

A.A. Kabdollanova*

Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan
(E-mail: a.kabdollanova@gmail.com)

National Interest as a Philosophical Category: G7 Ideals and the Strategic Identity of Kazakhstan

This article proposes a new definition of the philosophical concept of *national interest*, considering its ontological, epistemological, and moral aspects. It moves beyond the realist view, where interest is reduced to power and survival, and instead highlights how identity, recognition, and narrative shape the strategic behavior of states. The case of Kazakhstan is taken as an example: a post-Soviet, culturally diverse, and geopolitically uncertain country seeking its role in a liberal international order led by the G7. The study argues that Kazakhstan's foreign policy is not only practical but also expressive. It reflects principles such as justice, pluralism, and civilization dialogue. Using insights from hermeneutics, phenomenology, and political ethics, Kazakhstan can be seen as a conceptual actor that reinterprets national interest through ethical engagement in global debates. This role is evident in initiatives like the Congress of Leaders of World and Traditional Religions, multilateral diplomacy, and the "multi-vector" strategy. In doing so, the article contributes to ongoing discussions of international norms and legitimacy, showing the value of a plural and culturally informed understanding of state activity in global politics.

Keywords: Kazakhstan; national interest; strategic identity; philosophy; recognition; civilisational dialogue; pluralism; hermeneutics; global order; political ethics.

Introduction

The concept of *national interest* has long held a central place in political and international relations debates. Traditionally, it has been approached from a realist perspective, often defined in terms of power, security, and material gain. However, recent contributions from philosophy, cultural theory, and postcolonial studies have reshaped the concept, prompting a reconsideration of its ontological, epistemological, and moral foundations [1]. In this study, national interest is examined not as a fixed geopolitical fact but as a dynamic philosophical construct shaped by narratives of civilization and identity formation. Kazakhstan is taken as a case study to illustrate this perspective. Situated within the context of the G7 and the broader liberal international order, Kazakhstan demonstrates how a post-Soviet and non-Western state can engage philosophical traditions to question and reframe dominant Western paradigms in constructing its strategic identity [2], [3]. The need for a philosophical rethinking of national interest becomes clear in light of an increasingly interconnected world, where both bipolar and unipolar international regimes have lost dominance. In the 21st century, nation-states are no longer only rational actors pursuing security or wealth; they also operate as moral and symbolic agents that generate meaning and value in global politics. For this reason, international relations today require a deeper philosophical outlook that accounts for diverse ontologies and normative claims in shaping the global order.

Hans Morgenthau's classical realism interprets national interest primarily as an expression of a state's instinct for survival within an anarchic international order [4]. While this framework remains effective for certain types of analysis, it overlooks the role of ideas, values, and symbolic structures in shaping foreign policy choices. A strictly materialist account cannot explain why states may act against immediate economic logic in the name of dignity, recognition, or historical continuity. This is why philosophical perspectives on subjectivity, intersubjectivity, and moral orientation are essential for a fuller understanding of state behavior [5], [6]. Drawing on Hegelian philosophy, mutual recognition emerges as a central principle in the formation of international identity [7], [8]. When a state asserts its interest, it seeks not only security or resources but also acknowledgement within the international community. This approach highlights the dialogical character of strategic identity, particularly for developing states seeking to establish their presence in normative orders long shaped by Western dominance [9]. Kazakhstan provides a telling example. As a post-Soviet state with a self-declared "multi-vector" foreign policy, it positions itself both within and outside the ideological frameworks of the G7. Its foreign policy outlook is not only pragmatic but also grounded in philosophical concerns

* Corresponding author's e-mail: a.kabdollanova@gmail.com

with cultural sovereignty, historical narrative, and moral pluralism [10]. By emphasizing civilization dialogue, sovereign equality, and strategic flexibility, Kazakhstan challenges the assumption that liberal homogeneity is the sole path to modernization.

The article develops its argument by drawing on philosophical traditions that emphasize the fluidity of identity, the formative role of narrative, and the contextual nature of knowledge. Thinkers such as Paul Ricoeur, Charles Taylor, and Alasdair MacIntyre provide conceptual tools for understanding national interest as something that emerges through historically embedded practices [11]. Here, identity is not a background condition for interest but the very foundation that makes it possible. As Taylor argues, the self is formed through dialogue; in a similar way, the state comes into being through continuous conversations about its role within moral and political frameworks. On this basis, the article redefines the philosophical concept of national interest, focusing on its ontological, epistemological, and moral dimensions. Moving beyond realist approaches that equate interest with power and survival, it highlights how identity, recognition, and narrative shape strategic state action. Kazakhstan is presented as a case study, analyzed in the context of the liberal international order led by the G7. Its post-Soviet background, cultural diversity, and ambiguous geopolitical position make it a revealing example [12]. Using perspectives from hermeneutics, phenomenology, and political ethics, the article shows that Kazakhstan's foreign policy is not only instrumental but also expressive, reflecting principles of justice, pluralism, and civilization dialogue. Kazakhstan functions as a conceptual actor that reinterprets national interest through ethical participation in global debates. This role is visible in initiatives such as the Congress of Leaders of World and Traditional Religions, its multilateral diplomacy, and the "multi-vector" strategy. By connecting philosophy with practice, the study contributes to wider debates on international norms, calling for a plural and culturally contextualized understanding of state legitimacy and action in world politics.

Literature review

From Machiavelli and Hobbes to Morgenthau and Waltz, the classical tradition has interpreted national interest primarily through the lens of power politics and the anarchic structure of the international system [4]. Morgenthau famously argued that "interest defined in terms of power" forms the core of political realism [4]. Waltz, in turn, maintained that states act rationally to ensure survival in an anarchic international environment, a claim central to his structural realist paradigm. Across these formulations, the concept of national interest appears universal, constant, and largely materialist. In contrast, constructivist and post-structuralist perspectives—advanced by scholars such as Alexander Wendt and David Campbell—view national interest as socially constructed, closely linked to identity, norms, and discourse. These approaches suggest that foreign policy is not only a response to external conditions but also a performative act through which the state defines itself. Campbell stresses how foreign policy narratives simultaneously shape identity and security, while Wendt's well-known claim that "anarchy is what states make of it" underscores the importance of intersubjective meaning in structuring international relations [13]. These theoretical frameworks open the door to philosophical inquiry. Understanding national interest as both performative and interpretive resonates with hermeneutic traditions, particularly the works of Hans-Georg Gadamer and Paul Ricoeur. Gadamer's notion of the "fusion of horizons" highlights that understanding arises through dialogue between different historical and cultural contexts [14]. Applied to international politics, this implies that national interest is not fixed but emerges from the interaction of diverse global value systems. Ricoeur's concept of narrative identity further illustrates how individuals—and, by extension, states—make sense of themselves over time through interpretive storytelling [12], [15].

Postcolonial theorists such as Edward Said, Homi Bhabha, and Dipesh Chakrabarty have challenged the Eurocentric frameworks of knowledge that dominate international relations. They argue that Western values often disguise strategic interests under the language of universality, casting non-Western societies into binary categories such as modern/traditional, rational/emotional, and developed/developing. Bhabha's concept of hybridity is especially relevant for analyzing states like Kazakhstan that navigate between multiple civilisational influences. Hybridity, in his account, is not a simple blending of cultures but a contested space of negotiation, transformation, and resistance, where existing categories are unsettled and reinterpreted. Within this context, a growing body of research—by scholars such as Vanderhill, Joireman, Tulepbayeva, Hanks, and Clarke—has examined Kazakhstan's foreign policy and highlighted its long-standing commitment to a "multi-vector" strategy. First articulated by President Nursultan Nazarbayev in the early 1990s, this approach sought to balance Kazakhstan's relations with major global powers—Russia, China, the United States, and the European Union—while avoiding overdependence on any single partner. As Vanderhill and

colleagues note, multi-vector diplomacy has become an essential instrument for safeguarding Kazakhstan's independence and enabling constructive cooperation with diverse geopolitical blocs. President Kassym-Zhomart Tokayev reaffirmed this orientation in his address of January 2025, emphasizing that Kazakhstan would continue to pursue a multi-vector policy. He stressed that since independence, balanced engagement with major powers has been the foundation of the country's foreign relations, serving not only to maintain sovereignty and international standing but also to strengthen economic capacity. Tokayev's remarks underscore Kazakhstan's aspiration to be recognized as a stable and pragmatic actor within a complex geopolitical environment. At the same time, a smaller group of scholars has approached Kazakhstan's strategic trajectory from a philosophical angle, interrogating the concepts of national interest and identity within the broader dynamics of global power [16].

A philosophical perspective can be applied through Charles Taylor's theory of recognition, which argues that identity is shaped through ongoing processes of recognition and misrecognition. In this sense, a state's national interest extends beyond security and economic development to include the pursuit of international recognition. Kazakhstan's foreign policy reflects this dimension by emphasizing civilisational dialogue, cultural pluralism, and the enhancement of its global visibility. Alasdair MacIntyre's account of virtue ethics offers another way of interpreting state behavior [11]. His notion of narrative unity suggests that moral agents—and, by extension, governments—can only be understood through the stories they construct about themselves. Kazakhstan's self-presentation as a peaceful, multi-ethnic state and a builder of bridges is therefore more than diplomatic rhetoric; it constitutes a central element of its national interest. This narrative contributes both to internal cohesion and to the shaping of Kazakhstan's external relationships, reinforcing its image as a stable and constructive actor in international politics.

Heidegger's ontology, particularly his concept of *being-in-the-world*, provides a useful lens for examining the spatial and temporal dimensions of state identity. Kazakhstan occupies a position of ontological liminality, as its territory spans both Europe and Asia. Its foreign policy is therefore not merely a strategic reaction to geography, but also an expression of its location within multiple historical and cultural contexts. This ontological perspective resonates with political theorists such as Jacques Rancière and Étienne Balibar, who emphasize the fluid and contested nature of political subjectivity. Rancière's notion of *dissensus*—the disruption of established meanings—helps to explain Kazakhstan's refusal to be neatly classified within Western, Russian, or Chinese spheres of influence [17]. Balibar's concept of *transindividuality* further underscores the relational character of political identity, suggesting that Kazakhstan's statehood is not an isolated phenomenon but emerges through its interactions with other states and regions. In this light, Kazakhstan's initiatives such as the Congress of Leaders of World and Traditional Religions or its advocacy for nuclear disarmament can be read as philosophical gestures. These are not merely pragmatic policy decisions but symbolic acts that project a particular image of Kazakhstan as an international actor. Such efforts challenge conventional notions of modernity and present a more nuanced understanding of global engagement.

We can better grasp national interest by using philosophical ideas like recognition, narrative identity, hybridity, performativity, and being-in-the-world. This model goes beyond the divide between realism and idealism by putting foreign policy in a context of moral duties, ways of thinking about existence, and ways of knowing things. Kazakhstan's foreign policy shows that the idea of national interest has been rethought as a philosophical idea. It shows that governments are not just passive recipients of global norms or rational actors trying to get the most out of things; they are also agents who are actively involved in building meaning, legitimacy, and identity. Using a combination of political philosophy, critical theory, and international relations can help us better comprehend the complicated link between how states act and how global norms work. This philosophical recontextualization has effects that go beyond the immediate situation. It forces scholars and politicians to rethink the foundations of international cooperation, the sources of legitimacy in global governance, and the role of non-Western actors in shaping world order. As the world becomes more multipolar and politically diverse, these kinds of ideas are both important and useful.

Methodology

Heidegger's ontology, and in particular his notion of *being-in-the-world*, offers an important framework for analyzing the spatial and temporal dimensions of state identity. Kazakhstan can be understood as occupying a condition of ontological liminality, positioned between Europe and Asia. Its foreign policy is thus not simply a strategic response to geography but also an expression of its place within multiple historical and cultural contexts. This ontological view aligns with the insights of political theorists such as Jacques Rancière and Étienne Balibar, who highlight the contested and relational nature of political subjectivity.

Rancière's concept of *dissensus*—the disruption of established meanings—illuminates Kazakhstan's reluctance to be fully absorbed into Western, Russian, or Chinese spheres of influence [17]. Balibar's notion of *transindividuality* further underscores that statehood is not an isolated essence but arises from relations with other states and regions. Seen from this perspective, Kazakhstan's initiatives—such as hosting the Congress of Leaders of World and Traditional Religions or advocating nuclear disarmament—may be interpreted as philosophical gestures. These actions are not merely pragmatic policy choices; they symbolically articulate the type of actor Kazakhstan aspires to be on the global stage. In doing so, they question conventional assumptions about modernity and suggest a more complex and pluralistic mode of international engagement.

The study also draws on philosophical hermeneutics, particularly the work of Hans-Georg Gadamer and Paul Ricoeur. Gadamer's concept of the *fusion of horizons* offers a way to interpret how Kazakhstan negotiates between different civilisational logics—Western liberalism, Eurasianism, and Sinocentrism. Ricoeur's notion of *narrative identity* further illuminates the stories that Kazakhstan constructs about itself on the international stage. This approach aligns with the study's broader view of strategic identity as a narrative performance that evolves over time rather than as a fixed essence. Postcolonial theory, especially the contributions of Edward Said, Homi Bhabha, and Dipesh Chakrabarty, complements this framework by challenging Eurocentric binaries such as developed/developing and modern/traditional. Bhabha's concept of *hybridity* is particularly valuable for situating Kazakhstan between Russia, China, and the West, highlighting foreign policy as a site of negotiation, adaptation, and symbolic resistance. In addition, the analysis applies Hannah Arendt's conception of the *public sphere* as a space where identity is enacted through speech and appearance. From this perspective, Kazakhstan's diplomatic practices—its role as a mediator, its advocacy for nuclear disarmament, and its hosting of the Congress of Leaders of World and Traditional Religions—are not only policy instruments but also meaningful performances. They serve to project and solidify Kazakhstan's self-image as a distinct and responsible actor in global politics.

The study also examines the ontological dimension of political identity through Martin Heidegger's phenomenological framework. His concept of *being-in-the-world* allows Kazakhstan's strategic identity to be understood in spatial and temporal terms. The country's geographical and civilisational position between Europe and Asia is thus not merely a backdrop but an active element shaping its conduct in global affairs. The moral and relational aspects of agency are further illuminated by the philosophies of Emmanuel Levinas and Maurice Merleau-Ponty [18], [19]. Both emphasize responsibility toward the Other and the significance of embodied subjectivity. Applied to international politics, these perspectives suggest that Kazakhstan's foreign policy cannot be reduced to the pursuit of material interests but also reflects a normative orientation grounded in ethical responsibility. Methodologically, the study employs close textual analysis of policy speeches, diplomatic documents, and symbolic actions such as summits and international initiatives. Particular attention is given to official discourse, including President Tokayev's address of January 2025, in which he reaffirmed the importance of Kazakhstan's multi-vector strategy for strengthening sovereignty, enhancing economic potential, and consolidating international standing. Such statements are interpreted as both performative and world-constituting, offering deeper insight into how national interest is articulated and projected [20].

Overall, this method of interpretation and interdisciplinary study lets us think about national interest not as a fixed or purely logical calculation, but as a concept that is philosophically rich, ethically sound, and created through stories that are influenced by Kazakhstan's unique geopolitical and cultural position.

Discussion

This part builds on the interpretive and philosophical methods described above and shows how Kazakhstan's foreign policy is an example of a new way of thinking about national interest. Kazakhstan doesn't just rely on realist ideas of survival and power maximization [7], [21]. Instead, it sees itself as an active agent creating meaning through diplomacy, symbolic action, and norm entrepreneurship.

1. Positioning of civilizations and strategic identity

Kazakhstan's position at the crossroads of Europe and Asia has played a decisive role in shaping its foreign policy and strategic identity. Both Nursultan Nazarbayev and Kassym-Jomart Tokayev have emphasized the significance of Kazakhstan's Eurasian identity for state-building and diplomacy [22]. The policy of "multi-vector diplomacy," first implemented in the early years of independence, represents a deliberate strategy to balance relations with major powers such as Russia, China, the European Union, and the United States [23], [24]. This approach is not only pragmatic but also part of a broader civilisational discourse that seeks to position Kazakhstan as a mediator and integrative platform between East and West [25], [23]. Homi

Bhabha's [6] concept of *hybridity* provides a useful lens for interpreting this plural identity. Rather than being confined by binary categories, nations construct hybrid identities that draw strength from their multiplicity. Shakhanova [26] describes hybridity as a "civilisational buffer" in Kazakhstan's case: not a weakness but a strategic resource that enhances flexibility in diplomacy while reinforcing the country's ontological security as a peaceful and neutral actor in world politics. The image of Kazakhstan as a "bridge" nation therefore goes beyond political rhetoric. It functions as both a symbolic narrative and a strategic instrument, legitimizing the state's international role while strengthening its standing domestically and abroad [27].

2. Dialogic Diplomacy as a Moral Way to Do Things

Hannah Arendt's conception of the *public sphere* and Emmanuel Levinas's ethics of alterity provide a valuable framework for interpreting Kazakhstan's global engagement, including initiatives such as the Congress of Leaders of World and Traditional Religions and its consistent support for nuclear non-proliferation [18]. These actions extend beyond pragmatic strategy, expressing Kazakhstan's moral and ontological position in world affairs. They function as performative gestures of visibility and ethical participation, reflecting the idea that diplomacy serves as a stage for demonstrating moral presence and responsibility. Kazakhstani scholars such as Zarema Shaukenova and Nurlan Yerimbetov emphasize that such foreign policy practices are not merely instrumental or reactive, but are also shaped by Kazakhstan's self-understanding as a civilisation and its normative commitments [28], [29]. Architectural symbols like the Palace of Peace and Reconciliation serve as material anchors for this narrative identity. They resonate with Paul Ricoeur's concept of *narrative selfhood*, which views identity as constructed through moral storytelling across space and time. Serik Nugerbekov further argues that Kazakhstan's role as a site of dialogue is not only geopolitically expedient but also a deliberate cultural strategy rooted in nomadic pluralism and historical openness [30]. Within this framework, national interest is redefined not as competitive advantage but as a moral and relational responsibility to foster stability and intercultural understanding. In this way, Kazakhstan's strategic identity is linked to a broader civilisational mission, positioning it as a moral voice within an increasingly multipolar world [31].

3. Pluralism in knowledge and a normative strategy

Kazakhstan's selective engagement with G7 values—such as the rule of law, free markets, and human rights—illustrates its commitment to strategic pluralism. Rather than fully adopting these principles, Kazakhstan adapts them to align with its cultural context and developmental priorities. As Michel Foucault argues, hegemonic norms often serve to reinforce existing power structures [14]. By contrast, Kazakhstan seeks to avoid epistemic dependency by embracing what Bhikhu Parekh describes as *pluralistic universalism*: the acceptance of diversity without rejecting universal principles [32]. In his "Just Kazakhstan" discourse, President Kassym-Zhomart Tokayev frames justice and accountability not only as national objectives, but also as guiding principles for Kazakhstan's conduct in international affairs. Such commitments reinforce the country's image as a stabilizing and constructive actor, particularly in regions undergoing rapid transformation.

4. Regional Connectivity as a Way of Thinking

Kazakhstan's participation in regional initiatives such as the Belt and Road Initiative, the Middle Corridor, and Turkic cooperation platforms extends beyond economic considerations. These projects reflect an alternative vision of globalization grounded in ontological plurality and geographical interdependence [21], [3]. Heidegger's concept of *being-in-the-world* provides a useful framework here: Kazakhstan positions itself within a multipolar order that resists simple alignment with either Western liberalism or authoritarian alternatives. In this context, Jacques Rancière's notion of *dissensus* helps explain Kazakhstan's support for multiple forms of regional cooperation [33]. By doing so, the country deliberately resists fixed geopolitical classifications and asserts its agency through symbolic, diplomatic, and institutional practices. Such efforts underline Kazakhstan's aspiration to be recognized not only as a regional hub but also as a moral actor with a distinct role in shaping global discourse.

5. Acceptance and Legitimacy Around the World

Charles Taylor's theory of recognition highlights the centrality of acknowledgement for understanding Kazakhstan's national interest [34]. This involves not only trade and investment, which provide material forms of recognition, but also participation in the United Nations, peacekeeping operations, and mediation initiatives that generate symbolic legitimacy. Such practices illustrate the performative and narrative dimensions of statehood [35], [36], which are essential for sustaining long-term sovereignty and authority.

Kazakhstan's foreign policy challenges the epistemic dominance of unipolar liberal order. Rather than rejecting G7 principles outright, it seeks to diversify them by emphasizing cultural sovereignty, non-

alignment, and dialogic diplomacy. This position reflects Bhikhu Parekh's notion of *pluralistic universalism*, which accepts multiple interpretations of the good life without denying shared principles [20]. By positioning itself as a "norm entrepreneur" [13], Kazakhstan contributes to a more diversified international order, demonstrating how smaller states can exercise philosophical agency and propose alternative models of coexistence without succumbing either to Westernisation or authoritarianism. This orientation is evident in Kazakhstan's endorsement of initiatives such as the Belt and Road, the Middle Corridor, and Turkic regional cooperation. Each of these illustrates a multifaceted vision of regionalism and globalization that neither replicates the liberal paradigm nor functions merely as its supplement. Instead, Kazakhstan's engagement shows how philosophical concepts—dialogical ethics, recognition, and plural modernities—can be enacted within strategic contexts. In this light, national interest emerges not as a static framework but as a dynamic construct shaped by interpretive interaction, symbolic performance, and ethical positioning.

Conclusion

Kazakhstan's foreign policy demonstrates that national interest need not be confined to rigid geopolitical calculations or the deterministic logic of power and survival long emphasized by classical realism, from Machiavelli and Hobbes to Morgenthau and Waltz. Realist theory posits national interest as universal and unchanging [4]. By contrast, Kazakhstan illustrates the possibility of a more dynamic and nuanced understanding, one shaped by identity, ethics, and relational engagement with the world. Drawing on insights from constructivism and post-structuralism (Wendt; Campbell) as well as hermeneutic philosophy (Gadamer; Ricoeur), foreign policy can be understood as a domain where narratives are articulated, moral choices are made, and intercultural dialogue is enacted. Kazakhstan's model—encompassing initiatives such as nuclear disarmament, the Congress of Leaders of World and Traditional Religions, and its multi-vector diplomacy—reveals the performative and ethical dimensions of international relations. These initiatives are not merely strategic instruments but expressions of Kazakhstan's civilisational vision. Charles Taylor's theory of recognition and Alasdair MacIntyre's virtue ethics shed further light on this process: Kazakhstan presents itself through moral storytelling as a peaceful, multi-ethnic, and mediating state within a plural global order [11].

Rather than passively accepting norms defined by powerful actors such as the G7, Kazakhstan actively interprets and reshapes them. This aligns with constructivist notions of "norm entrepreneurship" and resonates with Bhikhu Parekh's idea of *pluralistic universalism*, which insists that participation in the global system need not erase cultural and philosophical distinctiveness [32]. Kazakhstan resists binary oppositions such as East versus West or modern versus traditional, opting instead for a diplomatic stance rooted in diversity, recognition, and moral responsibility.

In this sense, philosophy is not abstract rhetoric in Kazakhstan's foreign policy but a practical instrument for shaping global interaction. Through mutual recognition, and dialogical engagement, Kazakhstan contributes to a rethinking of interest and identity in international affairs. Its example makes a compelling case for moving beyond power politics toward relational diplomacy, where states seek not only survival or dominance but also understanding and coexistence. This vision calls for a paradigm shift: from competition to recognition, from instrumental gain to ethical responsibility, and from rigid realism to dialogical pluralism [37].

References

- 1 Campbell D. *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity* / D. Campbell. — University of Minnesota Press, 1998.
- 2 Ricoeur P. *Oneself as Another* / P. Ricoeur. — University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- 3 Waltz K. *Theory of International Politics* / K. Waltz. — Addison-Wesley, 1979.
- 4 Gadamer H.-G. *Truth and Method* / H.-G. Gadamer. — Continuum, 1975.
- 5 Morgenthau H.J. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* / H.J. Morgenthau. — Alfred A. Knopf, 1948.
- 6 Токаев К. *Независимость и дипломатия* / К. Токаев. — Астана: Институт «Рухани жаңғыру», 2020.
- 7 Сатпаев Д. Многовекторная внешняя политика Казахстана: дилеммы и перспективы / Д. Сатпаев, Т. Умбеталиева // *Бюллетень КазИСИ*. — 2018. — № 3 (42). — С. 4–10.
- 8 Laruelle M. *Kazakhstan in the Making: Legitimacy, Symbols and Social Changes* / M. Laruelle. — Rowman & Littlefield, 2015.
- 9 Токаев К. *Дипломатия Республики Казахстан* / К. Токаев. — Алматы: Елорда, 2009.

- 10 Isaacs R. *Party System Formation in Kazakhstan: Between Formal and Informal Politics* / R. Isaacs. — Routledge, 2011.
- 11 Balibar É. *We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship* / É. Balibar. — Princeton University Press, 2004.
- 12 Bhabha H.K. *The Location of Culture* / H.K. Bhabha. — London: Routledge, 1994.
- 13 Bilgin P. *Thinking Past 'Western' IR?* / P. Bilgin // *Third World Quarterly*. — 2008. — Vol. 29, № 1. — P. 5–23.
- 14 Acharya A. *Whose Ideas Matter? Agency and Power in Asian Regionalism* / A. Acharya. — Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011.
- 15 Bevir M. *Democratic Governance* / M. Bevir. — Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- 16 Fairclough N. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* / N. Fairclough. — Longman, 1995.
- 17 Finnemore M. *International norm dynamics and political change* / M. Finnemore, K. Sikkink // *International Organization*. — 1998. — Vol. 52, № 4. — P. 887–917.
- 18 Foucault M. *The History of Sexuality: Volume I* / M. Foucault. — Pantheon, 1978.
- 19 Arendt H. *The Human Condition* / H. Arendt. — Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958.
- 20 Honneth A. *The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts* / A. Honneth. — MIT Press, 1996.
- 21 Rancière J. *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy* / J. Rancière. — University of Minnesota Press, 1999.
- 22 Levinas E. *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority* / E. Levinas. — Duquesne University Press, 1969.
- 23 Merleau-Ponty M. *Phenomenology of Perception* / M. Merleau-Ponty. — Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962.
- 24 Heidegger M. *Being and Time* / M. Heidegger. — Harper & Row, 1962.
- 25 Said E. *Orientalism* / E. Said. — Vintage Books, 1978.
- 26 Chakrabarty D. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* / D. Chakrabarty. — Princeton University Press, 2000.
- 27 Linklater A. *The Transformation of Political Community: Ethical Foundations of the Post-Westphalian Era* / A. Linklater. — Polity Press, 1998.
- 28 Parekh B. *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory* / B. Parekh. — Harvard University Press, 2000.
- 29 Taylor C. *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition* / C. Taylor. — Princeton University Press, 1992.
- 30 MacIntyre A. *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory* / A. MacIntyre. — University of Notre Dame Press, 1981.
- 31 Wendt A. *Social Theory of International Politics* / A. Wendt. — Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- 32 Kazakh Ministry of Foreign Affairs. *Concept of Kazakhstan's Foreign Policy for 2020–2030*. — Astana, 2020.
- 33 Шаукенова З. *Казахстан в глобальных процессах: Идентичность и имидж государства* / З. Шаукенова. — Алматы: Казахстанский институт стратегических исследований (КИСИ), 2017.
- 34 Еримбетов Н. *Мягкая сила Казахстана и продвижение норм* / Н. Еримбетов // *Аналитический доклад*. — 2020.
- 35 Нугербек С. *Казахстан и культура диалога* / С. Нугербек // *Central Asia Affairs*. — 2015. — Т. 2, № 1. — С. 1–15.
- 36 Тулебаева Г. *Стратегическая идентичность Казахстана в меняющемся мире* / Г. Тулебаева, Р. Вандерхилл, С. Джойрман // *Журнал евразийских исследований*. — 2023. — Т. 14, № 1. — С. 65–80.
- 37 Шаханова А. *Цивилизационная гибридность во внешней политике Казахстана* / А. Шаханова // *Central Asian Survey*. — 2019. — Т. 38, № 3. — С. 345–360.

А.А. Кабдолланова

Ұлттық мүдде философиялық категория ретінде: G7 идеалдары мен Қазақстанның стратегиялық сәйкестігі

Мақалада ұлттық мүдде ұғымы философиялық категория ретінде қайта қарастырылады. Зерттеу реализмнің классикалық тұжырымдамаларынан бас тартып, мүддені биліктен ман қалуға гөрі, оны онтологиялық, эпистемологиялық және этикалық деңгейде ұғынуға тырысады. Мақала Қазақстан мысалында ұлттық мүдденің қалыптасуына тарихи жады, танымдық құрылымдар мен өркениеттік нарративтердің қалай әсер ететіні көрсетілген. Посткеңестік және өркениеттік аралық кеністікте орналасқан Қазақстан G7 елдері үстемдік ететін либералды әлемдік тәртіппен өзара байланысын философиялық тұрғыда бейнелейді. Герменевтика, феноменология және саяси этика сынды философиялық тәсілдер арқылы Қазақстанның сыртқы саясаты әділет, плюрализм және өркениеттік сұхбат секілді құндылықтарға негізделген этикалық әрекет ретінде қарастырылады. Съездер, көпвекторлы саясат және көпжақты дипломатия арқылы Қазақстан ұлттық мүддені жаһандық мағына құру үдерісіндегі философиялық белсенділік ретінде ұсынады. Бұл зерттеу қазіргі халықаралық қатынастардағы нормалар туралы пікірталастарға мәдениетке негізделген, плюралистік көзқарас ұсына отырып үлес қосады.

Кілт сөздер: ұлттық мүдде, стратегиялық сәйкестік, Қазақстан, философия, тану, өркениеттік диалог, плюрализм, герменевтика, әлемдік тәртіп, саяси этика.

А.А. Кабдолланова

Национальный интерес как философская категория: Идеалы G7 и стратегическая идентичность Казахстана

Статья переосмысливает понятие национального интереса как философскую категорию, акцентируя внимание на его онтологических, эпистемологических и этических аспектах. Отходя от реалистской традиции, где интерес определяется через власть и выживание, автор исследует, как идентичность, признание и нарратив формируют внешнеполитическую стратегию государства. На примере Казахстана рассматривается, как постсоветское, культурно гибридное и геополитически промежуточное государство осмысляет своё место в либеральном мировом порядке, сформированном странами G7. На основе философских традиций герменевтики, феноменологии и этики политики показано, что внешняя политика Казахстана не только прагматична, но и выразительна — воплощает ценности справедливости, плюрализма и диалога цивилизаций. Через такие инициативы, как Съезд лидеров мировых и традиционных религий, многосторонняя дипломатия и «многовекторная» стратегия, Казахстан предстаёт как философский субъект, переопределяющий национальный интерес как этическое участие в глобальном смыслопроизводстве. Работа вносит вклад в современные дискуссии о глобальной нормативности, предлагая плюралистический и культурно укоренённый взгляд на агентность и легитимность в международной политике.

Ключевые слова: национальный интерес, стратегическая идентичность, Казахстан, философия, признание, цивилизационный диалог, плюрализм, герменевтика, мировой порядок, политическая этика.

References

- 1 Campbell, D. (1998). *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. University of Minnesota Press.
- 2 Ricoeur, P. (1992). *Oneself as Another*. University of Chicago Press.
- 3 Waltz, K. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*. Addison-Wesley.
- 4 Gadamer, H. -G. (1975). *Truth and Method*. Continuum.
- 5 Morgenthau, H. J. (1948). *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- 6 Tokayev, K. (2020). *Nezavisimost i diplomatiia* [Independence and Diplomacy]. Astana: Institut «Rukhani zhangyru» [in Russian].
- 7 Satpaev, D., & Umbetalieva, T. (2018). *Mnogovektornaia vneshniaia politika Kazakhstana: dilemmy i perspektivy* [Kazakhstan's Multi-Vector Foreign Policy: Dilemmas and Prospects]. *Bulleten Kazakhstanskii Institut Strategicheskikh Issledovaniï — Bulletin of Kazakhstan Institute for Strategic Studies*, 3(42), 4–10 [in Russian].
- 8 Laruelle, M. (2015). *Kazakhstan in the Making: Legitimacy, Symbols and Social Changes*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- 9 Tokayev, K. (2009). *Diplomatiia Respubliki Kazakhstan* [Diplomacy of the Republic of Kazakhstan]. Almaty: Elorda [in Russian].
- 10 Isaacs, R. (2011). *Party System Formation in Kazakhstan: Between Formal and Informal Politics*. Routledge.
- 11 Balibar, É. (2004). *We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*. Princeton University Press.
- 12 Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. Routledge.
- 13 Bilgin, P. (2008). Thinking Past 'Western' IR? *Third World Quarterly*, 29(1), 5–23.
- 14 Acharya, A. (2011). *Whose Ideas Matter? Agency and Power in Asian Regionalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- 15 Bevir, M. (2010). *Democratic Governance*. Princeton University Press.
- 16 Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Longman.
- 17 Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998). International norm dynamics and political change. *International Organization*, 52(4), 887–917.
- 18 Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality: Volume I*. Pantheon.
- 19 Arendt, H. (1958). *The Human Condition*. University of Chicago Press.
- 20 Honneth, A. (1996). *The Struggle for Recognition: The Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*. MIT Press.
- 21 Rancière, J. (1999). *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy*. University of Minnesota Press.
- 22 Levinas, E. (1969). *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*. Duquesne University Press.
- 23 Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *Phenomenology of Perception*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

- 24 Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and Time*. Harper & Row.
- 25 Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. Vintage Books.
- 26 Chakrabarty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton University Press.
- 27 Linklater, A. (1998). *The Transformation of Political Community: Ethical Foundations of the Post-Westphalian Era*. Polity Press.
- 28 Parekh, B. (2000). *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Harvard University Press.
- 29 Taylor, C. (1992). *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*. Princeton University Press.
- 30 MacIntyre, A. (1981). *After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory*. University of Notre Dame Press.
- 31 Wendt, A. (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- 32 Kazakh Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (2020). *Concept of Kazakhstan's Foreign Policy for 2020–2030*. Astana.
- 33 Shaukenova, Z. (2017). *Kazakhstan v globalnykh protsessakh: Identichnost i imidzh gosudarstva* [Kazakhstan in Global Processes: Identity and Image of the State]. Almaty: Kazakhstanskii institut strategicheskikh issledovaniy (KISI) [in Russian].
- 34 Yerimbetov, N. (2020). Miagkaia sila Kazakhstana i prodvizhenie norm [Kazakhstan's Soft Power and Norm Entrepreneurship]. *Analiticheskii doklad — KazISS Analytical Report* [in Russian].
- 35 Nugerbekov, S. (2015). Kazakhstan i kultura dialoga [Kazakhstan and the Culture of Dialogue]. *Central Asia Affairs*, 2(1), 1–15 [in Russian].
- 36 Tulebayeva, G., Vanderhill, R., & Joireman, S. (2023). Strategicheskaiia identichnost Kazakhstana v meniaiushchemsia mire [Kazakhstan's Strategic Identity in a Changing World]. *Zhurnal evraziiskikh issledovaniy — Journal of Eurasian Studies*, 14(1), 65–80. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1177/18793665221149749> [in Russian].
- 37 Shakhanova, A. (2019). Tsivilizatsionnaia gibridnost vo vneshnei politike Kazakhstana [Civilizational Hybridity in Kazakhstan's Foreign Policy]. *Central Asian Survey*, 38(3), 345–360. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/02634937.2019.1635184> [in Russian].

Information about the author

Kabdollanova Aigerim — PhD student, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4100-6612>