

**PHILOSOPHICAL FOUNDATIONS AND ACTUAL PROBLEMS OF THE
CONTENT SATURATION OF THE EDUCATIONAL COURSE “GLOBAL
STUDIES” IN MODERN RUSSIAN HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS**

**FUNDAMENTOS FILOSÓFICOS E PROBLEMAS ATUAIS DA SATURAÇÃO DOS
CONTEÚDOS DO CURSO DE FORMAÇÃO “ESTUDOS GLOBAIS” NOS
ESTABELECIMENTOS DE ENSINO SUPERIOR RUSSOS MODERNO**

**FUNDAMENTOS FILOSÓFICOS Y PROBLEMAS ACTUALES DE LA SATURACIÓN
DE CONTENIDOS DEL CURSO EDUCATIVO “ESTUDIOS GLOBALES” EN LOS
MODERNOS CENTROS DE ENSEÑANZA SUPERIOR RUSOS**



Alexey YAKOVLEV¹
e-mail: alexey.yakovlev@mymail.academy



Alexei VOSKRESENKY²
e-mail: alexei.voskresenskiy@mymail.academy



Anastasia SHEVCHENKOVA³
e-mail: anastasia.shevchenkova@mymail.academy



Evgeniy IVANOV⁴
e-mail: evgeniy.ivanov@mymail.academy

How to reference this paper:

YAKOVLEV, A.; VOSKRESENKY, A.; SHEVCHENKOVA, A.; IVANOV, E. Philosophical foundations and actual problems of the content saturation of the educational course “Global Studies” in modern Russian higher educational institutions. **Nuances: Estudos sobre Educação**, Presidente Prudente, v. 36, n. 00, e025004, 2025. e-ISSN: 2236-0441. DOI: 10.32930/nuances.v36i00.10899



| **Submitted:** 02/02/2025
| **Revisions required:** 01/03/2025
| **Approved:** 27/03/2025
| **Published:** 01/04/2025

Editors: Prof. Dr. Rosiane de Fátima Ponce
Prof. Dr. Paulo César de Almeida
Raboni

Deputy Executive Editor: Prof. Dr. José Anderson Santos Cruz

¹ Instituto de Filosofia Humana, Universidade Pedagógica Estatal Herzen da Rússia, São Petersburgo – Rússia. Professor Associado do Departamento de Filosofia.

² Instituto de Filosofia Humana, Universidade Pedagógica Estatal Herzen da Rússia, São Petersburgo – Rússia. Professor Associado do Departamento de Antropologia Filosófica e História da Filosofia.

³ Instituto de Filosofia Humana, Universidade Pedagógica Estatal Herzen da Rússia, São Petersburgo – Rússia. Assistente no Departamento de Antropologia Filosófica e História da Filosofia.

⁴ Instituto de Filosofia Humana, Universidade Pedagógica Estatal Herzen da Rússia, São Petersburgo – Rússia. Assistente no Departamento de Filosofia.

ABSTRACT: This study examines the philosophical, ideological, and political factors shaping global stability and their impact on education and international relations. Using a multidisciplinary approach, it contrasts Russian cosmism with Western liberal ideologies, analyzing key thinkers like Fedorov and Florensky. The research highlights how global studies curricula reflect a shift from unipolar to multipolar frameworks, emphasizing the enrichment of education through cultural and national identity. Case studies, including Russia’s “pivot to the East” and “One Belt, One Road” participation, illustrate the practical impacts of multipolarity. Findings suggest that Russia’s emphasis on traditional values and multipolarity is reshaping global relations, challenging Western dominance. The transition to a multipolar order calls for collaborative and inclusive strategies rooted in cultural diversity.

KEYWORDS: Global Studies. Educational Curriculum. Multipolarity. Russian Cosmism. Educational Philosophy.

RESUMO: *Este estudo examina os fatores filosóficos, ideológicos e políticos que moldam a estabilidade global e seu impacto na educação e nas relações internacionais. Utilizando uma abordagem multidisciplinar, contrasta o cosmismo russo com as ideologias liberais ocidentais, analisando pensadores-chave como Fedorov e Florensky. A investigação destaca como os currículos de Estudos Globais refletem uma transição de quadros unipolares para multipolares, enfatizando o enriquecimento da educação por meio da identidade cultural e nacional. Estudos de caso, incluindo a participação da Rússia no “pivô para o Leste” e na iniciativa “Uma Faixa, Uma Rota”, ilustram os impactos práticos da multipolaridade. Os resultados sugerem que a ênfase da Rússia nos valores tradicionais e na multipolaridade está remodelando as relações globais, desafiando o domínio ocidental. A transição para uma ordem multipolar exige estratégias de colaboração e inclusão baseadas na diversidade cultural.*

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Estudos Globais. Currículo Educacional. Multipolaridade. Cosmismo Russo. Filosofia da Educação.*

RESUMEN: *Este estudio examina los factores filosóficos, ideológicos y políticos que configuran la estabilidad mundial y su repercusión en la educación y las relaciones internacionales. Utilizando un enfoque multidisciplinar, contrasta el cosmismo ruso con las ideologías liberales occidentales, analizando a pensadores clave como Fedorov y Florensky. La investigación pone de relieve cómo los planes de estudios globales reflejan un cambio de los marcos unipolares a los multipolares, haciendo hincapié en el enriquecimiento de la educación a través de la identidad cultural y nacional. Los estudios de casos, incluido el “pivote hacia el Este” de Rusia y la participación en “Un cinturón, una ruta”, ilustran las repercusiones prácticas de la multipolaridad. Las conclusiones sugieren que el énfasis de Rusia en los valores tradicionales y la multipolaridad está remodelando las relaciones mundiales, desafiando el dominio occidental. La transición a un orden multipolar exige estrategias de colaboración e integración basadas en la diversidad cultural.*

PALABRAS CLAVE: *Estudios Globales. Currículo Educativo. Multipolaridad. Cosmismo Ruso. Filosofía de la Educación.*

Introduction

In the context of the rapid advance of phenomenal transformations in the international situation on a global scale, the need for a substantial saturation of educational resources on the problems of Globalistics is becoming increasingly urgent (Volkova, 2023; Yespolova; Ybyraimzhanov; Mussabekova, 2019). To this day, the fundamental principles of the state, as an effective and sustainable social organism, remain unchanged in their essential purposes. The functions that the state assumed as stabilizers and guarantors of continuity were already present in ancient civilizations (Guzeeva, 2023; Polovchenko, 2021). Thus, protection against external threats has been and continues to be an essential element for the preservation of the human community throughout history, from primitive clans and tribes to the Greek polis and the modern state. The traditions of protecting society, its internal integrity and unity, as well as the conditions that ensure its very existence, have a rich history and various forms of implementation. “N.Y. Danilevsky compared the state to a solid shell, emphasizing that without a core, this shell would be useless” (Sharipov, 2017, p. 431).

The protection of society, and in particular the state, involves significant moral complexity. The need to preserve freedom, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and an independent and dignified way of life for the people, as well as cultural values, constitutes the primary function of the state, which must guarantee its effectiveness in defending society against external violence and destruction.

Even an opponent of war and defender of peace, such as the Russian religious-cosmic philosopher Fedorov, recognized the realities of the modern world and justified the need to defend the state as long as humanity, its nature, its basic needs, and its traditions were not transformed.

Our history is both civil and sacred; as a history of struggle, it is civil; as a history of the sermon “thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not fight,” it will not yet become sacred, it will not be Christian, but it will remain ancient. Humanity will not stop killing and fighting and, on the contrary, will continue to perfect the invention of lethal weapons (the invention of gunpowder inaugurates a new historical era) to protect the wealth accumulated thanks to progress (Fedorov, 1995, p. 147-148).

Reflection on Russia’s historical and cultural experience, represented by a broad spectrum of Russian thinkers such as Solovyov, Florensky, Karsavin, Khomyakov, Danilevsky,

Ilyin, and Fedorov, when incorporated into the development of educational courses in global studies, makes it possible to enrich the syllabus and broaden the conceptual bases and meanings of global processes beyond the perspectives proposed by Western countries.

Given this context, education stands out as an essential domain for interpreting, analyzing, and transmitting the complex processes that drive global transformations. The field of Global Studies has the potential to establish connections between philosophical and political reflections and pedagogical practice, allowing students to critically engage with the ideological and cultural changes that shape international relations. Thus, the development of educational content in Global Studies should not be limited to descriptive overviews of global trends but should also stimulate critical thinking, intercultural dialog, and value-based reasoning.

In Russian higher education, the incorporation of philosophical traditions, such as Russian cosmism, into Global Studies programs represents an opportunity to diversify epistemological references and resist the hegemony of Western narratives. By integrating these perspectives into the curriculum, educational institutions can promote a deeper understanding of national identity, civilizational dialogue, and the role of cultural heritage in global cooperation. In this way, the inclusion of content rooted in the national philosophical discourse in Global Studies is not only a political or ideological undertaking but also a pedagogical imperative aimed at training students as global, reflective, and responsible citizens.

The aim of this study is to critically analyze the philosophical, ideological, and political factors that influence global stability and to investigate how these factors can contribute to the development of educational content in Global Studies programs in higher education.

Methodology

This study takes a multidisciplinary approach, combining philosophical research, political analysis, and educational theory. It critically examines globalism and multipolarity from the perspective of Russian cosmism, contrasting these ideas with Western liberal ideologies. Texts by key figures such as Fedorov and Florensky are analyzed in conjunction with contemporary Western theories to explore their synergies and differences.

A comparative model investigates how the content of Global Studies reflects broader ideological and cultural paradigms, emphasizing the transition from a unipolar to a multipolar model in international relations. The research uses a hermeneutic methodology to interpret

philosophical concepts and their relevance to modern education, highlighting how national and cultural identity can enrich curricula and promote a more inclusive approach.

Case studies, such as Russia's "pivot to the East" and its involvement in initiatives like "One Belt, One Road," illustrate the practical implications of multipolarity. This analysis aligns philosophical reflections with geopolitical realities, establishing connections between theory and practice to propose a culturally grounded approach to Global Studies.

Results

The idea of globalization, developed in modern Western liberal social thought, conflicts with the traditional, nationally oriented conception of state society, revealing a clear contradiction. Although on the surface, this liberal ideology seems anti-statist, directed against the predominance of state entities in international relations, in essence, it calls for the creation of a supra-state structure that not only suppresses individual differences but also eliminates national and cultural differences in the conception of social management.

This "global elimination of differences," necessary to remove the traditional state from the field of international governance, inevitably generates conflicts. It is possible to identify various regional characteristics in the perception of the Western theoretical construct—globalism—within the wider world space.

This philosophical and ideological tension between globalist homogenization and national-cultural differentiation has profound implications for educational practice. In the field of Global Studies, it is essential to critically deconstruct these conflicting views in order to promote a more comprehensive and inclusive curriculum. When educational content uncritically reflects Western liberal interpretations of globalization, there is a risk of marginalizing alternative civilizational experiences and epistemologies. It is, therefore, essential to reformulate the pedagogical approach of Global Studies, incorporating diverse philosophical traditions—such as those rooted in Russian thought—which prioritize cultural sovereignty, the preservation of identity, and pluralism.

In the countries leading the construction of the "New World Order," the imperatives of globalism are sustained by the ruling class, driven by the success of privatized technical industrialization and computerization, which allows it to make significant profits on a global scale. At the same time, the protection and control structures of national states represent an undeniable threat to this global elite. The aim of the globalist project is to transform national

political leaders into a buying social stratum, economically linked and benefiting from access to the highest civilizational advantages provided by the ruling globalist elite. These global economic and political dynamics also influence the content and orientation of higher education, especially in the social sciences and international studies. Educational institutions can inadvertently become vehicles for the reproduction of globalist ideologies when curricula emphasize market-oriented perspectives and neglect national and cultural contexts. Thus, revising the Global Studies programs to include a critical reflection on these power structures is essential for forming independent and analytically prepared graduates.

As far as the majority of the population in developed Western countries is concerned, the elite policy aims to preserve the high standard of living achieved during the period of extensive technological development between the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 21st century, compared to other regions. However, the economic indicators of the last two decades suggest that the dynamics and sustainability of the development of societies that once enjoyed “universal well-being” are increasingly slowing down. The general standard of living is declining, and the corporate profit rate increasingly depends on attracting large contingents of low-paid migrants, often illegally. Growing marginalization, a significant increase in drug use, corruption, and practically legalized lobbying in Western societies indicate a growing movement by economic elites to assimilate openly criminal profit-making mechanisms—at the cost of reducing the standard of living of the main social stratum in these societies: the smallholder class.

The growing challenges faced by traditionally leading countries in the global economy mean that the architects of the globalist project are seeking to act even more actively on the international stage, expanding their sphere of influence, especially over states that possess strategic resources—whether natural or geopolitical. In this way, a “new expansionism” factor can be identified, which manifests itself in the move away from the neocolonial practices developed during the period of technological domination and in the advance of global structures of production, information, and ideology. The main leader of this globalist movement is the United States of America, which established itself as the central power of the Western world during the Cold War and the confrontation between the Western liberal-democratic model and the socialist model of the Soviet Union.

Since the emergence of the “Monroe Doctrine,” the bicentennial of whose announcement to the US Congress was celebrated on December 2, 2023, US foreign policy has

been based on the moral justification of US interference in the internal affairs of other countries. However, unlike the “Monroe Doctrine,” which became a model of distinction similar to the Treaty of Tordesillas, the moral principle was not associated with religious proselytism, but rather with the declared differences between “political systems,” which, according to the doctrine, determined the “principles of justice,” ensuring peace, security and the response to any “manifestation hostile to the United States” (United States, 1920, p. 2-3). It is significant that Monroe’s message to Congress was initially motivated by an official request from the Russian government, transmitted by the US ambassador in St. Petersburg, proposing the establishment of zones of interest in North America (United States, 1920, p. 1).

At the same time, the well-known religious rhetoric developed during the colonization of North America by English Protestant dissidents and the idea of the “Shining City on the Hill” have always been preserved as defining and structuring elements of North American political ideology. Incorporating such case studies into the educational content allows students to critically evaluate how foreign policy narratives are constructed and justified. This approach also promotes the development of analytical skills, enabling students to decode the interaction between moral rhetoric and geopolitical strategy in global governance.

The predominance of the political component in international relations can be seen in the competition between the “capitalist West,” led by the United States after the Second World War, and the socialist project of the Soviet Union, as well as in the liberal-democratic globalist project that followed the collapse of the USSR, intensively developed on an ideological level since the 1970s.

The crisis of this project, based on the economic, military, political, and ideological leadership of the United States, defines and determines the current theoretical and practical problems of international relations. It was this crisis that gave rise to increasingly expansionist forms of justification for US military intervention and that of its Western European allies, not only in the internal affairs of other countries, but also in the direct overthrow of political regimes considered undesirable by the leaders of the Western world and in the assassination of democratically elected heads of state.

Kagan’s speeches in the first decade of the 21st century are noteworthy in this context. In his essays on modern history, he defends the application of the “law of the jungle” in international relations and links the affirmation of democracy to openly despotic forms of liberal interventionism. The very titles of Kagan’s books are revealing, reflecting the whole

spectrum of ideological justification for US expansionism: *Of Paradise and Power: America and Europe in the New World Order* (Kagan, 2004), *The World America Made* (Kagan, 2012), and *The Jungle Grows Back: America and Our Imperiled World* (Kagan, 2018). The similarity between the words *imperiled* (threatened) and *imperial* in the title of the last book mentioned is no coincidence, since the project of a “hierarchy of global domination” developed by the author correlates directly with the idea of empire, in which the center of power regulates relations with its satellites. Kagan puts Western Europe on the first level, Japan, and the small “Asian tigers” on the second. At a new level of this system are the countries of Eastern Europe, considered vectors of US new imperial policy on the borders of the Russian Federation—a rival defeated in the Cold War, but which still preserves a geopolitical and economic potential that could pose a threat (Petrovsky, 2012, p. 225-226).

The other side of this global confrontation is also structured hierarchically. The latest US national security doctrines constantly classify as “threats” to certain countries that challenge the liberal-democratic monopoly of the United States and the West as a whole. At different levels of this categorization are practically all states that conduct an independent international policy and preserve national and cultural characteristics in their political programs. The People’s Republic of China, India, and the Russian Federation are, to a greater or lesser extent, targets of US neocolonial imperial policy.

In general, the vision of the crisis leads the US ideologues of the unipolar world order, Pax Americana, to turn to the Western philosophical tradition. It is significant that Plato (1972, p. 73), when describing the social structure in the dialogue *Laws*, characterizes relations between states as a war of “all against all,” pointing to the inevitability of conflicts and the need to protect society from external attacks.

A similar consideration of war can be found in Aristotle (2012, p. 38), a disciple of Plato, who saw it as an inherent characteristic of the human community, with the purpose of establishing the best government. Thus, among the classics of ancient philosophy, conflict reflects, on the one hand, the struggle between different social formations, in which one tradition clashes with another, and, on the other, the conflicting essence of social life itself. However, in US ideology, a far-reaching conclusion is drawn from this reflection: the need to suppress any social forms that are openly considered “antidemocratic.” On this point, the Christian-Catholic intellectual tradition of Western thought offers support to the defenders of globalism.

Before the fall of the Roman Empire, Christian preachers were guided by the commandment “Thou shalt not kill,” urging their followers to refuse military service. Origen (185-254) preached: “The spears with which we used to fight, we have turned into sickles; we will no longer raise the sword against any nation... for Christ has made us children of peace.” Clement of Alexandria (150-215) exhorted:

Living in peace is the highest form of justice [...] Let’s learn to wield the weapons of peace. Let us protect ourselves with the shield of justice, raise the sword of faith, and put the helmet of salvation on our heads. Let us also take up the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God. This is our weapon, which will not cause bloody wounds (Chatfield; Ilyukhina, 1993, p. 51).

However, when the Church began to assume a number of significant state functions, pacifist rhetoric could no longer be applied on an absolute scale. Augustine, in a sermon to his centurion son, quoted words from the Gospel of Luke:

If the Christian religion prohibited wars as a whole, those who sought salvation advice in the Gospel [soldiers] would be instructed to abandon their weapons and withdraw from military service. However, they were told: “Do not extort... and be content with your wages” (Luke 3:14). And since they were ordered to be content with their wages, this means that there was no objection to military service (Thomas Aquinas, 2011, p. 498).

At the beginning of the Christian period, the Church imposed restrictions on “barbaric” methods of conquest and maintaining power in the territories of the former world empire, in opposition to civilized Roman norms. Before long, however, real wars were being fought under the leadership of the Church, whose ideological justification differed little from the ideology of the wars against barbarism in antiquity. The categorical pacifist tradition of the commandment “Thou shalt not kill” was organically replaced by the militant ideology of “Holy War” for the “Peace of God,” demonstrating the adaptability of the traditional Christian worldview to the demands of social reality. The West, as in ancient times, has begun the fight against Eastern “barbarism,” now called “impiety.”

During the Crusades and the Spanish Reconquista, the concepts of military “valor,” “honor,” and “victory on the battlefield” returned to the vocabulary of Christian morality. Combined with the traditional “barbarian” vision of the one who destroyed Rome, these concepts were transformed into a peculiar tradition of “chivalry” based on the ideas of

protecting the faith and “spiritual salvation” of the pagan peoples defeated during the armed struggle, regardless of their culture, history, and way of life.

The unification of the ancient and medieval traditions of a rational attitude towards the struggle for power in favor of European values, which occurred during the Renaissance, resulted in the formulation of the principle of moralism by European thinkers, a principle that neither Machiavelli nor Hobbes adopted in justifying war. As Dilthey (2013, p. 29-30) observed, “The idea of evolution or the development of humanity is completely foreign to Machiavelli. He belongs to those who, based on the thesis of the homogeneity of men in all times, prepared, in the 16th century, the derivation of a system of cultural forms from human nature”. At the same time, Machiavelli distances himself from moral considerations that are not inherent to nature, opposing social dynamics to natural traditionalism.

Similarly, in Hobbes’ *Leviathan* the “war of all against all”, inherent in the natural state, and the rational opposition to its chaos become conditions for the formation of a stable social order, as well as political and public institutions. However, it was the English Protestants who founded colonies in North America who placed natural moral sense at the center of the justification of the international politics of states, transforming European rationalism into a form of ideological manipulation.

The ideology of liberal democracy, in its modern version of American globalism, has undergone a similar transformation into its opposite. Thus, in Nash, one of the main developers of the theory of “soft power,” we can see the need for an ideal and rational basis for the state. “The nightmare of our contemporary,” writes Manning Nash (1989, p. 128-129), “is the absence of the roots of the state to which you belong, the loneliness, the alienation, the feeling of being lost in the world of organized others”. However, according to Nash, this individual feeling of anxiety should not be eliminated by restoring the reality of state social existence but rather through methods of ideological pressure, unification of culture, and the creation in society of the image of a global Leviathan—a true supranational subject of violence. According to another liberal thinker, Bowdon (1989, p. 11), “ideology is a ‘natural ingredient’ of social life, the ‘glue of social structures.’” In the theory and practice of modern liberalism, the intrastate social forms that emerge spontaneously can no longer guarantee the socialization of all members of society, leaving room for outcasts who, for one reason or another, do not fit into the general collective being.

In this way, classical moral principles, which presuppose the value of each individual life in all its diversity and differences, end up turning into their opposite among American liberals, who agree with the exclusion from public life of entire social groups associated with the traditional state. Phenomena in modern Western socialism, especially in the US, such as the LGBT+ movement, BLM, and various “cancellation cultures,” demonstrate the practice of the liberal ideological dictate and its demand for unification in the entire social sphere, from the individual to humanity as a whole. These ideological shifts have important implications for education, especially in the way global political narratives are presented and debated in university classrooms. It is essential that Global Studies curricula encourage students to critically examine the ideological bases of international theories, going beyond superficial neutrality to analyze how concepts such as liberal democracy, soft power, and cultural unification shape global educational discourse. This reflexive approach helps students develop historical awareness and critical literacy in navigating contemporary global ideologies.

The agents of this scenario also manifest themselves at the level of international relations—countries that refuse to accept the political-ideological, economic, and cultural unification dictated by neocolonial imperial globalism. At the same time, the actual adherence of state entities to democratic and/or liberal values plays no role in the imposition of political and ideological labels, which are widely disseminated by the global media and internet networks.

The internal contradictions, both logical and rational, of modern American globalism, together with the informational noise that suffocates any reasonable voice both in the West and beyond its borders, undoubtedly lead to practical failures both in the field of international relations and in the internal political affairs of contemporary adherents of liberalism. If, at the turn of the 20th to the 21st century, American political, military, and ideological power could not be questioned due to successful actions in the international arena—in Yugoslavia, Iraq, and Afghanistan and the effective conduct of anti-Russian political coups in the countries of the former USSR—in the last decade, American expansionism has suffered more and more localized defeats.

The events in Libya have already shown the world the most negative consequences of Western military expansion, triggering a chain reaction of “migration crises” in Europe, later aggravated by the “Syrian episode.” The situation in Ukraine after 2014 highlighted the military weakness of the West and the economic failure of the sanctions policy.

In view of the active process of confrontation between the unipolar and multipolar (or polycentric) projects of world order, as well as the fact that the unipolar project is based on a common tradition of Western philosophical thought, it makes sense to turn to the Russian philosophical heritage—more precisely, to that part of it that considers the meaning of human existence in the context of global processes. Attention to the individual not as an average being, reduced to economic and political functions, but as someone who seeks a value-oriented existence and maintains a strong connection with the spiritual, moral, and cultural heritage of their ancestors characterizes Russian thought as prepared for dialogue with the world and open to the possibility of recognizing the same characteristics in the originality of other cultures.

One of the most significant ideas in Russian philosophy is that of universal unity. Undoubtedly, this idea, in its historical version, is oriented by Orthodox Christianity, but it should be noted that it presents itself as an alternative to Western individualism, utilitarianism, and the orientation towards unification Florensky (1996), in discussing the crisis of Christianity, writes:

We know that the Spirit is One, but there are many manifestations; however, this knowledge has not been fully assimilated by us, and we always want to recognize only one manifestation of the Spirit - the one that is habitual for us in the present - minimizing all the others or not even recognizing them as fruits of the Spirit (Florensky, 1996, p. 554-555).

There is no missionary *pathos* in the orientation toward universal unity; one person is not required to convert everyone else to their faith, because universal unity operates more like an optic, through which all of humanity is seen as potentially united in its essence. Thus, at the local level, this approach makes it possible to build a dialog outside the paradigm of domination over the other participants.

Of particular interest, in the context of the current reinterpretation of the Western conception of globalism, is the project of common work proposed by Fedorov. The philosopher's religious reflections are aimed at building a creative situation in which humanity is united, above all, by common spiritual and practical goals: the regulation of nature (seen as the bearer of death and destruction), the transformation (resurrection) of the dead and the transition of the evolutionary process from an unconscious to a conscious mode. This "work of salvation" contributes to overcoming the individual limitations of the human being and his communion with the entire human race, without him dissolving into the collective, but rather

through a universal kinship acquired by the cooperation between human and divine forces. The moral sense exported by the West, formulated according to the canons of classical European rationality, gives way in Fedorov's work to the fundamental feeling of kinship and solidarity—the thinker proposes “living not for oneself, not for others, but with all and for all,” because living for oneself “[...] means sacrificing the lives of others for oneself”, while living for others means “sacrificing one's own life for others” (Fedorov, 2019, p. 8).

Taken literally, Fedorov's project can undoubtedly be perceived as utopian; however, considered an “event of thought” and a specific configuration of national self-determination in the context of globalization, it opens up new strategies for creating life in the face of restructuring the world order.

In this scenario, the need to create a multipolar world based on real democratic procedures and a genuine international liberal order, which takes into account the state and cultural characteristics and national values of the members of the international community—a principle long advocated by Russia's political leadership—becomes especially relevant. The idea of a new statism, of a return to the ideals of internal self-development of social structures according to their historical traditions, allowed them to preserve a unique state identity over the centuries and millennia, even in the face of conflicts and confrontations in the international arena, not only opposes the globalist project of dictatorial unification led by the United States, which uses it to maintain its dominant position, but also gradually comes to constitute a new ideological benchmark.

These are the national states and federations which, in their universality, “welcome” all citizens, giving them common and uniform rights and duties. Zhukotskaya (1998, p. 48) figuratively describes this function of the state, state power, and ideology: “Just as nature is a necessary condition for our life, the state, the government and the ideology that sustains them are an expression of our social nature [...]” In the ideal project, supranational structures are not global, but rather geared towards the interests of individual states, having regional relevance and value and affecting global civilizational development only indirectly, prospectively, but not necessarily.

Final considerations

In light of the above, we can talk about the gradual creation of new forms of rationality in interstate relations, capable of overcoming the predominance of the Eurocentric and

fragmented conception of rationality and its historicity. The civilizational and state development trajectories of China, India, the Arab world, and, in the future, other global regions can and must be part of the common history of the modern world on equal terms. The economic, political, and cultural realities of our time indicate that the era of the expansionist dictates of liberal globalism is coming to an end, and no ideological artifice can hide the fundamental contradictions of the idea of American global domination, nor its destructive impact on the entire system of international relations, including the main institutions of international law and order, which end up becoming a parody of themselves.

The Russian Federation, which is currently waging a real struggle against the globalist West for the future of its state-civilizational project, based on traditional and family values, seeks to preserve true human nature in the face of the inhuman projects of its “reconstruction” in Western liberal societies. It also strives to maintain and develop cultural, regional, and state uniqueness based on public consensus. This effort is finding increasing support on the world stage, despite the long predominance of globalist ideology, supported by Western and pro-Western supporters of the unipolar world order.

Civilized, respectful, and culturally oriented international relations, to which the Russian leadership pays special attention, require joint efforts in all spheres, including the economy. In the past, economic rationale, rational organization, and effective management were the forces that led European civilization to global leadership; today, however, globalist ideological objectives actively prevent new players from joining, on equal terms, a system that benefits from international cooperation. This is why support for the Chinese “One Belt One Road” project is so significant for Russia, just as the “Russian turn to the East” is perceived as a necessity at all levels of Russian society. The dynamics of this process do not appear to be without conflict, as various aspects have to be taken into account—both the challenges related to the organization of a new multipolar order by potential stakeholders and the actively opposing forces, which reap significant dividends from the current order and promote their vision of a globalist future. The road to achieving multipolarity is still in its early stages, and its magnitude does not imply revolutionary changes, but rather meticulous rationalization and implementation work.

In this context, the field of education—especially higher education—plays a strategic role in shaping the intellectual tools and values needed to navigate the transition of the world order. Global Studies, as an interdisciplinary field, must evolve beyond descriptive models of

globalization, actively engaging students in the critical analysis of civilizational diversity, epistemological plurality, and geopolitical transformations. Incorporating alternative philosophical traditions, such as Russian cosmism and multipolar thinking, into academic curricula enables learners to interpret global realities through culturally rooted lenses, fostering intercultural competence, critical awareness, and civic responsibility in future global citizens.

REFERENCES

ARISTOTLE. **Politika** [Politics]. Moscow: AST, 2012. 393 p.

BOWDON, R. **The analysis of ideology**. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989.

CHATFIELD, C.; ILYUKHINA, R. M. (eds.). **Mir**: Al'ternativy voyne ot antichnosti do kontsa Vtoroy Mirovoy Voyny [Peace: Alternatives to war from antiquity to the end of World War II. Anthology]. Moscow: Nauka, 1993.

DILTHEY, V. **Vozzreniye na mir i issledovaniye cheloveka so vremen Vozrozhdeniya i Reformatsii** [View of the world and the study of man since the Renaissance and Reformation]. 2nd ed. Moscow: Center for Humanitarian Initiatives, 2013.

FEDOROV, N. F. **“Zhit’ so vsemi i dlya vsekh”**: Aforizmy i fragmenty [“To live with all and for all”: Aphorisms and fragments]. Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt, 2019.

FEDOROV, N. F. **Sobraniye sochineniy**: v 4-kh tomakh [Essays in 4 vols.]. Moscow: Progress, 1995. v. 1.

FLORENSKY, P. A. **Sochineniya v 4 t.** [Works in 4 vols.] Moscow: Mysl, 1996. v. 2.

GUZEEVA, O. Rights and obligations of the state as a participant of criminal law relations. **Legal Bulletin**, v. 4, n. 8, p. 76-93, 2023. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.11190367.

KAGAN, R. **O raye i sile**: Amerika i Yevropa v novom mirovom poryadke [About paradise and power: America and Europe in the new world order]. Moscow: ROSSPAN, 2004.

KAGAN, R. **The jungle grows back**: America and our imperiled world. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2018.

KAGAN, R. **The world America made**. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2012.

NASH, M. **Cauldron ethnicity in the modern world**. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

PETROVSKY, V. F. **Doktrina “natsional’noy bezopasnosti” v global’noy strategii SSHA** [The doctrine of “national security” in the US global strategy]. Moscow: International Relations, 2012.

PLATO. Zakony [Laws]. *In: Sochineniya [Obras]*. Moscow: Mysl, 1972. v. 3, pt. 2.

POLOVCHENKO, K. A. Constitutional foundations of the security system in a modern state. **International Journal of Electronic Security and Digital Forensics**, v. 13, n. 4, p. 390-402, 2021.

SHARIPOV, A. M. Gosudarstvennoye obespecheniye preyemstvennosti sotsiokul'turnogo razvitiya natsii [State provision of continuity of socio-cultural development of the nation]. *In: RASTORGUEV, V. N. (ed.). Traditsionalizm v epokhu revolyutsiy: Kul'turnaya politika i tsivilizatsionnyy vybor: Kollektivnaya monografiya po materialam XIV Mezhdunarodnykh Panarinskikh chteniy [Traditionalism in the era of revolutions: Cultural policy and civilizational choice: A collective monograph based on the materials of the XIV International Panarin readings]*. Moscow: Russian Research Institute of Cultural and Natural Heritage named after D.S. Likhachev, 2017.

THOMAS AQUINAS. Vopros 40. The voyne [Question 40. About the war]. *In: Summa theologii [The sum of theology]*. Kiev: Nika-center, 2011. en. 2-2.

UNITED STATES. President (1817-1825: Monroe). **The Monroe Doctrine**: Also, Jefferson's letter to Monroe. Santa Barbara: University of California, 1920.

VOLKOVA, P. S. Iskusstvo v aspekte dialoga. K voprosu o filosofii obrazovaniya [Art in the aspect of dialog. On the question of educational philosophy]. **Art Criticism**, n. 1, p. 6-14, 2023.

YESPOLOVA, G.; YBYRAIMZHANOV, K.; MUSSABEKOVA, G. Research competence of pupils as the component of content of education. **Opcion**, v. 35, n. 88, p. 948-961, 2019.

ZHUKOTSKAYA, A. V. **Problema ideologii**: Sotsial'no-philosofskiy analiz [The problem of ideology: Socio-philosophical analysis]. Dissertation (Doctor of Philosophy) - Moscow State University, Moscow, 1998.

CRediT Author Statement

- **Acknowledgements:** The authors express their sincere gratitude to the editorial team of *Nuances: Estudos sobre Educação* and to the anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments and insightful recommendations, which contributed significantly to improving the clarity, focus, and academic quality of this article.
 - **Funding:** This study was carried out using internal funding from the Herzen State Pedagogical University of Russia (project no. 22VG) entitled “*Architectonics of University Education and the Ideas of Russian Cosmism: Dialogue of Values and Semantic Constants in the Post-Global World*”.
 - **Conflicts of interest:** The authors declare that there are no conflicts of interest related to the publication of this article.
 - **Ethical approval:** This study did not involve human subjects or use data requiring ethical approval.
 - **Data and material availability:** All the data and reference materials used in this study are available from the sources cited. No additional data sets were generated or analyzed during the preparation of this article.
 - **Authors’ contributions:** All authors contributed equally to the conceptual development, literature review, and writing of the manuscript. Each author was actively involved in analyzing the philosophical and educational dimensions of Global Studies, as well as revising and refining the final version of the article for publication.
-

Processing and editing: Editora Ibero-Americana de Educação
Proofreading, formatting, standardization and translation

