. -М., 2015. -Выпуск 3 (13). - С.34-55.

Подорожание газа для метановых заправок в апреле повысит себестоимость товаров — ЦБ – Spot. –Электронный ресурс:  
<https://www.spot.uz/ru/2025/02/11/energytariffs/#:~:text=%D0%A6%D0%91%C2%A0%D0%BE%D1%82%D0%BC%D0%B5%D1%87%D0%B0%D0%B5%D1%82%2C%20%D1%87%D1%82%D0%BE,%D1%83%D1%81%D0%BA%D0%BE%D1%80%D0%B5%D0%BD%D0%B8%D1%8E%20%D0%B8%D0%BD%D1%84%D0%BB%D1%8F%D1%86%D0%B8%D0%BE%D0%BD%D0%BD%D1%8B%D1%85%20%D0%BE%D0%B6%D0%B8%D0%B4%D0%B0%D0%BD%D0%B8%D0%B9>. –Дата обращения: 03.06.2025.