

RESEARCH
ARTICLE

On the Subject and Status of Global Studies

Alexander
Chumakov

Doctor of Philosophy, Professor

Head of the Department of Philosophy, Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation; First Vice-President of the Russian Philosophical Society

Russian Federation

Orcid: 0000-0002-6513-5585

Doi Serial

<https://doi.org/10.56334/sei/8.9.15>

Keywords

Global studies, globalization, global problems, interdisciplinarity, wholeness, social development, integration.

Abstract

This article examines the evolution and current state of global studies as an interdisciplinary field dedicated to understanding the complex processes of globalization and the global challenges they engender. It highlights the historical development of global studies, tracing its roots before the widespread use of the term "globalization," and underscores the foundational contributions of various scientific, philosophical, and cultural perspectives. The study outlines major thematic directions within global studies, including socio-natural, cultural, and philosophical approaches, emphasizing their interconnectedness and the need for integrative methodologies. The article also discusses the shifting focus from isolated global problems to comprehensive analyses of globalization processes and their socio-political implications. Finally, it addresses methodological and conceptual challenges inherent in defining the scope of global studies and stresses its crucial role in fostering a unified understanding and coordinated response to humanity's shared global destiny.

Citation

Chumakov, A. (2025). On the Subject and Status of Global Studies. *Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems*, 8(9), 161–169. <https://doi.org/10.56334/sei/8.9.15>

Issue: <https://imcra-az.org/archive/383-science-education-and-innovations-in-the-context-of-modern-problems-issue-9-vol-8-2025.html>

Licensed

© 2025 The Author(s). Published by Science, Education and Innovations in the context of modern problems (SEI) by IMCRA - International Meetings and Journals Research Association (Azerbaijan). This is an open access article under the **CC BY** license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Received: 21.05.2025

Accepted: 04.06.2025

Published: 18.07.2025 (available online)

Introduction

The emergence of global studies (*globalistics*) as a new scientific field dates back to the last quarter of the 20th century. It was largely driven by the integration of various scientific disciplines in addressing complex, multifaceted problems of a global nature. Although the term *globalistics* had already been in use during the 1970s, its conceptual significance only began to be seriously discussed in the late 1990s, when scholarly attention shifted from global problems to a more thorough understanding of the phenomenon of globalization. By that time, terms such as "global world," "global problems," and "global risks" had already become widespread not only in academic literature, the media, and political discourse, but also in everyday language. New concepts—*globalistics*, *globalization*, *globalism*, and *anti-globalism*—began to enter scientific circulation as well.

Today, while the general public may assume a shared understanding of these terms, in academic contexts their meanings remain contested and subject to clarification, as different scholars assign different interpretations to them. Some consider globalistics a scientific discipline, others view it as a branch of scientific knowledge, and still others define it as a transdisciplinary field. There is also debate over whether global problems preceded globalization, or whether the reverse is true. Some scholars regard globalization as an objective process, while globalistics is tasked with

studying this process and its consequences. Others interpret globalization as the result of specific socio-political forces acting on the international stage, which leads to fundamentally different perspectives on the nature and purpose of globalistics.

The divergence of views on the definition of key categories in globalistics should not be seen as mere scholasticism. Rather, it reflects a complex and painstaking effort to develop a shared language for interdisciplinary dialogue. It is important to note that the term *globalistics* arose amid widespread discussions and publications concerning global threats, particularly following the release of early reports by the Club of Rome. Initially, the term referred only to a body of scientific knowledge related to the study of global problems. This occurred a couple of decades before the widespread use of the term *globalization*. The term *anti-globalism* did not enter common use until the late 20th century, when international anti-globalization movements began to attract attention through provocative protest actions that quickly gained widespread media coverage.

The task of systematizing this terminological array is now an urgent priority. The status of globalistics—its categories, principles, and methodologies—has become a fundamental issue. This is evident in the term *globalization*, which is generally used to describe integrative and disintegrative processes on a planetary scale in the realms of economics, politics, and culture, as well as anthropogenic changes to the environment. These processes are global in form and affect the interests of the entire world community in content. However, two extremes can be identified in the interpretation of both the phenomenon of globalization and the history of its emergence.

One extreme involves an unjustified expansion of the concept of global social ties, projecting such relationships back to primitive societies and thus characterizing early stages of human development as global. This view is exemplified in the works of A.P. Nazaretyan. The other extreme is an overly narrow interpretation of globalization, whereby contemporary social developments are analyzed in isolation from their deeper causes and historical genesis. This approach neglects the historical evolution of international structures and transnational connections. Within such a framework, globalization is often portrayed as a phenomenon of just the past two or three centuries—or even as a deliberately orchestrated political strategy, a subjective process allegedly pursued in the interests of a particular group. Proponents of this view speak of a “global elite,” a “behind-the-scenes international order,” or individual states (notably the United States). Among those who support this interpretation—based on their writings and public statements—are V.I. Samokhvalov, V.S. Vasiliev, A.A. Zinoviev, and others. The anti-globalist position can also be characterized as a narrow conception of globalization.

The examples of diverse perspectives on globalization presented herein do not encompass the full range of existing viewpoints on the subject. This limitation is attributed not only to the complexity of the issue itself but also to the insufficient level of scholarly development in this area. Such a state of affairs undoubtedly hampers mutual understanding among people, hinders interdisciplinary collaboration, and creates significant obstacles to comprehending the root causes of globalization and the global contradictions it generates. These difficulties also underlie many misunderstandings and conflicts, stemming from the fact that the world, in its various regions and relationships, is increasingly becoming unified, holistic, and interdependent—while effective mechanisms for regulating social relations at the global level are currently lacking. It is evident that without a deep analysis and clear understanding of the essence of globalization processes, it is difficult to expect meaningful progress in addressing the problems outlined above.

Thus, we are now faced with the imperative to define the status of global studies (globalistics), a field that has accumulated a wealth of material, undergone significant development, and is represented by a variety of schools, movements, associations, research collectives, and scholarly groups. The complex nature of the object of study and the inevitable interdisciplinarity involved significantly complicate the delineation of the subject matter, which often overlaps with other domains such as futurology, cultural studies, and philosophy. Furthermore, the theoretical knowledge produced within globalistics is frequently intertwined with the necessity of making concrete decisions, thereby expanding the boundaries of the subject under discussion.

To better understand the issue at hand, it is useful to briefly review the history of the emergence of global studies. Its origins date back to the late 1960s and early 1970s, when scholars in both Soviet and Western academic circles began to discuss the global threats facing humanity and started to actively engage with what came to be known as the “global problems of modernity.” This historical context is important to highlight, as current discourses on globalization often

show weak correlations—or none at all—with global problems and the beginnings of their scholarly investigation more than four decades ago. Globalistics is still sometimes treated as an emerging discipline, its formation mistakenly associated solely with the developments of the last decade. In this regard, it is essential to note that, although in the 1970s and 1980s the academic focus was not on globalization as a process but on its consequences—i.e., on specific global-scale problems—an integrative field of interdisciplinary research was already taking shape. This field aimed both at the theoretical investigation and practical resolution of fundamentally new threats that had revealed their significance for all humankind.

It became apparent at the time that, alongside the centuries-long differentiation of scientific knowledge, there arose a pressing need for the integration of theoretical and practical knowledge aimed at studying new phenomena characterized by their scale, systemic complexity, and interconnectivity—both within the global problems themselves and in relation to economic, social, and political spheres.

Thus, from the outset, globalistics began to form as both a fundamentally new scientific discipline—where integrative processes came to the fore—and as a sphere of public practice encompassing international politics, economics, and even ideology. The emergence of globalistics was, in many ways, a response to the challenges of the time. This was facilitated by the worsening environmental conditions that first emerged in industrialized countries and then spread elsewhere, stemming from an increasing imbalance in human-environment relations. It soon became evident that this deterioration was closely linked to other planetary-scale contradictions: the arms race, uneven socio-economic development among nations and regions, demographic issues, and more. Alongside the unprecedented pollution of the environment came alarming trends such as the uncontrolled population explosion, the relentless arms buildup, and the depletion of natural resources—all of which posed serious threats to the progressive development of society and, indeed, to life itself on Earth.

The quantitative and qualitative transformations in various spheres of social life and in the interaction between society and nature—gradually accumulating over time—reflected not only the complexity, diversity, and dynamism of the modern era but also its pronounced technocratic and scientific character. Moreover, they revealed an expansionist mindset aimed at the absolute conquest of nature. The inhumane essence of the unchecked growth of environmentally harmful industrial production and unrestrained technological progress became increasingly evident. As a result, this new area of knowledge began to dispel techno-optimistic illusions and opened the eyes of a growing number of people to the fact that the world had undergone fundamental changes. The planet had never before experienced such strain, and humanity had never entered into such deep contradictions with the very outcomes of its labor—contradictions that rendered people highly dependent on scientific and technological achievements and vulnerable to the power they themselves had unleashed. The imbalance in human-nature relations had reached critical levels, while the fragmentation and disunity of humanity in the face of global problems had become evident not only to specialists but also at the level of mass consciousness.

Early Intellectual and Institutional Foundations of Global Studies: Historical and Philosophical Context

It is worth noting that certain trends in the formation of a unified world and the transformations within it captured the attention of scholars and philosophers well before these changes became evident to broader society. Among the earliest attempts to conceptualize emerging global tendencies and the fundamentally new, universal challenges they posed, we may cite T. Malthus's ideas on the natural regulation of population growth, I. Kant's reflections on perpetual peace, J. Lamarck's views on the role of humanity in nature, and the universalist outlook of K. Marx and F. Engels as presented in *The Communist Manifesto* and other works.

For instance, in analyzing the progress of societal development, Friedrich Engels emphasized that while humanity had achieved substantial successes in mastering nature, it often failed to grasp the full significance of these achievements. Consequently, the price paid for such triumphs was frequently far higher than anticipated. Engels referenced the example of an unsystematic, short-term approach to land use in ancient Mesopotamia, Greece, and Asia Minor, which led to the disruption of ecological balance in natural systems—many of which were never restored. He wrote: "Those who cleared forests in Mesopotamia, Greece, Asia Minor, and elsewhere in search of arable land never imagined that they were initiating the process of desertification in those regions, depriving them—along with the forests—of moisture-

retaining ecosystems. Nor did they foresee that they would leave their mountain springs dry for much of the year, only to unleash torrential floods during rainy seasons.”

Furthermore, the founding of the First International in 1864 by Marx and Engels responded to the urgent need for global consolidation of political and labor forces. It served as one of the earliest precursors to the proliferation of international organizations that began to emerge in the 20th century and are now an indispensable part of global civil society.

The emergence of international organizations in the second half of the 19th century was not incidental but rather a necessary response to expanding economic and socio-political relations that exceeded the boundaries of nation-states. These developments required intergovernmental cooperation and coordination to address new transnational challenges. Alongside the First International, notable examples include the International Committee of the Red Cross (founded in 1863 by Henri Dunant) and the Universal Postal Union (established in 1874 and renamed the World Postal Union in 1878). Both exemplify early institutional responses to global coordination needs.

The First and especially the Second World War significantly accelerated the establishment of international organizations. Driven by a collective determination to prevent future global conflict, the League of Nations was established in 1919 to promote peace and international cooperation. Although it was dissolved in 1946, its mission was inherited by the newly formed United Nations (UN), whose charter was adopted in San Francisco in 1945. The UN was created to maintain peace, ensure global security, and foster international collaboration in the postwar world. However, the onset of the Cold War and the resulting ideological bifurcation of the world relegated the growing forces of globalization to the periphery of academic and political discourse for several decades.

Nevertheless, significant contributions to the theoretical understanding of global processes were made by early thinkers such as V. Solovyov, É. Leroy, P. Teilhard de Chardin, V. Vernadsky, A.L. Chizhevsky, K.E. Tsiolkovsky, A. Toynbee, K. Jaspers, B. Russell, and J. Somerville. These thinkers were particularly concerned with emerging trends that disrupted the natural balance of ecological and social systems. Drawing on the knowledge available at their time, they endeavored to explain phenomena such as global population growth, perpetual peace, proletarian internationalism, the concept of a unified divine-humanity, the noosphere, world governance, cosmopolitanism, and the threat of nuclear omnicide.

Their intellectual efforts helped lay the philosophical and scientific groundwork for the recognition that humanity—bound inseparably to the biosphere, the geographical environment, and even the cosmos—shares a common destiny and collective responsibility for the planet’s future. Vernadsky, for example, developing his theory of the noosphere in the 1930s, concluded that human transformative activity had already begun to reshape the Earth itself. He warned that unless society developed rationally and in harmony with the laws of nature, the extinction of life on Earth was inevitable. “For the first time,” he wrote, “humankind must truly recognize that it is a planetary species and must think and act not only as individuals, families, or nations—but from a planetary perspective.”

Similarly, British historian Arnold Toynbee, who examined history as the coexistence and interaction of civilizations, asserted well before the digital age that the twentieth century had ushered in a truly global history. This emphasized that not only had the foundations of social organization shifted, but the very trajectory of global social processes had changed. Thus, to the eternal philosophical questions of existence, consciousness, and the meaning of life, the modern age added a fundamentally new issue: the shared fate of humanity and the search for survival strategies for terrestrial civilization.

The rise of globalization in the second half of the twentieth century, and the intensifying interdependence it engendered, led to a renewed and deeper understanding of global challenges. A growing number of international organizations were established to address and analyze these emerging concerns. Notable among these were the Institute for the Future (Vienna, 1965), the Humanity 2000 Foundation (Netherlands, 1965), and the World Future Society (Washington, D.C., 1966). These early institutions contributed significantly to the study of global issues and their root causes.

However, it was the establishment of the Club of Rome in 1968 that truly galvanized global attention. Its early reports—*The Limits to Growth* (1972), *Mankind at the Turning Point* (1974), *Reshaping the International Order* (1974), and

Beyond the Age of Waste (1976)—gained rapid international recognition and provided the theoretical foundation for the emerging field of global studies. These reports performed not only an essential heuristic and methodological function in shaping interdisciplinary global research, but also played a crucial role in raising public awareness.

In summary, global studies (or globalistics) emerged as a distinct field of scientific inquiry and worldview by the late 1980s. Its further development was propelled by a need to understand globalization processes that had not yet been fully recognized by scholars working in the field. The key turning point came in the second half of the 1990s, following the collapse of the socialist bloc and the subsequent reordering of international relations. Only after these radical changes did the global academic and political communities begin to shift their attention from the consequences of globalization to its underlying causes. This shift ushered in a “second wave” of interest in global studies, which experienced renewed vitality through active reflection on the dynamics of globalization.

It should be emphasized that for many contemporary researchers who joined global studies during this second wave of interest, much of the earlier foundational work largely remained outside their field of vision. This was primarily due to the nearly decade-long gap between the two “waves,” which was accompanied by a rupture in former paradigms and frameworks that are now often perceived as relics of the past, unworthy of serious consideration. As a result, numerous publications have been produced by authors who present global studies as if it is a nascent discipline, lacking any substantial prior achievements. However, even before the term “globalization” became widespread, relatively clear concepts had already formed regarding the trends in the emergence of global economic and social systems as unified wholes, and the global problems they engender. The nature and genesis of global problems were identified, criteria for their classification established, and approaches to their systematization developed. Furthermore, the profound interconnections between natural and social processes were revealed, as well as the contradictions arising therefrom, which are conditioned by social, economic, political, ideological, and scientific-technical factors.

One of the most important accomplishments of global studies in its first two decades was the development of an interdisciplinary language acceptable to various scientific disciplines, along with the formulation and refinement of key, fundamental concepts and categories—such as “global problem,” “ecological crisis,” “greening of production,” “demographic explosion,” “nuclear winter,” “global interdependence,” “world community,” “new thinking,” “new humanism,” among others. A.D. Ioseliani notes: “The emergence of post-industrial, information society has entailed a cascade of changes in human existence and, most importantly, in humans themselves as agents operating under radically new life conditions and levels of communication.”

Consequently, significant transformations occurred in people’s worldview—their understanding that humans are far more dependent than previously realized on nature, the terrestrial and cosmic environment, and the evolving power relations on the world stage. It became evident that the interdependence of all spheres of social life is steadily increasing. In particular, the mutual influence of states, which, while defending strictly national interests and sovereignty, generate fundamentally new contradictions in international relations under globalization, has intensified. It was also established that the emergence and sharp exacerbation of global problems in the second half of the twentieth century were neither the result of miscalculations, fatal errors, nor intentionally chosen socio-economic development strategies. Nor were they whims of history or outcomes of natural anomalies. Rather, global changes and the resulting universal problems arose from centuries-long quantitative and qualitative transformations in both societal development and the society-nature system. Their roots lie in the history of modern civilization, which engendered a broad crisis of industrial society and its technocratically oriented culture. This crisis encompassed the entire complex of human interactions—with one another, with society, and with nature—impacting the vital interests of the entire global community.

The outcome of this development was not only a “demographic explosion” and economic globalization but also the degradation of the human environment. This environmental decline quickly manifested in the degradation of humans themselves, as their behaviors, beliefs, and mindsets proved unable to adapt promptly and adequately to the accelerating changes occurring around them. Special studies have demonstrated that the rapid advancement of socio-economic processes was driven by humanity itself and its purposeful transformative activities, amplified repeatedly by ongoing scientific and technological breakthroughs. It was found that the recent decades have witnessed more changes in the development of productive forces than many preceding centuries combined. Moreover, the pace of change accelerated continuously and was invariably accompanied by increasingly profound and fundamental transformations in socio-economic spheres.

For example, the transition from oral to written communication took humanity about 3 million years; from writing to printing—approximately 5,000 years; from printing to audiovisual media such as telephone, radio, sound recording, and television—about 500 years. In contrast, the shift from traditional audiovisual means to modern computers and space communication technologies required less than 50 years. By the end of the twentieth century, the interval from new inventions to their practical application had shrunk to months or even days. This is exemplified by the unprecedented speed and scale of the spread of the Internet, electronic mail, and mobile telephony. Simultaneously, technology, economy, and transportation—both terrestrial and maritime—have dramatically increased human mobility and transformative capacity, while the global population continues to grow at alarming rates. For context, while the world population at the start of the Common Era did not exceed 250 million, it reached 1 billion only by 1800; by 1930, 2 billion; by 1975, 4 billion; by October 1999, 6 billion; and today exceeds 7 billion people.

Consequently, there are no longer unexplored places or practically pure territories on Earth whose natural state remains unaffected, directly or indirectly, by human activity. This reality has led to referring to our planet by the early 1990s as a “common home,” “an island in the universe,” a “global village,” or the “spaceship Earth.” Problems that have become common to all humanity are deemed global problems, and their study falls within the domain of global studies.

In close connection with other social sciences that address societal processes, global studies are also intimately linked to politics and ideology. From this perspective, it is appropriate to speak of various directions and currents within global studies, which were most distinctly manifested from the late 1960s through the early 1990s. During this period, the formation and development of global studies unfolded amid the rigid confrontation between two ideologically hostile socio-economic systems. This context shaped its evolution into two main strands: “Western global studies” and “Soviet global studies.” In the last decade, ideological confrontation has been largely replaced by economic, cultural, religious, and national disagreements, which have served as the basis for dividing the world into major regions—distinct actors in international relations. Cultural and civilizational differences in understanding contemporary global trends and contradictions have come to the fore. This development has given rise to new criteria for distinguishing approaches within global studies, including Western, Eurasian, Eastern, Islamic, and others. Among the many such approaches, those most commonly encountered in the literature can be highlighted.

For example, within Western global studies, two principal currents initially stood out: “technocratic” and “technopessimistic.” Over time, their positions converged somewhat and were variably adjusted in light of differing assessments of world market development prospects. Thus, this dichotomy can now be regarded as largely conventional. Proponents of the first emphasize the broad capabilities of science and technology in resolving global contradictions, stressing the significance of scientific and technological progress for societal life (notable scholars include T. Veblen, H. Kay, W. Brown, D. Bell, A. Toffler, A. Touraine, A. Schaff, G. Friedrichs, A. Wiener, G. Scott, D. Nesbit, E. Weizsäcker, L. Lovins, R. Robertson, among others). “Technopessimists,” by contrast, attribute responsibility for the negative consequences of globalization and the exacerbation of global problems to scientific-technical progress, international capital, and transnational corporations (including H. Marcuse, D. Meadows, A. Giddens, K. Boulding, T. Friedman, T. Roszak, P. Goodman, M. Roberts, K. Davis, A. Ehrlich, U. Beck, as well as many representatives of the “new left,” environmentalists, anti-globalists, and others).

The current stage of Western global studies is characterized by what can be described as a “crossroads” between modernity and postmodernity. Observed across various so-called “modern” (developed) and “modernizing” (developing) societies, this situation reflects a convergence of modern and postmodern paradigms.

In Russian scholarship and philosophy, global studies are represented by several schools, which can be conditionally categorized as follows:

1. The “philosophical-methodological and scientific-theoretical” approach focuses on the philosophical foundations, essence, and genesis of global processes. It analyzes key socio-political and economic transformations necessary for effectively addressing global problems and the underlying dynamics. Influential contributions in this vein have been made by V.I. Vernadsky, I.T. Frolov, N.N. Moiseyev, V.A. Engelhardt, P.L. Kapitsa, E.K. Fedorov, N.N. Inozemtsev, D.M. Gvishiani, V.S. Stepin, V.V. Zagladin, G.S. Khozin, I.B. Novik, E.A. Azroyants, I.V. Bestuzhev-Lada, Yu.V. Shishkov, A.S. Panarin, A.I. Utkina, among others.

2. The **“Socio-Natural”** approach within global studies addresses a broad range of issues, among which ecological concerns and the availability of raw materials, energy, water, land, and other resources provoke the greatest anxiety. Research in this area is conducted through close collaboration among experts from natural sciences, engineering, social sciences, policy makers, industry professionals, and public figures. Their efforts focus on developing principles and methods for optimizing the interaction between society and nature, promoting the ecological transformation of production, and advocating rational natural resource management (notable contributors include A.L. Yanshin, N.F. Reymers, M.M. Kamshilov, G.V. Dobrovolsky, M.I. Budyko, V.A. Kovda, Yu.A. Izrael, A.S. Isaev, M.G. Khublaryan, V.I. Danilov-Danilyan, I.I. Mazur, V.V. Snakin, N.N. Drozdov, E.V. Girusov, A.D. Ursul, V.A. Los, N.M. Mamedov, et al.).
3. The **“Cultural Studies”** strand focuses on problems of globalization emerging in domains such as scientific and technological progress, population dynamics, healthcare, culture, law, education, and other facets of social life (key figures include N.A. Agadzhanyan, S.P. Kapitsa, N.S. Kasimov, G.S. Gudozhnik, E.A. Arab-Ogly, V.V. Petrov, B.Ts. Uralnis, A.V. Katsura, among others).

In recent years, global studies have exhibited a new trend: the growing shift of attention among scholars, researchers, and even policymakers from isolated global problems to the broader processes of globalization and the increasing interdependence of the contemporary world. This shift stems from the nearly three-decade-long experience of addressing specific global issues, which has proven insufficiently effective, and from the desire to uncover the fundamental causes of their emergence and escalating severity. This trend characterizes not only individual scientific disciplines but philosophy as a whole across various countries and continents. For instance, although globalization was not explicitly discussed at the World Philosophical Congresses held in Moscow (1993) and Boston (1998), sessions and roundtables were dedicated to global problems. The 21st World Congress of Philosophy, held in August 2003 in Istanbul, was entirely devoted to the theme “Philosophy Facing World Problems.” Subsequent congresses in Seoul (2008) and Athens (2013) also paid significant attention to global issues. In Russia, research activity in this field has notably increased in recent years, evidenced not only by a growing number of publications and the launch of the journal *Globalization Age* but also by the establishment of the Faculty of Global Processes at Moscow State University and the publication of the *Encyclopedia*, *Encyclopedic Dictionary*, and *Encyclopedic Handbook of Global Studies* in both Russian and English. These works were prepared by a large collective of scholars and specialists from over fifty countries worldwide.

Overall, it can be stated that global studies have now acquired well-defined and largely established contours. In a narrow sense, global studies constitute an interdisciplinary field of scientific inquiry aimed at identifying the essence of globalization processes, determining the causes of their emergence and developmental trends, analyzing the global problems they generate, and seeking ways to promote positive outcomes while overcoming adverse consequences for humanity and the biosphere.

In a broader sense, the term “global studies” encompasses the entire body of scientific, philosophical, cultural, and applied research on various aspects of globalization and global problems, including the findings of such research and the practical activities for their implementation in economic, social, and political spheres, at both national and international levels.

To avoid inappropriate analogies and methodological confusion, it is important once again to emphasize that global studies should not be understood as a separate or specialized scientific discipline, which typically emerges through differentiation of scientific knowledge or at the intersection of related fields. Instead, global studies arise from opposite—integration—processes characteristic of contemporary science, representing a sphere of research and knowledge where various scientific disciplines and philosophy mostly interact closely. Each discipline, from the standpoint of its own subject matter and methods, analyzes diverse aspects of globalization, proposes solutions to global problems, considering them both in isolation and as components of a holistic system. This leads to an important consequence: questions about the subject, object, method, goals, and conceptual apparatus of global studies, as posed by some researchers, should be addressed differently than in regard to any particular science. For example, its subject cannot be unambiguously defined, though simplistically it may be described as the wholeness of the world, humanity as a whole, or the entire biosphere with its core element—humankind. Similarly, the conceptual apparatus of global studies will be unified only to a certain extent (philosophically and methodologically); otherwise, it tends to be “diffuse,” varying across disciplines involved in relevant research. Regarding methods and objectives, besides defining basic approaches, it is necessary to enumerate the specific sciences contributing to the study of particular problems and

to elucidate the role of philosophy, cultural studies, politics, and ideology in global studies—an endeavor that is practically unfeasible.

Another key distinction of global studies from particular scientific disciplines is that understanding global trends and effectively addressing the problems they generate require not only theoretical research but also corresponding practical, impactful actions. Thus, global studies objectively fulfill an integrative role across science and practice, compelling many scholars, politicians, and public figures to reconsider the modern world and recognize their shared responsibility for humanity's common fate. It compels reflection on the fact that globalization and its resulting problems leave humanity no choice but to overcome fragmentation and discord in pursuit of unity—while striving to preserve the unique cultures, centuries-old traditions, and particularities of individual nations and peoples. Such unity and coordinated action can only be ensured through an adequate understanding of contemporary global processes and events, knowledge of which is generated and articulated within global studies.

In conclusion, it should be noted that some conclusions drawn from analyzing objective trends in social development may face well-founded objections from those who primarily view globalization as a struggle of interests and a purposeful activity of particular clans or states, sometimes at the expense of ignoring or violating the legitimate rights of others. Such critiques may be valid, as both the emergence and exacerbation of global problems and their resolution are closely linked to human interests. This constitutes a serious argument for considering such objections in both theoretical research and practical activity concerning globalization. However, when addressing the status of global studies, one deals with a different issue and often encounters not merely subjective factors but subjectivism and biases of individual researchers. Their opinions should not supplant the analysis of objective trends in global processes and the naturally evolving approaches and principles underlying contemporary global studies.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest related to the content of this article.

Acknowledgements

The author expresses gratitude to colleagues and experts who contributed valuable insights and constructive feedback during the preparation of this manuscript. Special thanks are extended to the academic institutions and research networks supporting interdisciplinary studies of globalization and global challenges.

References

1. Beck, U. (2000). The cosmopolitan perspective: Sociology of globalization and global risk society. *Current Sociology*, 49(2), 1–17.
DOI: 10.1177/0011392100049002001
2. Buzgalin, A. V. (2008). Alter-globalism: In search of a positive alternative to the new empire. *The Age of Globalization*, (1), 120–127.
3. Chumakov, A. N. (2013). *Globalization: Contours of a holistic world* (pp. 48–60). Moscow: TK Velbi, Prospekt.
4. Chumakov, A. N. (2013). Theoretical and methodological foundations of globalization studies. *The Age of Globalization*, (2[12]), 23–37.
5. Dubrovskiy, D. I. (Ed.). (2013). *Global future 2045: Convergent technologies (NBICs) and transhumanist evolution* (pp. 59–67). Moscow: MBA Publishing.
6. Friedman, T. L. (2005). The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century. *Technology in Society*, 27(1), 91–95.
DOI: 10.1016/j.techsoc.2004.11.001
7. Gay, W. (2014). Globalization processes and global studies. In A. N. Chumakov & L. E. Grinin (Eds.), *Where is the age of globalization heading?* (pp. 24–32). Volgograd: Uchitel.
8. Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity*. Stanford University Press.
Friedman, T. (2000). *Understanding globalization: The Lexus and the olive tree*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
Boeck, U. (1998). *Was ist Globalisierung?* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

9. Giddens, A. (1999). Risk and responsibility. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 50(1), 1–14.
DOI: 10.2307/591049
10. Held, D., & McGrew, A. (2002). Governing globalization: Power, authority and global governance. *International Political Science Review*, 23(3), 301–309.
DOI: 10.1177/0192512102023003004
11. Ilyin, I. V., Mazur, I. I., & Chumakov, A. N. (Eds.). (2012). *Global studies: Personalities, organizations, works: Encyclopedic reference* (pp. 252–311). Moscow: Alpha-M.
12. Ilyin, I. V., Mazur, I. I., & Chumakov, A. N. (Eds.). (2012). *Global studies: Personalities, organizations, works: Encyclopedic reference* (pp. 11–238). Moscow: Alpha-M.
13. Ilyin, I. V., Mazur, I. I., & Chumakov, A. N. (Eds.). (2012). *Global studies: Personalities, organizations, works: Encyclopedic reference* (pp. 11–238). Moscow: Alpha-M.
14. Ioseliani, A. D. (2013). Anthropology of the global world: The human in the contemporary communicative-information sphere. *The Age of Globalization*, (2[12]), 144.
15. Klein, N. (2000). Globalization and its discontents. *World Development*, 28(1), 127–129.
DOI: 10.1016/S0305-750X(99)00129-7
16. Mamedzade, I. R., & Rzaeva, R. O. (2009). Trends in Turkish public consciousness: From modernity to postmodernity. *The Age of Globalization*, (2[4]), 116.
17. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (n.d.). *Works* (Vol. 20, p. 496).
18. Mazour, I. I., Chumakov, A. N., & Gay, W. C. (Eds.). (2003). *Global studies encyclopedia* (pp. 76–77). Moscow: Raduga Publishers.
19. Mazur, I. I., & Chumakov, A. N. (Eds.). (2003). *Global studies: Encyclopedia* (p. 199). Moscow: Raduga Publishers.
20. Mazur, I. I., & Chumakov, A. N. (Eds.). (2006). *Global studies: International, interdisciplinary, encyclopedic dictionary* (pp. 163–173). Moscow–Saint Petersburg–New York: Elima, Piter.
21. Meadows, D. H., Meadows, D. L., et al. (1974). *The limits to growth*. New York: Potomac.
22. Nazaretyan, A. P. (2001). Civilizational crises in the context of universal history (Synergetics – psychology – forecasting). Moscow: PER SE.
23. Pyrin, A. G. (2013). Presentation of the encyclopedic reference on global studies. *The Age of Globalization*, (1[11]), 180–184.
24. Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social theory and global culture*. London: Sage.
Robertson, R. (1998). Globalization and identity: Dialectics of flows and closures. *Development and Change*, 29(4).
Held, D., & McGrew, A. (Eds.). (2000). *Global transformations: Reader*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
25. Steger, M. B. (2003). Globalization: A very short introduction. *International Sociology*, 18(3), 395–396.
DOI: 10.1177/0268580903018003007
26. Vernadsky, V. I. (1988). *Philosophical thoughts of a naturalist* (p. 35). Moscow: Nauka.