



Possible trends in modern Russian philosophy and social science of physical culture and sports

UDC 316.77



PhD, Associate Professor **K.Y. Donskikh**¹

PhD, Associate Professor **D.V. Kotusov**¹

PhD, Associate Professor **N.V. Arzamastseva**¹

¹Russian State Agrarian University – Timiryazev Moscow Agricultural Academy, Moscow, Russia

Corresponding author: ks.donskih@gmail.com

Received by the editorial office on 24.04.2025

Abstract

Objective of the study is to highlight and discuss the probabilistic trends in modern Russian social philosophy and the science of FKIS, starting in the 90s of the XX century. laid by the next wave of "Eurocentrism" and "Westernization" of the domestic information space.

Methods and structure of the study. The study is designed as a systematic comparison of generally accepted and innovative scientific approaches in the fields of philosophy, social and cultural anthropology, history, political economy, political science, sociology, psychology and pedagogy of physical culture and sports.

Results and conclusions. The current state of Russian philosophy of physical culture and Sport (FKIS), as well as related social sciences, is characterized by sustained conservatism, insufficient preparedness and adaptation to a number of significant changes. This concerns the transition of Russian society to a capitalist model of development, the increasing informational impact of Western (European and American) scientific, educational and cultural trends, the aggravation of the international situation and foreign policy contradictions, as well as the transformation of the role and social significance of elite and Olympic sports in modern reality. Due to the objectivity and inevitability of historical progress, there is an urgent need for an urgent and fundamental restructuring of philosophy and social sciences studying the FKIS. This is necessary to ensure their compliance with modern socio-cultural challenges and the ability to adequately understand and cover them.

Keywords: *modern Russian philosophy, modern Russian social science, probabilistic trends of change, philosophy, science, education.*

Introduction. It is known that the first publications on the philosophy of physical education and sport (hereinafter referred to as PES) began to appear in the 1920s. In this regard, it becomes obvious that specialized philosophy is already about 100 years old [6, 7, 11-14]. At the same time, the significant diversity of philosophical doctrines of the 19th–20th centuries leads to the conclusion about the initial heterogeneity of the philosophical foundations of social sports science. This heterogeneity quite naturally influenced the theory and methodology of the social sciences of PES themselves, providing them with multidirectional development vectors [4, 5].

The heterogeneity and multidirectionality of the social sciences of PES, on the one hand, were further

proof of the falsity of a purely cumulative model of growth and accumulation of scientific knowledge, on the other hand, gave rise to a mass of discrepancies and paradoxes that are extremely harmful and dangerous from the standpoint of the principles of scientific unambiguity and consistency. Recognizing the undoubted fact of heterogeneity of the profile social science, specialists began to talk about history, pedagogy, sociology and psychology of physical culture and sport not just as sciences, but as disciplines filled with disagreements and internal contradictions, as eclectic conglomerates, in addition to science, including elements of mythology, ideology, art [1, 2, 6, 7, 10-14].

However, this heterogeneity also has a common character and features determined by belonging to



the Eurocentric and American sociocultural programs. These programs have been washing over Russian science, education, and culture in waves for the last century and a half, largely suppressing elements of originality and national identification, leaving Russian scientists at the “tail” of the world development of science. Therefore, the relevance of the proposed material, taking into account the assertion about the initial heterogeneity of domestic specialized philosophy and social science, is determined by the problem of their traditional commitment to foreign borrowings – commitment, once again confirmed by the facts of mass philosophical and social scientific borrowings in the period from the mid-90s of the 20th century to the present.

Objective of the study is to highlight and discuss the probabilistic trends in the change of modern domestic social philosophy and science of physical culture and social science, starting from the 90s of the 20th century, laid down by the next wave of “Eurocentrism” and “Westernization” of the domestic information space, including specialized philosophy, science, and education.

Methodology and organization of research. The scientific work is organized in the form of a consistent comparative analysis of traditional and innovative scientific concepts in the field of philosophy, social and cultural anthropology, history, political economy, political science, sociology, psychology and pedagogy of physical education and sports [7-8, 10-14]. The object of the analysis is foreign philosophical and social scientific borrowings, and the subject is the most probable trends of their dissemination to the sphere of philosophy and social science of physical education and sports. The hypothesis of the study consists in a preliminary scientifically substantiated assumption that the most promising trends of transferring the said borrowings to the sphere of physical education and sports have a fairly high probability, since they are based on the natural and largely inevitable nature of the development of this process.

Results of the study and their discussion. Philosophy of Physical Education and Sports. The main array of traditional areas of philosophical research in the field of Physical Education and Sports, for example, presented in the Anthology of Philosophy of Sport by Klaus Meyer and William Morgan [6, 14], or in the Reader edited by V.I. Stolyarov [11-13], is clear evidence of the great diversity and mixture of philosophical and sociological concepts of Physical Education

and Sports. However, even this array cannot take into account the full range and depth of philosophical and social problems of the existence of a specialized sphere in the conditions of the modern information society with its high rates of development of digital culture, which, in turn, greatly affects the nature and direction of development of modern sports [2, 3, 6-8]. The modern conflict confrontation between Russia and Europe also requires a significant adjustment of philosophical ideas about the humanistic, non-political, peacekeeping role of sport in the modern international process [1, 5, 10-13].

A new philosophical understanding requires a significant correction of the ancient and modern history of Olympism [7, 12, 13], partly unconsciously and partly quite consciously mythologically manipulated by apologists of the Western European model of the Olympic tradition [2, 5, 7, 12, 13].

In general, a thorough work should be done with the philosophical understanding of sport as an ancient and modern social institution, taking into account its religious and political roots and modern market-oligopolistic, corrupt-bureaucratic realities [1-3, 7, 10-13].

Anthropology of Physical Culture and Sport.

Sport is not the only component of the Physical Culture and Sport sphere. Physical culture, physical and military-physical education also have high social significance and an objective historical role in the development of society, which is especially relevant in the modern period of politicization and institutionalization of sports [1, 3, 4, 5, 7]. Now that society has entered a period of global crisis, it is necessary to point out the significant difference between sports, physical culture, military-physical education [1, 4, 5, 7].

It would also be worthwhile to consider that in addition to philosophical anthropology and cultural studies of sport, social and cultural anthropology has long existed and is actively developing [2, 7, 8, 16, 18]. This relatively young science includes many areas that can “shed light” on the real and concrete social identification and specificity of various forms and types of physical culture and physical education, different tribes, peoples, nations [8]. Which, in turn, will significantly undermine the absolutism of ideas about sport as a global phenomenon in the era of globalization.

Sociology of Physical Culture and Sport. Some experts have already rightly noted that the sociology of sport, firstly, is mixed with the philosophy and cultural studies of sport [7, 9-14], and secondly, it is develop-



ing in parallel and in significant isolation from the main directions of modern world sociology, which is largely due to the absence of international and domestic associations, unions and journals with a pure physical education and sports orientation [9].

In pursuit of the constitution of its own scientific discipline, the sociology of physical education and sport has largely lost its connection with sociology as a science, having blocked its own opportunity to feed on the latest sociological theories and concepts with its own traditionalism and conservatism.

Psychology of Physical Education and Sport. A similar situation of parallelism and lag has developed in the psychology of physical education and sport, which often comes into conflict not only with modern psychology, but also with sports pedagogy, and even with the theory and methodology of sport [4, 18].

Domestic psychology of physical education and sport has not yet fully realized the importance and irreversibility of modern trends in the radical convergence of biology, applied and psychological anthropology, social psychology with the real prospect of the formation of biosocial psychology as a new scientific discipline [8].

Conclusions. Traditional Russian philosophy of physical education and sport and social sciences of physical education and sport as a whole still demonstrate conservatism, unpreparedness and unadaptability to the transition of Russian society to the principles of capitalist formation development (without comments on the assessment of this transition), to the next wave of information influence from Eurocentric and American scientific, educational, cultural borrowings, to the situation of acute (partially military) confrontation of Russia in the foreign policy arena, to the change in the role and social significance of the highest achievements and Olympic sports in modern conditions. The objectivity and irreversibility of the historical process raises the question of an immediate and significant restructuring of the philosophy and social sciences of physical education and sport in order to remain at the height of correct understanding and coverage of modern socio-cultural challenges.

References

1. Bauer V.G. Socialnaya znachimost fizicheskoy kultury i sporta v sovremennykh usloviyakh razvitiya Rossii. *Teoriya i praktika fizicheskoy kultury*. 2001. No. 1. Pp. 50-56.
2. Lenk G. Sport kak sovremennyy mif? *Religiya*. Magiya. Mif. *Sovremennyye filosofskie issledovaniya*. M.: URSS. 1997. Pp. 156-179.
3. Lesh K. Vyrozhdenie sporta. *Logos*. 2006. No. 3 (54). Pp. 23-40.
4. Matveev L.P. Ot teorii sportivnoy trenirovki – k obshchey teorii sporta. *Teoriya i praktika fizicheskoy kultury*. 1998. No. 5. Pp. 5-8.
5. Melnikova N.Yu., Treskin A.V. *Istoriya fizicheskoy kultury i sporta: uchebnik*; pod. red. prof. N.Yu. Melnikovoj. M.: Sovetskiy sport, 2013. 392 p.: il.
6. Morgan U. *Filosofiya sporta: istoricheskiy i konceptualnyy obzor i ocenka ee budushchego*. *Logos*. 2006. No. 3 (54). Pp. 147-159.
7. Peredelskiy A.A. Dvulikiy Yanus. Sport kak socialnyy fenomen: sushhnost i ontologicheskie osnovaniya: monografiya. M.: Sport, 2016. 312 p.
8. Peredelskiy A.A., Zaharov M.Yu., Kortunov V.V., Zaycev A.A. Obosnovanie prikladnoy antropologii fizicheskoy kultury i sporta kak integrativnoy discipliny socialno-gumanitarnogo znaniya. *Teoriya i praktika fizicheskoy kultury*. 2025. No. 2. Pp. 42-44.
9. Peredelskiy A.A., Mamedov A.A., Kortunov V.V., Zaycev A.A. *Sociologiya fizicheskoy kultury i sporta v deyatelnosti sociologicheskikh associatsiy, obshchestv i izdaniy: realnost, problemy, perspektivy*. *Teoriya i praktika fizicheskoy kultury*. 2025. No. 5. Pp. 106-108.
10. Ponomarchuk V.A. Sport kak socialnyy institut. *Nauka o sporte. Enciklopediya sistem zhizneobespecheniya*. M.: YUNESKO, MAGISTR-PRESS, 2011. Pp. 797-813.
11. Stolyarov V.I. *Filosofiya sporta i telesnosti cheloveka: Monografiya*. V 2-h kn. M.: Universitetskaya kniga, 2011. Kn. 1. Vvedenie v mir filosofii sporta i telesnosti cheloveka. 766 p.
12. Stolyarov V.I., Chesnokov N.N., Stopnikova E.V. *Hrestomatiya po sociologii fizicheskoy kultury i sporta*. M.: Fizicheskaya kultura, 2005. Ch.1. 448 p.
13. Stolyarov V.I., Chesnokov N.N., Stopnikova E.V. *Hrestomatiya po sociologii fizicheskoy kultury i sporta*. M.: Fizicheskaya kultura, 2005. Ch.2. 448 p.
14. Fairchild David L. Review Essay: Morgan William J., Meier Klaus V. *Philosophic Inquiry in Sport*. Campaign, IL.: Human Kinetics, 1988. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*. 1987, Vol. XIV. Pp. 71-79.