

UDC 323.14

IRSTI 11.25.25

<https://doi.org/10.48371/ISMO.2025.60.2.002>

THE “RUSSIAN WORLD” CONCEPT: CRITICAL GEOPOLITICS AND ITS POLITICAL AND IDEOLOGICAL ASPECTS

Ibadildin N.¹, Apples J.², Ismagambetov T.³, *Aitymbetov N.⁴

¹ KIMEP University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

² Independent researcher, Amsterdam, Netherlands

^{3,*4} Institute for Philosophy, Political Science and Religious Studies MSHE RK, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Abstract. This article analyzes the components of ideology of the contemporary regime of Russia namely the “Russian World” (Russkiy Mir), imagined communities, Eurasianism, and biopolitics – through the lens of critical geopolitics. The concept of the “Russian World” has increasingly occupied a central position in the Kremlin’s ideological narratives. It portrays Russia as a transnational civilization extending beyond its current political borders and uniting communities through language, history, and shared cultural values.

Imagined communities, as manifested in the idea of the “Russian World”, support this narrative by presenting these transnational ties as a complex and cohesive social construct. Eurasianism, revived as an ideological discourse following the collapse of the Soviet Union, seeks to define Russia as a distinct civilization – neither Western nor Eastern.

The methodology employed in this study draws upon logical and historical methods, as well as an analysis of the interconnections among the manifestations of the “Russian World”. The academic significance lies in elucidating the nature of this ideological construct, which serves to legitimize Russia’s geopolitical ambitions, particularly in relation to neighboring states. The practical relevance of this understanding lies in its utility for anticipating the range of tools and strategies ranging from soft to hard power, including hybrid forms deployed by Russia in its near abroad.

In relation to Kazakhstan, a soft version of the “Russian World” is applied; the most extreme form is applied to Ukraine, the so-called “special military operation”; while Belarus is an example of integration within the framework of the so-called Union State of Belarus and Russia. The conclusions of this article help to uncover the underlying essence and origins of the “Russian World” beyond propagandistic rhetoric, revealing its role as a vehicle for Russia’s aspiration to become one of the poles in the multipolar world order.

Key words: Russian World, imagined communities, Eurasianism, biopolitics, critical geopolitics, Post-Soviet space, multipolar world, soft power,

Funding: The research in the article was carried out with grant funding from the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan within the framework of the AP26100127 project “Improving the digital

media literacy of Kazakhstanis in the context of the effectiveness of political communication”.

Introduction

Russia has sought to reassert its influence both regionally and globally through a combination of historical, cultural, and ideological frameworks. Central to this endeavor is the development of a contemporary ideology of Russian regime that merges concepts like Russkiy Mir, imagined communities, Eurasianism, and biopolitics. These concepts serve as pillars that shape Russia's perception of its own place in the world, with significant implications for neighboring states such as Ukraine and Kazakhstan. At the core of this ideological construct is the concept of Russkiy Mir (Russian World), which promotes the notion of Russia as a transnational civilization that extends beyond its political borders.

Through Russkiy Mir, the Kremlin frames itself as the protector of a shared Russian identity based on language, culture, and Orthodox Christianity, positioning Russia as a distinct civilization in opposition to Western influence. This identity-building process involves a blend of historical narratives and modern political strategies, as seen through the resurgence of Eurasianism – an ideology that emphasizes Russia's unique geopolitical identity as distinct from both the West and the East. Meanwhile, biopolitics plays a role in Russia's policy toward compatriots in the post-Soviet space, providing a framework for analyzing how populations are governed and regulated in accordance with these ideological goals. This research primarily focuses on the conceptualization of Russkiy Mir, imagined communities, Eurasianism, and biopolitics in the context of Russian ideology.

Critical geopolitics offers a valuable lens through which to examine these developments by analyzing how geopolitical actors, including Russia, construct narratives and “truths” that influence foreign policy. The influence of Russkiy Mir extends beyond rhetoric and soft power, influencing practical actions in Russia's “near abroad”, including its policies toward Ukraine and Kazakhstan. This research explores how these ideological components coalesce to form contemporary Russian geopolitical thinking and assesses their implications for Kazakhstan's foreign policy and national identity in a rapidly changing geopolitical environment.

Materials and methods

Sources that accurately describe aspects of the Russkiy Mir concept exclude the use of propagandistic statements and publications. This research was conducted using a variety of analytical methods. The theory of critical geopolitics made it possible to identify the nature of shifts in Russia's foreign policy following Vladimir Putin's landmark speech in Munich (Germany) in February 2007.

The method of functional analysis, through identifying interconnections, helped to reveal the role of each component within the doctrine of Russkiy Mir and to determine the nature and scope of their influence on the holistic

understanding of the concept. Logical analysis enabled the differentiation of how each component – critical geopolitics, neo-Eurasianism, imagined communities, and biopolitics – manifests itself within the doctrine. The deductive method allows for the forecasting of situational shifts in emphasis on particular components of Russkiy Mir in opposition to other civilizations, primarily Western European ones.

Critical geopolitics serves as a theoretical lens aimed at unpacking how political authority, territorial dynamics, and geographical imaginaries interact to influence global politics, national identities, and international conflicts. It arose in the 1990s as a critique of classical geopolitical traditions, which largely prioritized the analysis of nation-states, border configurations, and military strategy.

The concept of Russkiy Mir envisions a border-crossing community symbolically and ideologically anchored to Moscow, bound together through shared elements such as identity, security concerns, nationalism, historical interpretations, and cultural markers. Russian geopolitical narratives are deeply shaped by the state’s self-conception and its engagement with historical memory. Understanding the intersections between discursive politics, spatial representations, and identity construction is essential when examining Russia’s policies toward Ukraine and Kazakhstan in the context of Russkiy Mir.

Geopolitical narratives are not merely descriptive; they actively shape reality by creating categories and reinforcing political perceptions. Their performative nature lies in the fact that categorizing is itself an exercise of power. Political rhetoric and mass media play a pivotal role in propagating historical narratives and geopolitical myths [1]. As Russian scholar Mariya Omelicheva explains, critical geopolitics shares similarities with constructivism in that it views geopolitical space as shaped by cognitive processes and discursive practices [2]. Consequently, the Russkiy Mir is not a tangible geopolitical entity but a constructed narrative that the Kremlin adapts to serve its strategic preferences and goals.

Russia employs a variety of geopolitical frameworks to position itself both regionally and globally. According to David Lewis, the Russian state projects multiple spatial metaphors such as Greater Europe, the Russian World, and Eurasia each tied to different foreign policy trajectories. Despite these differing visions, they all seek to resolve the central issue of Russia’s identity in the evolving post-Soviet global order [3]. As such, critical geopolitics is particularly useful for investigating how these imaginative geographies are instrumentalized in support of Russia’s broader foreign policy agenda.

By utilizing critical geopolitics, this study explores how discourses, representational strategies, and narratives help construct the notion of Russia’s “Near Abroad” through the ideological apparatus of Russkiy Mir. The term “Near Abroad”, introduced in the aftermath of the Soviet Union’s collapse in 1992, is illustrative of geopolitical narrative-making. It simultaneously designates the former Soviet republics as independent states yet places them within a symbolic

space of Russian proximity and influence, reinforcing the idea that they are distinct from other foreign nations.

This theoretical framework allows for an analysis of the divergent ways in which Ukraine and Kazakhstan are conceptualized within *Russkiy Mir*, and how these conceptualizations shape Russia's foreign policy toward both nations. As Marlene Laruelle notes, the Kremlin's actions in the post-Soviet sphere are informed by its perception of national security imperatives and the necessity of safeguarding the current political regime against perceived internal and external threats. *Russkiy Mir*, therefore, emerges as a flexible and ambiguous geopolitical construct, which the Russian state employs in ways that align with its shifting political objectives [4]. Critical geopolitics, in turn, provides a suitable foundation for assessing this behavior, as it reveals how Russia's policies are embedded in state-controlled discourse, media, and academic production loyal to Kremlin narratives.

The way in which space is imagined need not align with its empirical or lived geography. Toal illustrates this with the case of Northern Ireland's second-largest city, where the name "Londonderry" instead of "Derry" validates a British geopolitical narrative and symbolically centers the region's identity around London and the British imperial legacy [5]. A comparable example can be found in Donetsk Oblast, where Russian authorities, following their occupation of Bakhmut, reimposed the Soviet-era name "Artemovsk". Additionally, rhetorical devices like "Little Russia" or "Novorossiia" are deployed to justify territorial claims over Ukrainian regions and to undermine Ukraine's sovereign legitimacy. These linguistic strategies, though symbolic, significantly influence material geopolitical realities – as underscored by Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine.

Critical geopolitics also dissects the ways geopolitical knowledge is reproduced across three domains: the formal (academia and intellectual institutions), the practical (foreign policy and diplomacy), and the popular (national identity and representations of the 'other' in media and culture) [2]. This thesis engages with all three dimensions through a detailed examination of political rhetoric, journalistic content, academic writings, and public discourse found on blogs and semi-official platforms promoting the *Russkiy Mir* narrative.

In sum, critical geopolitics equips this research with an analytical perspective for understanding how power, space, and identity interconnect within the framework of *Russkiy Mir* and Russia's strategies in its perceived "Near Abroad". Positioned at the crossroads of spatial theory and biopolitics, *Russkiy Mir* represents more than a foreign policy tool – it is a mode of constructing borders, assigning meanings to territories, and forging identities aligned with the Kremlin's worldview. As Russia crafts its international posture based on internally constructed historical, spatial, and ideological realities, critical geopolitics offers a powerful toolset for decoding how these realities shape foreign policy behavior in the post-Soviet geopolitical landscape.

Results

Ruskiy Mir as Imagined community and Eurasianism

According to the ideology of Ruskiy Mir, Russia is conceptualized not merely as the political entity known as the Russian Federation, but as a broader civilizational space that surpasses the current territorial boundaries of the state. Belonging to this space is marked by several indicators, including the use of the Russian language, adherence to shared historical narratives, cultural affinity, alignment with Russian values, cooperative ties with Moscow, and opposition to Western ideologies.

The notion of imagined communities, as introduced by Benedict Anderson, is crucial for understanding how Ruskiy Mir is constructed as a community. Imagined communities are not necessarily grounded in direct, interpersonal relationships among members; rather, they are formed through a collective sense of shared language, historical continuity, cultural practices, and, at times, common political affiliations. The Kremlin's construction of Ruskiy Mir operates in much the same way, by producing a sense of unity among disparate individuals who may never have personal contact with one another but are linked through symbols, narratives, and state-endorsed ideologies.

Anderson identified three essential instruments that shaped the colonial imagination of territory and identity: the census, the map, and the museum [6]. These tools served to categorize and codify populations and spaces in ways that made them legible to the state, and similar mechanisms are at work in the symbolic creation of Ruskiy Mir. Importantly, imagined communities are not static, they evolve over time, influenced by political agendas, social transformations, and cultural developments. Individuals may simultaneously belong to multiple imagined communities based on overlapping identifiers such as national origin, ethnicity, religion, and language.

This theoretical concept proves especially relevant in explaining the logic and practice underlying the construction of Ruskiy Mir. The Kremlin imagines this community through biographical and political narratives, uniting people who either identify as Russian or possess a partial Russian identity – whether through emotional connections to Russia, spiritual ties to the Russian Orthodox Church, former Soviet or Russian citizenship, or mother-tongue use of Russian. The conceptual boundaries of Ruskiy Mir extend across modern nation-states that were once part of the Russian Empire or the USSR. Statements made by President Vladimir Putin questioning the legitimacy of Ukrainian and Kazakh sovereignty serve as clear illustrations of this expansive civilizational view.

Nevertheless, the cohesiveness of the so-called "compatriots" within this imagined community is highly debatable. As noted by Mikhail Suslov, it is intellectually challenging to unify the diverse groups of the Russian-speaking diaspora under a single identity. The Russian diaspora is composed of multiple segments: those who emigrated in different historical waves from the Soviet

Union, Russian-speaking populations from Central Asia, Ukraine, Belarus, and the Baltic states; economic migrants; Russian women who married into Western societies; scholars and IT professionals working abroad; and the affluent “global Russians” who reside in cosmopolitan hubs such as London and New York [7].

Critical geopolitics as a theoretical lens significantly contributes to the central research inquiry of this thesis. Unlike traditional geopolitical thinking, which treats territoriality and power as fixed and objective, critical geopolitics interrogates how spatial and political realities are constructed and framed by geopolitical actors. This framing gives rise to what is perceived as “truth” in global politics. By applying this perspective, one can better grasp *Russkiy Mir* as an ideological instrument through which the Russian state exerts influence in its perceived “Near Abroad.”

Through its focus on power relations, discourse, and contestation, critical geopolitics helps unravel the underlying complexities of Russia’s foreign policy behavior toward countries like Ukraine and Kazakhstan. Moreover, this framework offers insight not only into Russia’s geopolitical imagination but also into how states such as Ukraine and Kazakhstan perceive their own identities and geopolitical cultures. These local self-conceptions both influence and are influenced by the Russian geopolitical narrative, creating a dynamic interplay of meaning-making and strategic positioning.

Eurasianism and Biopolitics as Integral Aspects of *Russkiy Mir*

The relevance of Eurasianism in analyzing the ideology of *Russkiy Mir* stems from the fact that within segments of the Russian political and intellectual elite, these two concepts are often seen as compatible or even interchangeable. Eurasianism represents a geopolitical ideology that perceives the Eurasian continent not as a mere geographical link between Europe and Asia, but rather as an independent civilization with its own historical trajectory, cultural values, and geopolitical interests. Much like *Russkiy Mir*, Eurasianism champions a multipolar global order, challenging Western hegemonic dominance. It seeks to construct a distinctive identity and geopolitical paradigm for Eurasia, encompassing both the European and Asian territories.

Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, Western narratives frequently conflated the notions of “Soviet” and “Russian”. In response to this oversimplification and as part of an effort to reshape the conceptual space of the post-Soviet region, the idea of “Eurasia” emerged as the most compelling and viable geocultural framework to redefine the former Soviet landscape. Scholar Sergey Glebov emphasizes that the term “Eurasia” came to serve as a replacement concept to articulate a new civilizational vision of the region [8].

Eurasianist ideology was originally formulated by Russian émigrés who had fled Bolshevik rule in the 1920s and 1930s and resettled in Western Europe. Glebov views Eurasianism as a strategy aimed at suppressing competing forms of nationalism within the multiethnic framework of the former Russian Empire by

unifying them under a singular civilizational identity. In his analysis, Eurasianism is inherently imperial in nature, reflecting the fragmented and unequal cultural and social terrain of imperial Russia [8, pp. 5–6]. Eurasianism, like Russkiy Mir, incorporates elements of traditionalism and ethnic pluralism, merging both into an inclusive imperial vision intended to manage diversity under a shared ideological umbrella.

The concept of biopolitics, derived from the theoretical work of French philosopher Michel Foucault, further enriches the analysis of Russkiy Mir. Biopolitics examines the intersection of political authority and the regulation of life processes within modern states. It explores how governments and institutions manage populations not solely through coercive political mechanisms but by governing aspects of biological, social, and cultural life. Within the context of the post-Soviet region, biopolitics provides a useful analytical lens for evaluating the Kremlin’s approach toward its so-called “compatriots.”

Biopolitical theory offers insights into how power functions across domains that blend human biology, collective identity, and sociopolitical governance. Applying this framework, one can better understand the Kremlin’s strategies for managing Russian-speaking populations outside its current borders. These policies are not only geopolitical in intent but biopolitical in function, as they engage with issues of belonging, cultural affinity, and emotional loyalty to the Russian state.

Political scholars Andrey Makarychev and Alexandra Yatsyk suggest that integrating the concept of biopolitics into the analysis of post-Soviet political relations offers a more sophisticated understanding of the mechanisms of Russian influence. They differentiate between two strategic approaches used by Russia in what it identifies as its “Near Abroad”: one that seeks territorial control through classical geopolitical means, and another that governs populations by fostering a shared identity rooted in language, history, and culture. This biopolitical strategy centers around safeguarding and maintaining an imagined community of Russian speakers, a core tenet of Russkiy Mir ideology [9].

Thus, the juxtaposition between the territorial ambitions implicit in Eurasianist thought and the biopolitical practices surrounding Russkiy Mir reveals the multifaceted nature of Russia’s regional strategy. While Eurasianism articulates a grand civilizational vision to rival Western influence, biopolitics focuses on nurturing and regulating communities that align with Russian identity markers, even beyond the borders of the state. Together, these two frameworks illustrate how contemporary Russian geopolitical thinking blends ideological narratives with mechanisms of population management to extend its influence in the post-Soviet space.

Traditional Values and Biopolitical Symbolism in the Narrative of Russkiy Mir

The ideological foundation of Russkiy Mir is closely tied to the promotion

of so-called traditional values, which are expressed through a combination of anti-Western sentiment, social conservatism, and the prominence of Russian Orthodoxy. Notably, both the Moscow Patriarchate and neo-Eurasianist thinkers have played significant roles in perpetuating the civilizational discourse that aligns with the Kremlin's recent conservative ideological orientation [4, p. 23]. Within this worldview, *Russkiy Mir* serves as a vehicle for affirming traditional norms such as the sanctity of the family unit, patriotism, and religious devotion. Through this emphasis, it positions itself in opposition to the values of Western liberal democracy, which it depicts as morally and spiritually corrupt.

A central element in this oppositional stance is the way in which Russian state propaganda has portrayed Ukraine's geopolitical orientation as a betrayal of shared cultural and spiritual heritage. One of the Kremlin's rhetorical justifications for its large-scale invasion of Ukraine is the framing of Ukraine as having succumbed to the "satanic" influences of Western liberalism, thus necessitating a moral and civilizational intervention by Russia.

The mythos of *Russkiy Mir* also draws heavily from the Soviet legacy, especially in how it blurs the boundaries between Soviet and Russian identities. During the Soviet period, the Russian and Soviet identities were largely conflated, which allows contemporary *Russkiy Mir* narratives to glorify and mythologize the Soviet past [1, p. 758]. For individuals raised and socialized in the Soviet system, who maintain a deep emotional connection to its historical narratives and cultural practices, the message of *Russkiy Mir* resonates as familiar and legitimate. This emotional continuity is reinforced by decades of Soviet ideological indoctrination in public education, workplaces, and mass media.

An illustrative example of this nostalgic identification can be found in British journalist Joanna Lillis's account of a conversation with a woman in her fifties in the city of Semey, located in eastern Kazakhstan. When asked about Russia's annexation of Crimea, the woman responded that "Crimea's always been considered Russian," asserting further that "Sevastopol and Crimea are real Russian lands. The Russians and the Orthodox defended it from the Turkish yoke, and that's where our Russian soldiers fought" [10, p. 272]. Such narratives reflect a deep internalization of imperial and Soviet-era historical memory, which continues to inform contemporary geopolitical perceptions.

A prominent biopolitical metaphor employed in the discourse of *Russkiy Mir* is that of the family, which is laden with symbolic associations linked to both Soviet and imperial traditions [9, p. 25]. This metaphor positions the Russian state as a paternal figure or guardian tasked with protecting its extended "family" of Russian speakers and cultural kin beyond its national borders. The notion of familial unity is further visualized through various public monuments that were intended to symbolize the brotherhood of nations. One such example was the "People's Friendship Arch" in Kyiv, erected in 1982 to mark the 60th anniversary of the Soviet Union. Though recently dismantled, the monument was emblematic

of the Kremlin’s idealized vision of unity among the peoples of the former USSR.

Historical Experiences, Political Dynamics, Economic Factors, and Security as Practical Manifestations of the Russkiy Mir

The ideology of Russkiy Mir aspires to extend beyond the geographical boundaries of the Russian Federation by tapping into emotional connections and shared historical consciousness among Russian-speaking communities abroad. One of the central narratives employed by the Kremlin to cultivate a unified Russian identity is the memory of the Great Patriotic War. This historical episode serves as a powerful symbol for rallying populations around the notion of a collective Russian world. Spiritually, Russkiy Mir fuses Orthodox Christianity with collective memory, drawing on a constructed idea of a mutual origin dating back to Kievan Rus’ [11]. Through this synthesis, the ideology draws from a triad of historical experiences – rooted in the Russian Orthodox Church, the Tsarist Empire, and the Soviet Union to assert a sense of continuity and belonging.

More than just a cultural or spiritual project, Russkiy Mir functions as a psychological framework for facilitating the political reintegration of the post-Soviet space. The prospect of Ukraine moving closer to Western institutions is interpreted by Moscow as a significant threat to the reintegration project, undermining the Kremlin’s long-term geopolitical vision. In response, Russia has taken steps across diplomatic, economic, and political arenas ultimately resorting to military means to assert its influence. Those states and populations that fall within the perceived domain of Russkiy Mir are expected to demonstrate political allegiance. As Wawrzonek notes, Russia’s neo-imperial ambitions in Ukraine have been ideologically reinforced through the discourse of Orthodox civilizational unity and the conceptual framework of Russkiy Mir [11, p. 766].

On the economic front, the Russkiy Mir ideology is institutionally represented by the Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU), comprising Russia, Belarus, Armenia, Kazakhstan, and Kyrgyzstan. Modeled in part on the European Union, the EAEU is portrayed by Eurasianist thinkers as a counterweight to Western unipolarity, aiming to establish a balanced and multipolar international order [12]. Within this union, Russia positions itself as the dominant actor, with the Russian language functioning as the primary medium of communication.

The security component of Russkiy Mir finds tangible expression through the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), a military alliance under Russian leadership designed to maintain influence across the post-Soviet sphere. Kazakhstan remains a member of the CSTO, unlike Ukraine, which has consistently sought to distance itself from Russian-led security frameworks. A notable demonstration of this security alliance occurred in January 2022, when CSTO troops largely composed of Russian forces—were deployed to Kazakhstan to quell civil unrest linked to widespread dissatisfaction with the government and the departure of President Nazarbayev. Since the onset of Russia’s full-scale war in Ukraine, the militarized aspect of Russkiy Mir has become increasingly

concerning for Kazakhstan, as the lead power of the CSTO is now actively engaged in a major international conflict.

Discussion

Which indicator of the Russian world is more important: Russian language and culture or Russian Orthodox Church

Russian identity, from this perspective, is anchored in multiple historical periods and is considered to possess an eternal and transcendent essence. The significance of the mental and ideological aspect of Russkiy Mir is underscored by Putin's statement that "Russia is not a project, it is a destiny. You know, it is a life" [2, p. 718]. Due to Russkiy Mir's perceived timeless nature, it transcends the boundaries defined by contemporary law.

Historically, the term Russkiy Mir has been employed to describe the Russian state and empire as a unique civilizational domain. Medieval texts referred to ancient Rus as a Russian world. From the nineteenth century onward, some interpreted it spiritually as a community of Orthodox Christians united by shared beliefs, rituals, and traditions. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union, Russkiy Mir arose as a new conceptual framework to provide meaning in the post-communist era. It became Russia's new "national idea" [1, p. 747]. However, Irina Kotkina points out that, despite robust backing from the Russian Orthodox Church, the concept only achieved widespread recognition within Russia after the 2014 annexation of Crimea [13].

Supporters of Russkiy Mir emphasize various criteria for membership. Yet, Russkiy Mir also functions as an instrument of soft power, appealing to people's emotional ties to the Soviet past and drawing them through the Russian language and culture.

The indicators of Russkiy Mir allow this thesis to define how the concept is understood through the 'traits' or 'conditions' that constitute belonging to it.

Russkiy Mir officially entered Russian Federation rhetoric in 2006, when President Vladimir Putin stated that the "Russkiy Mir can and must unite everyone who cherishes the Russian word and Russian culture, wherever they may live – in Russia or abroad", during a speech in St. Petersburg on the eve of the Year of the Russian Language. Subsequently, on June 21, 2007, the Russkiy Mir Foundation was established by Putin's decree. In 2016, Putin emphasized that the Russian language fosters the creation of a national identity with its distinctive character and traditions within a multinational state. He further argued that the Russian language preserves Russia's identity in a globalized world and serves as a pathway to civilization and culture via spiritual and historical values [14].

Within Russkiy Mir, the Russian language is portrayed as the link connecting various peoples who belong to this community, while also constituting the essence of Russian civilization. Moreover, the Russian language has been leveraged to justify military interventions, as exemplified by Russian assertions of protecting Russian-speaking populations in Ukraine.

Although adherence to Orthodox Christianity is not formally required for inclusion in Russkiy Mir, the role of the Russian Orthodox Church within this framework is emphasized by the fact that it is the sole religious institution represented on the governing board of the Russkiy Mir Foundation [1, p. 751]. Orthodoxy in Russkiy Mir is not merely a religion but is also conceived as a civilizational identity [11]. Moscow endeavors to create a counter-hegemonic narrative opposing the West, with the Russian Orthodox Church actively shaping this narrative through the concept of ‘Holy Rus’. The Russian Orthodox Church views the Russian nation as a multicultural entity tracing its origins to Kievan Rus and extending into present-day Russia. According to Naydenova N., Moscow is regarded as the center of Holy Rus, which encompasses Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and, in some interpretations, Moldova and Kazakhstan. The supra-national character of Christianity legitimizes the ambiguous borders of Holy Rus, covering all territories considered part of Russkiy Mir [14, p. 41].

Conclusion

A coherent vision of what constitutes the ‘Russian World’ does not exist, as its various manifestations may come to the fore at different times. Concluding, the exact definition of the Russkiy Mir is imprecise. Nevertheless, it is important to conceptualize the Russkiy Mir as an imagined transnational community that, according to the Kremlin, belongs to Russian civilization through different concepts such as language, history, culture and values, geography, religion and cooperation with Moscow and competition with the West. Russkiy Mir is an irredentist of nature. However, Russkiy Mir is also a soft power tool as it appeals to the emotional attachment of people to the Soviet Union and attracts people through Russian language and culture. This, however, does not exclude the possibility of more assertive or coercive manifestations – most notably, the military actions undertaken in Ukraine. The concept of the “Russian World” has evolved into an ideological framework that reflects what Samuel Huntington referred to as a “clash of civilizations”. It supports the proposition that the “Russian World” represents the second major manifestation of civilizational conflict following the rise of Islamic fundamentalism. In comparison, China’s quiet economic and political expansion tends to attract considerably less attention from global public opinion.

From a practical standpoint, the case of Kazakhstan illustrates that the prevalence of the Russian language does not necessarily lead to the automatic inclusion of a sovereign state within the geopolitical orbit of the “Russian World”. This has become especially evident in the aftermath of the Russian Federation’s launch of its ‘special military operation’ against Ukraine on February 24, 2022.

Simultaneously, the ideological dimension of the “Russian World” presents a potential threat to Kazakhstan’s social cohesion, as it seeks to position itself as a centre of ideological and geopolitical attraction within post-Soviet states

bordering the Russian Federation. Mitigating this threat is possible through the development of an ideological immunity at the national level. Consequently, the present study offers a foundation for further academic inquiry in this direction.

REFERENCES

- [1] O'Loughlin J., Toal G., Kolosov V. Who identifies with the “Russian World”? Geopolitical attitudes in southeastern Ukraine, Crimea, Abkhazia, South Ossetia, and Transnistria // *Eurasian Geography and Economics*. – 2016. – Vol. 57, No. 6. – P. 745–778. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15387216.2017.1295275>.
- [2] Omelicheva M. Critical geopolitics on Russian foreign policy: Uncovering the imagery of Moscow's international relations // *International Politics*. – 2016. – P. 708–726. – DOI: 10.1057/s41311-016-0009-5.
- [3] Lewis D. G. Geopolitical Imaginaries in Russian Foreign Policy: The Evolution of ‘Greater Eurasia’ // *Europe-Asia Studies*. – 2018. – Vol. 70, No. 10. – P. 1612–1637. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09668136.2018.1515348>.
- [4] Laruelle M. The “Russian World”: Russia's Soft Power and Geopolitical Imagination. – Washington: Center on Global Interests, 2015. – 29 p. – Available at: file:///C:/Users/User/Downloads/FINAL-CGI_Russian-World_Marlene-Laruelle.pdf [Accessed 26 June 2025].
- [5] Toal G. Near Abroad: Putin, the West, and the Contest over Ukraine and the Caucasus. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017. – 387 p.
- [6] Anderson B. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism. – London: Verso, 2016. – P. 163–164.
- [7] Suslov M. “Russian World” Concept: Post-Soviet Geopolitical Ideology and the Logic of “Spheres of Influence” // *Geopolitics*. – 2018. – Vol. 23, No. 2. – P. 330–353. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2017.1407921>.
- [8] Glebov S. From Empire to Eurasia: Politics, Scholarship, and Ideology in Russian Eurasianism, 1920s–1930s. – New York: Cornell University Press, 2017. – 238 p.
- [9] Makarychev A., Yatsyk A. Biopower and geopolitics as Russia's neighborhood strategies: reconnecting people or reaggregating lands? // *Nationalities Papers*. – 2017. – Vol. 45, No. 1. – P. 25–40. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00905992.2016.1248385>.
- [10] Lillis J. Dark Shadows: Inside the Secret World of Kazakhstan. – London: Bloomsbury, 2018. – 272 p.
- [11] Wawrzonek M. Ukraine in the “Gray Zone”: Between the “Russkiy Mir” and Europe // *East European Politics and Societies*. – 2014. – Vol. 28, No. 4. – P. 758–780. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0888325414543947>.
- [12] Abbas S. R. Russia's Eurasian union dream: A way forward towards multipolar world order // *Journal of Global Faultlines*. – 2022. – Vol. 9, No. 1. – P. 33–43. – Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48676221> [Accessed 26 June 2025].
- [13] Kotkina I. Geopolitical Imagination and Popular Geopolitics between

the Eurasian Union and Russkii Mir // In: Bassin M., Pozo G. (Eds.). *The Politics of Eurasianism: Identity, Popular Culture and Russia's Foreign Policy*. – London: Rowman & Littlefield International, 2017. – P. 59–78.

[14] Naydenova N. Holy Rus: (Re)construction of Russia's Civilizational Identity // *Slavonica*. – 2016. – Vol. 21, No. 1–2. – P. 37–48. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13617427.2017.1319120>.

«ОРЫС ӘЛЕМІ» ТҰЖЫРЫМЫ: СЫНИ ГЕОСАЯСАТ, САЯСИ ЖӘНЕ ДҮНИЕТАНЫМДЫҚ ҚЫРЛАРЫ

Ибадильдин Н.¹, Эпплс Й.², Исмағамбетов Т.Т.³, *Айтымбетов Н.И.⁴

¹ КИМЭП Университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

² Тәуелсіз зерттеуші, Амстердам, Нидерланды

^{3, *4} ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Философия, саясаттану және дінтану институты, Алматы, Қазақстан

Аңдатпа. Бұл мақалада қазіргі Ресей режимінің идеологиясының құрамдас бөліктері саналатын «Орыс әлемі» (Русский мир), қиялдағы қауымдастықтар, еуразияшылдық және биосаясат – сыни геосаясат контекстінде талданады. Соңғы онжылдықта «Орыс әлемі» тұжырымдамасы Кремльдің идеологиялық баяндауларында уақыт өткен сайын негізгі орынды ала бастады. Бұл тұжырымдама Ресейді қазіргі саяси шекараларынан тыс жатқан, тілді, тарихты және мәдени құндылықтарды байланыстыратын қауымдастықтар арқылы біріктіретін трансұлттық өркениет ретінде ұсынады. Орыс әлемі бейнесіндегі нарративті елестетілген қауымдастықтар қолдап, бұл трансұлттық байланыстарды күрделі әлеуметтік құрылым ретінде бейнелейді. Кеңес Одағы ыдырағаннан кейін идеологиялық дискурс ретінде қайта жанданған еуразияшылдық Ресейді Батыстан да, Шығыстан да бөлек ерекше өркениет ретінде көрсетуге тырысады.

Зерттеу әдістемесі логикалық, тарихи әдіс және «Орыс әлемі» компоненттерінің өзара байланыстарын табуға негізделген. Зерттеудің ғылыми маңызы – бұл идеологиялық құрылымның мәнін түсінуде жатыр, ол геосаяси амбицияларды, әсіресе Ресеймен шекаралас елдерге қатысты, заңдастыру құралы ретінде қызмет етеді. Практикалық маңызы «Орыс әлемінің» түсінігінің әртүрлі құралдары мен формаларын жұмсақ, қатаң және олардың аралас нұсқаларын болжауға мүмкіндік береді. Қолданылатын құралдар мен формалар жағдайға байланысты таңдалады. Мысалы, Қазақстанға қатысты «Орыс әлемінің» жұмсақ формасы қолданылады. Украинаға қатысты ең қатаң түрі, яғни, «арнайы әскери операция» түрінде жүзеге асырылуда. Ал, Беларусь пен Ресейдің одақтас мемлекеттер интеграциясы мысалында көрсетіледі. Мақаланың қорытындылары насихаттық мәлімдемелердің артында тұрған «Орыс әлемінің» мәнін және шығу тегін, сондай-ақ көпполюсті әлемнің бір полюсі болуға ұмтылысын

тануға мүмкіндік береді.

Тірек сөздер: Орыс әлемі, қиялдағы қауымдастықтар, еуразияшылдық, биосаясат, сыншыл геосаясат, Посткеңестік кеңістік, көпполярлы әлем, жұмсақ күш

Қаржыландыру: Мақаладағы зерттеу Қазақстан Республикасының Ғылым және жоғары білім министрлігінің гранттық қолдауымен АР26100127 «Саяси коммуникацияның тиімділігі контекстінде қазақстандықтардың цифрлық медиа сауаттылығын арттыру» жобасы аясында жүзеге асырылды.

КОНЦЕПТ «РУССКОГО МИРА»: КРИТИЧЕСКАЯ ГЕОПОЛИТИКА, ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИЕ И МИРОВОЗЗРЕНЧЕСКИЕ АСПЕКТЫ

Ибадильдин Н.¹, Эпплс Й.², Исмагамбетов Т.Т.³, *Айтымбетов Н.И.⁴

¹ Университет КИМЭП, Алматы, Казахстан

² Независимый исследователь, Амстердам, Нидерланды

^{3,*4} Институт философии, политологии и религиоведения КН МНВО РК, Алматы, Казахстан

Аннотация. В данной статье анализируются компоненты идеологии современного режима России – «Русский мир», воображаемые сообщества, евразийство и биополитика – в контексте критической геополитики. Концепция «Русского мира» в последнее десятилетие все больше занимает центральное место в идеологических нарративах Кремля, представляя Россию как транснациональную цивилизацию, выходящую за пределы её нынешних политических границ и объединяющую сообщества через язык, историю и культурные ценности. Воображаемые сообщества в образе «Русского мира» поддерживают этот нарратив, представляя эти транснациональные связи как сложносоставную единую социальную конструкцию. Евразийство, возрождённое как идеологический дискурс после распада Советского Союза, стремится выделить Россию как особую цивилизацию, отличную как от Запада, так и от Востока.

Методология исследования основана на логическом методе, историческом методе и нахождении взаимных связей между компонентами «Русского мира». Научное значение состоит в понимании сущности этой идеологической конструкции, которая служит для легитимации геополитических амбиций, особенно по отношению к сопредельной России странам. Практическая значимость состоит в том, что это понимание позволяет прогнозировать разные инструменты и формы как мягкие, так и жёсткие и их гибридные варианты по отношению к ближнему зарубежью. Выбор инструментов и формы зависит от ситуации. Так по отношению к Казахстану применяется мягкая форма «Русского мира». Для Украины – самая жесткая форма в виде «специальной военной операции», в то время как Беларусь есть пример интеграции в так называемое Союзное государство Беларуси и России. Выводы статьи позволяют распознать за

пропагандистскими заявлениями сущность и истоки «Русского мира», стремление стать одним из полюсов многополярного мира.

Ключевые слова: Российский мир, воображаемые сообщества, евразийство, биополитика, критическая геополитика, постсоветское пространство, многополярный мир, мягкая сила

Финансирование: Исследование, представленное в статье, выполнено при грантовой поддержке Министерства науки и высшего образования Республики Казахстан в рамках проекта AP26100127 «Повышение цифровой медиаграмотности казахстанцев в контексте эффективности политической коммуникации».

Information about authors:

Ibadildin Nigmat – head of Department, Assistant Professor, PhD, KIMEP, Almaty, Kazakhstan, email: nygmet@kimep.kz, ORCID ID 0000-0001-7794-3128

Appels Johannes Peter Woutherus – Master of International Relations, independent researcher, Amsterdam, Netherlands, email: sam-a@live.nl

Ismagambeov Talgat – Candidate of Political Sciences, Institute for Philosophy, Political Science and Religious Studies, Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: is_v2001@mail.ru ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9177-0208>

Aitymbetov Nurken – PhD, Institute of Philosophy, Political Science and Religious Studies, Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: aitymbetov_nurken@mail.ru ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2095-375X>

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Ибадильдин Нығмет Амангелдіұлы – халықаралық қатынастар және аймақтық зерттеулер кафедрасының меңгерушісі, ассистент профессор, PhD, КИМЭП, Алматы, Қазақстан, email: nygmet@kimep.kz, ORCID ID 0000-0001-7794-3128

Эпплс Йоханнес – халықаралық қатынастар магистры, тәуелсіз зерттеуші, Амстердам, Нидерланды, email: sam-a@live.nl

Исмағамбетов Талғат Таңатарұлы – ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Философия, саясаттану және дінтану институтының жетекші ғылыми қызметкері, саясаттану ғылымдарының кандидаты, Алматы қ., Қазақстан, e-mail: is_v2001@mail.ru ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9177-0208>

Айтымбетов Нүркен Ысқақұлы – PhD, ҚР ҒЖБМ ҒК Философия, саясаттану және дінтану институтының жетекші ғылыми қызметкері, PhD, Алматы қ., Қазақстан, e-mail: aitymbetov_nurken@mail.ru ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2095-375X>

Сведения об авторах:

Ибадильдин Ныгмет Амангельдинович – заведующий кафедрой международных отношений и региональных исследований, ассистент профессор, PhD, КИМЭП, Алматы, Казахстан, email: nygmet@kimep.kz, ORCID ID 0000-0001-7794-3128

Эпплс Йоханнес – магистр международных отношений, независимый исследователь, Амстердам, Нидерланды, email: sam-a@live.nl

Исмагамбетов Талгат Танатарович – кандидат политических наук, ведущий научный сотрудник Института философии, политологии и религиоведения КН МНВО РК, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: is_v2001@mail.ru ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9177-0208>

Айтымбетов Нуркен Искакович – PhD, ведущий научный сотрудник Института философии, политологии и религиоведения КН МНВО РК, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: aitymbetov_nurken@mail.ru ORCID ID <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2095-375X>

Received: May 18, 2025