

Arctic and North. 2025. No. 59. Pp. 200–208.

Review article

UDC [101.1:316.3](985)(045)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37482/issn2221-2698.2025.59.238>

Elements of the Cognitive Sovereignty Strategy in Arctic Socio-Humanitarian Research

Elena V. Kudryashova¹, Dr. Sci. (Phil.), Professor

Artem V. Makulin²✉, Dr. Sci. (Phil.), Associate Professor

Marina V. Nenasheva³, Cand. Sci. (Phil.), Associate Professor

Inga M. Zashikhina⁴, Cand. Sci. (Phil.), Associate Professor

Larisa A. Zhgileva⁵, Cand. Sci. (Phil.), Associate Professor

Fen Lyu⁶, Cand. Sci. (Ped.), Senior Lecturer

Sun Yanan⁷, Cand. Sci. (Philol.), Senior Lecturer

^{2, 3, 4, 5} Northern (Arctic) Federal University named after M.V. Lomonosov, Naberezhnaya Severnoy Dviny, 17, Arkhangelsk, Russia

⁶ Southwest University of Science and Technology, Fucheng District, Sichuan, Mianyang, China

⁷ International Art College of Shandong Normal University, Wenhua East Road, 88, Lixia District, Jinan, China

¹ ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0684-3856>

² a.makulin@narfu.ru ✉, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7028-9650>

³ m.nenasheva@narfu.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2875-5638>

⁴ i.zashikhina@narfu.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8217-2302>

⁵ l.zhgileva@narfu.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1639-5791>

⁶ 635155335@qq.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1497-0724>

⁷ 1195279203@qq.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4450-6196>

Abstract. The article discusses the elements of the concept of “cognitive sovereignty” in relation to the practice of building a unified Russian strategy in Arctic socio-humanitarian research. Based on the problem field of various types of sovereignty, the general outlines of a strategy for creating an integrated mechanism for independent examination of existing and future scientific concepts that define thematic, problematic and methodological diversity in Arctic socio-humanitarian research are highlighted. The proposed strategy explicates the close relationship between the level of formation of cognitive sovereignty in the Russian humanitarian scientific community and the possibilities of developing the domestic potential of a cognitive resource in the social sciences. The authors are of the opinion that the production, functioning and transformation of the content of knowledge are socially determined; therefore, cognitive sovereignty is considered as a tool that prevents the ideological and informational manipulation of cognitive intents of Russian science. The practical significance of the proposed strategy lies in the possibility of applying its provisions in the development, planning and implementation of socio-humanitarian scientific research, providing Russia with the opportunity to create not only innovative ideas and products, but also to make them globally competitive. The latter is a guarantee of an independently manageable and understandable future, defense capability, economic power and the possibility of successful competition in the Arctic region.

Keywords: *cognitive sovereignty, humanitarian geography, cultural identity, scientific discourse, Arkhangelsk Oblast, Russian Arctic*

* © Kudryashova E.V., Makulin A.V., Nenasheva M.V., Zashikhina I.M., Zhgileva L.A., Fen L., Sun Y., 2025

For citation: Kudryashova E.V., Makulin A.V., Nenasheva M.V., Zashikhina I.M., Zhgileva L.A., Fen L., Sun Y. Elements of the Cognitive Sovereignty Strategy in Arctic Socio-Humanitarian Research. *Arktika i Sever* [Arctic and North], 2025, no. 59, pp. 238–248. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.37482/issn2221-2698.2025.59.248>



This work is licensed under a CC BY-SA License

«Sapere aude! — Have the courage to use your own reason!

I. Kant

Relevance of the cognitive sovereignty strategy

In the current geopolitical situation, the ability of countries to reproduce the genetic foundations of their own culture, based on the understanding of fundamental historically determined strategies of adaptation, preservation and progress of intellectual potentials embedded in a particular culture, is of great importance. The results of social forecasting and foresight studies [1, Lishuan G.] indicate the emergence and spread of situations that entail the future revision of traditional mechanisms¹ for the reproduction of cultural identity in all its diversity and manifestations [2, Permilovskiy M.S.]. Russian mentality, gravitating toward the traditional mechanisms of its own reproduction, as well as seeking a competitive place for itself in the global world and developing optimal ways to respond to the challenges of modernity, needs an explication of semantic heuristics, scientific and philosophical justification of new concepts that have application to specific macro-regions of the Russian Federation [3, Reznik Yu.M.]. One of the promising directions for responding to the challenges of our time is the formation of a system of cognitive sovereignty [4, Selezneva I.E.], the production of which will be carried out by scientists, researchers, representatives of the academic and expert community in various disciplinary areas of social and humanitarian profile. The specific task that the strategy is aimed at solving is to develop a conceptual model of cognitive sovereignty and justify its use to develop new approaches to the formation of Russia's cognitive sovereignty in the Arctic. The scale of the task is determined by the need to ensure Russia's sovereignty in the world and the search for new approaches to the integrated development of the Arctic. The complexity of the task lies in the broad coverage of the phenomena under study: from various theories and approaches to the development of northern spaces to the concept of sovereignty as a multidimensional interdisciplinary phenomenon.

The scientific problem is related to the search for new approaches to the formation of cognitive sovereignty of the Arctic Zone of the Russian Federation and the resulting need for philosophical-methodological and socio-epistemological reflection of the concept of "cognitive sovereignty" based on the scientific and publication discourse on Arctic issues. Reproduction of the genetic foundations of one's own culture and the development of one's own, rather than globalist, forms of enlightenment [5, Ignatyeva O.A.] is not possible without understanding the fundamental historically determined strategies of adaptation, preservation and progress of intellectual potentials embedded in a particular culture. After the collapse of the USSR, Russia experienced a fundamental social transformation, the consequence of which was the destruction of the integrity of a single socio-economic system and the network of institutionalized social exchange based on it.

¹ Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of 09.11.2022 No. 809 "On approval of the fundamentals of state policy for the preservation and strengthening of traditional Russian spiritual and moral values" URL: https://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_430906/ (accessed 05 February 2024).

The strategy implies a mechanism for creating national instruments for ensuring cognitive sovereignty on the example of the Arctic zone of the Russian Federation. The scientific novelty of the strategy lies in the development of a conceptual model of cognitive sovereignty in the segment of scientific and published discourse on the Arctic, description and explication of mechanisms and algorithms of its use not only at the regional level, but also for the solution of federal tasks aimed at the formation and protection of cognitive sovereignty of the Russian Federation.

Expected results of the strategy and their significance

The expected results are as follows:

- construction of a cognitive sovereignty model;
- identification of mechanisms of cognitive sovereignty formation;
- creation of a unique digital database on the problem of cognitive sovereignty with the possibility of its analysis, compacting and visualization of the obtained conclusions, as well as extraction of non-trivial information about the phenomenon under study within the declared area — Arctic humanitarian research on the example of the scientific discourse of the Arkhangelsk Oblast.

The possibility of transferring the general algorithm of creating the declared database to other regions with their own specifics and problems of competitive reproduction of science and innovative business in the invention–innovation chain is assumed. The social significance lies in the possibility of formulating scientifically grounded proposals for the development of social sphere of the Arkhangelsk Oblast as a whole, the education and science system in the region in particular, as well as assistance in the work of government bodies on the issues of cognitive sovereignty in a specific area. The main task of the digital database on the problem of cognitive sovereignty is in solving the current problem, the dilemma of the inventor-innovator [6, Graham L.], i.e., on the one hand, in the search for workable links between creativity and invention, on the other hand, in the implementation of discoveries, inventions and innovations in the spheres of production, science and technology, social sphere, education. The application of the findings of this knowledge base will allow finding gaps and barriers in the processes of implementing innovations in a specific region.

Possibilities of using the results of the strategy

The results of the strategy can be used in the development of programs for the implementation of innovations at enterprises by restructuring the professional consciousness of entrepreneurs, enterprise managers and employees, in particular, reorienting from consciousness founded on the so-called “colonial thinking” to professional thinking based on the concept of cognitive sovereignty. Approbation of the concept of cognitive sovereignty in a specific region could become an experimental platform for the tasks faced by the social development of the Russian Federation as a competitive player in the international arena. The Arctic region, given its difficult climatic condi-

tions and sparse population, seems to be a convenient and safe platform for testing the model, since the risk of unplanned social effects from the implementation of the model is reduced compared to, for example, larger social platforms (megapolises, etc.).

Discussion issues and paradigms substantiating the relevance of the strategy

In the context of the declared challenges of Industry 4.0 [7, Schwab K.], as well as forecasts about the transition of the world from an “empty” state to a “full” one (Report of the Club of Rome 2018 “New Enlightenment” [8, Yanitskiy O.N.]), the ability of countries to protect their own cultural and genetic potentials is of particular importance. Disruptive innovations (the so-called “disruptive” technologies) predetermine the disappearance of many professions, the displacement of people from various production and intellectual chains, the creation of the Internet of Things (IoT), the widespread introduction of robotic systems in the processes of making not only technical, but also ethical decisions (machine ethics or machine morality). Thus, the preconditions are being created for a total revision and cancellation of traditional mechanisms of reproduction of cultural identity in all its diversity and manifestations. The Russian strategy needs an explication of new semantic heuristics. The latter is impossible without studying the phenomenon of cognitive sovereignty and the problem of cognitive import substitution. Scientists note the formation of a generation (millennials, Z) as a consequence of the neoliberal withdrawal of the modernist humanistic ideal of human development from the idea of the state. After the second collapse of statehood at the end of the 20th century, Russia experienced a fundamental social transformation, the consequence of which was the destruction of the integrity of a single socio-political-economic system and the network of institutionalized social exchange based on it. Serious challenges arose for national security [9, Kokoshin A.]. The structures of continuity of social experience and scientific knowledge were torn apart. In the information-cognitive field, which came under external control, a single rule was established: all achievements of Russian civilization were actually declared insignificant or borrowed; the assessment of errors was unilaterally hypertrophied and hyperbolized. The cognitive war (mental war, “brain war”) unleashed by the West against Russia played an important role [10, Medushevskiy A.N.]. The result is a generation whose world is defined by the “absence of a recognizable and understandable future”, overflowing with contradictions, the solution of which is supposedly impossible within the framework of their own country, conflicts, psychological vulnerability and ideological socio-cognitive-civilizational inferiority. The lack of support in the form of successful strategies for achieving serious civilizational goals, ideals, moral standards, behavior patterns, successful innovations, which traditionally serve as a model for building a personal, civic identity, has manifested itself in the emergence of a rift in social communication between the generation that sets standards and carries the civilizational baton, and the generation that accepts and develops the heritage at a new level of historical development. In the modern information society, cognitive sovereignty is produced by scientists, researchers, representatives of the academic and expert community in various disciplinary areas of

the social and humanitarian profile. The comprehension of social development and the formation of mechanisms of cultural identity take place in the course of search, analytical activity, in which the above-mentioned representatives of the academic community are involved. The results of this activity are expressed in scientific publications. The latter are an important communication tool in the public space. Being a criterion for the effectiveness of the work of representatives of the academic community, today scientific publications also reflect the areas in which knowledge-intensive activities are carried out. Thus, in scientific publications we find coverage of pressing problems of modern society and attempts to solve them by the authors of the articles. Since the main space for the formation of cognitive sovereignty is the field of education, it would not be an exaggeration to say that the production of cognitive sovereignty in society is carried out by kindergarten teachers, school teachers, and lecturers of secondary specialized schools and universities. All these personnel are engaged in research activities to one degree or another and, at their level, transmit the results of their search to the public space. Obviously, representatives of the education sector are making attempts to create innovative solutions [11, Zhernov E.E.]. However, in general, publications describe the state of affairs that has already developed in the public space. Thus, scientific publications are a mirror reflection of the epistemological situation in which modern society finds itself and what cognitive patterns are used in the field of the modern academic community in general and education in particular. Discussion of certain issues and problematic areas in scientific articles indicates the thematic blocks responsible for the formation of the cognitive status of the subjects of education. Thus, the domestic scientific community plays a critically important role in building relations between the ideological and political course of the Russian state-civilization on the one hand and the younger generation on the other [12, Belyaeva L.A.].

Objectives of the strategy, its scale and complexity

The specific objective that the strategy is aimed at is to develop a conceptual model of cognitive sovereignty and justify the use of this model to develop new approaches and recommendations for the formation of Russia's national sovereignty in the Arctic. The scale of the task is determined by the need to ensure Russia's sovereignty in the world and the search for new approaches to the integrated development of the Arctic. The applied task is to develop algorithms that help to overcome the effects of external reflexive management [13, Lefebvre V.; 14, Novikov D.A., Chkhartishvili A.G.] by cognitive discourses of Russian social and humanitarian research. The complexity of the task lies in the broad coverage of the phenomena under study: from various theories and approaches to the development of the northern and Arctic spaces of the Russian Federation to the concept of sovereignty as a multidimensional and interdisciplinary phenomenon.

Global paradigms and the problem of cognitive sovereignty

The current state of research on this problem varies in the global agenda by several fundamental interdisciplinary problem and thematic areas related to the socio-humanitarian para-

digms (projects) of the world social order: the first is the liberal model of economic, political, cultural, scientific, creative, ethical-aesthetic and ideological hegemony of Western civilization, built on the following principle: technologically advanced metropolis (core, “golden billion”²) vs. raw material colonies (resource periphery). According to this position, the hegemony of Western civilization is an axiom accepted as a justification for the “end of history”, which means the final victory of Western liberal civilization in the modern world and, as a consequence, the exclusion of other alternatives of the socio-cultural, spiritual and ideological development of mankind from the historical process. This model implies the so-called zero-sum game — a complete and final victory of the liberal model with a complete loss of all other alternatives (i.e. controlled preservation of safe and disarmed in every sense alternatives for the needs, requirements and demands of the metropolis). Such a system, in essence, is a closed non-democratic network organization of financial and real power, the power structures of Western civilization, using the rest of the world to solve their own problems related to the preservation and increase of their power and influence. The second paradigm, which puts forward the multi-polarity of the world as a dominant factor in its stability, assumes non-linearity and non-equilibrium of predictive-civilizational prospects, open for development, the complexity of cultural-genetic systems of response to external and internal challenges. In the regional agenda, the research issues are formed and substantiated by the logic of the concept of the “Russian world” and an attempt to find cognitive, socio-epistemological, communicative mechanisms for safe and sustainable development of Russian civilization through “soft power”, internal cultural and genetic reserves, codes and information flows, as well as a constructive and competitive response to the global challenges of Industry 4.0 and the disruptive technologies and innovations associated with it.

***Proposed methods and approaches, general plan for the first stage
of the strategy implementation***

Cognitive sovereignty is a concept, the semantic heuristics of which are actualized under the influence of global changes and challenges of the modern world. At the same time, the concept of cognitive sovereignty within the framework of the proposed strategy is considered as an unchanging conceptual core of collective consciousness, founded on history, culture, cognitive picture of the world and multinational identity of the Russian civilization. The multidimensionality of the concept of cognitive sovereignty, its socio-cultural and political significance determine the choice of approaches and methods of scientific research.

Since it is impossible to review all stages of the strategy within the framework of one article, we will consider specific activities for the implementation of its first stage.

At the first stage, using integrated and interdisciplinary approaches, the multidimensionality of semantic heuristics of the concept of “cognitive sovereignty” in modern social and humanitarian knowledge will be studied. As a result, the conceptual sphere (D.S. Likhachev) of the con-

² "Putin called the idea of the "golden billion" neocolonialist and racist" Forum "Strong ideas for a new time". URL: <https://tass.ru/politika/15264159> (accessed 05 January 2024).

cept of “cognitive sovereignty” will be described. The next stage of the study will consist in the analysis of the existential forms of the concept of “cognitive sovereignty” in modern social and humanitarian scientific discourse. The results of this stage of the study will include:

- analysis of the semantic and content structure of the “cognitive sovereignty” concept;
- cultural and anthropological interpretation of the content of the “cognitive sovereignty” concept;
- epistemological interpretation of the “cognitive sovereignty” concept;
- analysis of the reflection of the elements of the “cognitive sovereignty” concept in the scientific and publication discourse on the Arctic using articles of socio-humanitarian orientation;
- cultural-anthropological and epistemological analysis of the “cognitive sovereignty” concept of the Russian Arctic on the example of the scientific discourse of the Arkhangelsk Oblast.

To elaborate the theoretical aspects of the topic, the following tools will be used:

- method of accumulating initial theoretical material with its subsequent primary generalization on the main aspects of the problem;
- comparative analysis of Russian and foreign scientific literature on the topic of the project using an interdisciplinary approach;
- general logical method of analyzing the “cognitive sovereignty” concept;
- method of explication of semantic heuristics of the “cognitive sovereignty” concept from scientific texts of social and humanitarian focus on Arctic topics;
- method of visual-digital modeling of the “cognitive sovereignty of the Russian Arctic” concept;
- digital processing of the obtained databases, data mining (deep data analysis).

Systemic content analysis will be used to analyze texts of social and humanitarian focus. In the traditions of the hermeneutic approach, scientific works published in journals of the social and humanitarian profile of the scientific metric database RSCI (Russian Science Citation Index) over the past 15 years (2010–2024) will be studied.

The following practical steps are planned:

- development of criteria for selecting journals of social, humanitarian and interdisciplinary profile in the thematic area “Arctic. Arctic Research” to study the issue of the cognitive status of the Russian Arctic;
- selection of journals of social and humanitarian and interdisciplinary profile in the thematic area “Arctic. Arctic Research”;
- selection of keywords for a sample of articles suitable for text and logical analysis of the cognitive status of Arctic territories;
- selection of at least 200 articles of social and humanitarian profile by keywords;

- systematic content analysis of the selected articles for understanding the cognitive status of the Russian Arctic in the scientific discourse of the Arkhangelsk Oblast;
- description of the cognitive status of the population of the Arctic region by researchers of the Arkhangelsk Oblast in dynamics over the past 15 years (2010–2024). To develop a model of the “cognitive sovereignty” concept, methods of scientific modeling and visualization of the obtained data will be used.

The work plan for 2025–2026 includes:

- analysis of the experience of foreign and domestic researchers in studying the theory of development of northern and Arctic territories, the concept of sovereignty and the concept of “cognitive sovereignty of the Russian Arctic”;
- development of tools for semantic analysis of texts of social and humanitarian orientation on the problem of cognitive sovereignty of the Russian Arctic;
- explication of semantic heuristics of the “cognitive sovereignty of the Russian Arctic” concept from the corpus of scientific texts of social and humanitarian orientation.

Conclusion

The task of developing and implementing a conceptual model of “cognitive sovereignty” in Arctic social and humanitarian research can only be solved using an integrated and interdisciplinary approach. The results obtained can be used to prepare recommendations for the development of strategies for the formation of cognitive sovereignty of the Russian Arctic, as well as new theoretical approaches to the development of northern spaces. The feasibility of solving the set task and the possibility of obtaining the expected results is determined by the creation of an information and analytical base with its subsequent processing using digital visualization methods (big data visualization) with the ability of extracting new data and knowledge from the obtained arrays of information.

References

1. Lishuang G. Rethinking and Reviving: The Modern Fate of Traditional Russian Values. *Voprosy Filosofii*, 2023, no. 3, pp. 58–69. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21146/0042-8744-2023-3-58-69>
2. Permilovsky M.S. Traditional Russian Spiritual and Moral Values and Russian Constitutional Values: The Dogmatic Correlation. *State Power and Local Self-Government*, 2023, no. 11, pp. 20–24. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.18572/1813-1247-2023-11-20-24>
3. Reznik Yu.M. Value Bases of Civilisational Existence of Man in Modern Russia. *Scientific Almanac Questions of the Social Theory*, 2021, vol. 13, pp. 73–103. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30936/2227_7951_2021_13_73_103
4. Selezneva I.E. Formation of Innovative Development Strategies in the New Reality of the Russian Economy. *Drukerovskij Vestnik*, 2022, no. 4 (48), pp. 4–14. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.17213/2312-6469-2022-4-4-14>
5. Ignatieva O.A. Formation of Cognitive and Technological Sovereignty in the Context of the Concept of Islandization. In: *Political Challenges and Political Dialogue in Conditions of Global Turbulence: Materials of the All-Russian RAPN Conference with International Participation*. Moscow, Aspekt Press Publ., 2022, pp. 182–183.

6. Graham L. *Can Russia Compete? History of Innovations in Tsarist, Soviet and Modern Russia*. Moscow, Mann, Ivanov i Ferber Publ., 2014, 254 p. (In Russ.)
7. Schwab K. *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*. Moscow, E Publ., 2016, 209 p. (In Russ.)
8. Yanitsky O.N. A New Report to the Roman Club for the 50th Anniversary of Its Foundation: Pluses and Minuses. *Vlast'*, 2018, no. 2, pp. 19–25.
9. Kokoshin A. National Interests, Real Sovereignty and National Security. *Voprosy Filosofii*, 2015, no. 10, pp. 5–19.
10. Medushevskiy A.N. Cognitive Warfare: Social Control, Meaning-Making and the Instrument of the Global Dominance (Part 2). *Issues of Economic Theory*, 2023, no. 3, pp. 92–107. DOI: https://doi.org/10.52342/2587-7666VTE_2023_3_92_107
11. Zhernov E.E. Technological and Humanistic Sovereignities: Search for a New Vector of Education. In: *65 Years of DonSTU. Science and Practice. Actual Issues and Innovations: Collection of Abstracts of Reports of the Anniversary International Scientific and Technical Conference*. Alchevsk, DonSTU Publ., 2022, pp. 77–80.
12. Belyaeva L.A. Russian Youth in Times of Change: Structural Changes and New Challenges to Political Socialization. *Voprosy Filosofii*, 2020, no. 10, pp. 17–27. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21146/0042-8744-2020-10-17-27>
13. Lefebvre V.A. *Lectures on the Theory of Reflexive Games*. Moscow, Kogito-Tsentr Publ., 2009, 218 p. (In Russ.)
14. Novikov D.A., Chkhartishvili A.G. *Reflexive Games*. Moscow, SINTEG Publ., 2003, 149 p. (In Russ.)

The article was submitted 14.05.2024; accepted for publication 21.05.2024

Contribution of the authors: the authors contributed equally to this article

The authors declare no conflicts of interests