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Религиозно-идеалистическая и позитивистско-практическая трактовки в рамках курса «Солидарология»

Проблема и цель. В России отмечается рост как общегражданской солидарности, так и солидарности сетевых сообществ, главным образом – добровольческих движений. При этом в имеющихся разработках курса «Солидарология» пока отсутствует база, демонстрирующая специфику и конструктивный потенциал исторически сложившихся концепций солидарности студентам всех направлений и программ подготовки.

Цель статьи – выявить сходства и различия между двумя исторически сложившимися трактовками солидарности для включения их в философский (метанаучный) раздел солидарологии, направленный на развенчание некоторых стереотипов об их конструктивном и деструктивном потенциале, научно обоснованном и идеологически сконструированном компонентах содержания.

Материалы и методы. Использованы источники, посвященные солидаризации и консолидации, начиная с XIX в., в достаточной степени разработанные специалистами, но в меньшей степени представленные в научно-популярном изложении и учебной литературе. Проанализированы методические разработки и нормативно-правовые акты, регулирующие образовательный процесс в части воспитания солидарности у обучающихся. Применены методы теоретического анализа и обобщения российской и зарубежной научной литературы по проблеме структурирования содержания курса солидарологии в высшем образовательном учреждении.

Результаты исследования. Представлена структура темы «Солидарология в России», состоящая из последовательного описания религиозно-идеалистической и позитивистско-практической трактовок солидарности в России. Исследование выявляет непреходящую теоретическую ценность и структуру философских концептуализаций солидарности в России и эвристическую значимость концепций соборности и кооперации, в соответствии с которой должны быть разработаны тексты лекций и практические занятия. Полученное знание стимулирует создание новым поколением молодых исследователей и креативного класса адекватной современности концепции общенациональной и глобальной солидарности, сохраняющей преимущества и конструктивные аспекты партикулярных и макросоциальных солидарностей.

Заключение. Охарактеризованы две основы отечественной солидарологии – религиозно-идеалистическая и позитивистско-практическая, не теряющие прикладное и мировоззренческое значение. В практика консолидации общества правомерно в равной степени использовать лучшие черты обеих для солидаризации власти, интеллектуальных групп, консолидации креативного класса со всеми слоями общества.
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Ссылка для цитирования:
Religious-idealist and positivist-practical interpretations within the “Solidarology” educational course

**The problem of the study.** Russia experiences the growth of both universal solidarity and the solidarity of network communities, especially of volunteer movements. The available developments of the Solidarology course do not provide students of all areas and training programs with materials demonstrating the specifics and the positive impact of historically established concepts of solidarity.

**The purpose of the study is** to identify similarities and differences between two historically established interpretations of solidarity in Russia to include them in a philosophical (metascientific) section of Solidarology, aimed at debunking some stereotypes about their constructive and destructive potential, and about their scientifically substantiated and ideologically constructed components.

**Materials and methods.** The authors refer to the literature on issues of solidarization and consolidation, starting from the 19th century. The sources applied are comparatively well-developed knowledge among professional researchers, but less presented in popular science literature and educational literature. The paper analyzes methodology developments and regulatory acts governing the educational process in terms of enhancing solidarity among students. The research applies the methods of theoretical review and generalization of international and Russian literature on the issues of structuring the content of Solidarology course in higher educational institutions.

**Results.** The paper represents the structure of Solidarology in Russia theme, consisting of a consistent description of the religious-idealist and positivist-practical interpretations of solidarity in Russia. Following the mentioned structure, lectures and practical classes should be developed. The findings stimulate the new generation of young researchers and a creative class in Russia to produce adequate new concepts of national and global solidarity, retaining the advantages and constructive aspects of the particularistic and macrosocial solidarities.

**Conclusion.** The authors distinguish two basic pillars of Russian Solidarology, religious-idealistic and positivist-practical, both of which retain their applied and ideological relevance. The practices of social consolidation can use the best features of both to solidarize the authorities, intellectual groups, and the creative class with all social strata.
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Introduction

The recent initiative by the UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres “Our Common Agenda” positions solidarity as a tool for the global mobilization of collective forces. This initiative aims to restore the level of education affected by the past pandemic and to adapt the educational system [38] to the passage from the “solid” to “liquid” phase of modernity. The “Revival of the Spirit of Mosul”, a joint initiative by UNESCO and the Republic of Iraq, also asserted education as the driving force for social unity [37]. Moreover, the International Association of Universities and the Magna Carta Observatory included solidarity and fair treatment of international partners to the educational institutions code [28].

While building an effective business strategy and searching for potential foreign policy allies, one should consider the peculiarities of solidarization and consolidation processes strongly associated with splitting public opinion [6; 32] on certain political decisions. Notwithstanding, it is essential to identify and study in-depth the patterns of newer solidarity types development. In this context, the young generation needs to acquire the skills of critical independent critical examination for any kind of solidarity concepts. The students should also display understanding of the capacities for practicing solidarity principles matching global humanity’s needs to traditional national and religious values, and personal development trajectories. We find it quite reasonable to introduce the Solidarology course for directions and specializations related to international relations [32], management, and foreign trade.

In 2016, Kh.A. Barlybaev first proposed the concept of innovative educational and scientific Solidarology course [see 3; 7]. Based on the monograph, he planned to compile a textbook, to design a program for educational institutions, and to build the learning process [8].

Solidarology studies cover all the multitude of varied forms of solidarity relations integral to society along with conflict relations, which have been already studied in a relatively well-researched separate area of Conflictology [3]. The core module group of Solidarology proposed by Kh.A. Barlybaev corresponds to the spheres of society, and includes solidarity ecology (which studies consent, cooperation, and mutual aid within human society and towards environment, namely, in form of nature protection), solidarity economy, policy, law, ethics, and management. Solidarology is intended to deepen and systematize knowledge on solidarity crises and types of solidarity relations, to give rationale for the need of “indioglobalization”, i.e., reconciling personal development with global strategy of sustainable development and building fair and solidarity society [3].

The intuition to distinguish this line of research into a distinct Solidarity discipline can be credited to P.A. Sorokin, who initiated Amitology and altruism studies. Sorokin defined it as a “positive” version of sociology placing primacy on love and overcoming one-sidedness of the “negative” one [29; 36], focused on adverse social phenomena of disintegration, social struggle, and anomie. The turn to a “positive” sociology correlated with developments of psychology, previously focused on complexes, neuroses, and deviations. The new direction in psychology, established by E. Shostrom and A. Maslow and familiar to P.A. Sorokin, was also familiar, was primarily concerned with the ways of personality self-actualization and building healthy non-manipulative relationships [34, pp. 117-118]. At present, this line of sociology, pedagogy and psychology research continues with the studies of solidarity basis, trust [15].
and agency [6; 25]. Agency manifests itself in a set of personality self-determination qualities: awareness, critical thinking, creativity, initiative, reflectiveness, and competence [25, p. 142].

Recent sociological research corresponds mostly to narrow specialized Solidarology tasks, and detects the sheer necessity to transform the work of emergency staff who operate strictly in compliance with uniform protocols. Applying traditional techniques and following to standardized guidelines often run counter to unpredictable patterns of emergency situations [39] and rapidly evolving local challenges. As the expanding non-specialist volunteer activities are not yet tightly regulated [39], they can boast the ability to adapt and thrive in response to not static, but rather constantly changing conditions. The absence of legal regulation and permanent control over non-formal volunteering mean that the interactions between volunteers, public service representatives, local population, and local governments draw on practices of solidarization [30] and consolidation. To reform the emergency services, government should incorporate the knowledge and values of solidarity to the rescuers, government and volunteers cooperation framework at the preparatory stage of search-and-rescue activities.

The elaboration of Solidarology is updated by reassociation of recent decades’ research with prerevolutionary socio-philosophical thought [31; 36] interrupted by the ideological policy of the Soviet state. On the other side, after the destruction of Soviet society, previously effective ways of solidarization have been lost or severely weakened [10, p. 97]. The new types of solidarity have just begun taking shape. Being at the early phase of their formation, they do not yet ensure the realization of the interests of the majority of the population. The post soviet decrease and transformations of solidarity manifested in the spread of professional deformations, a change in professional identities, and the search for new grounds of solidarity [13; 22].

Solidarology may become an antidote to the breakdown of Russia’s macrosocial solidarity into a number of simpler particularistic forms based on the combination of private interests and similarities in consumption levels. Gelepithis and Giani show that universities in Europe, albeit contributing to cultural inclusion, undermine economic solidarity. Namely, most graduates from European universities are less supportive of measures to fairly redistribute economic wealth and opportunities, since they have more to lose than gain from [27].

Not yet having experimented with a new Solidarology course, educational institutions have already introduced solidarity principles to various pedagogy contexts, such as environmental, cadet education and enhancing social solidarity. The Annex of Russian cadet (Cossack) development strategy, introduced by the Department of Cossacks affairs and cadet educational institutions and approved by the Government of the Rostov Region, sets out founding principles of military education. They contain the sobornost (collegiality, spiritual community), a peculiarly Russian version of solidarity, manifested in the synthesis of a “singular and plural, the real and the sacred, the rational and the irrational” [19].

Sobornost involves good leadership qualities and development of subjectnost (agency) by innovative methods of personal growth and self-development on one side and the mutual responsibility of person and collective on the other [19].

The research problem consists in the contradiction between the surge in the study of Solidarology course and the insufficient scientific knowledge on patterns of new solidarity types formation, ways of social solidarization and preventing local conflicts or catastrophes associated with global risks and threats.

The study aims to develop the fundamentals of historical-philosophical and socio-philosophical module of Solidarology course, related to meta-scientific base of solidarization
and solidarity’s sociocultural foundation research. To develop this module, the authors define general and special in the structure of influential trends in studies of solidarity in history and present Russian social thought.

Materials and methods

The study applies a comparative historical method, comparative analysis and synthesis methods, the method of scientific literature generalization to Russian and foreign publications on the issues of structuring the content of Solidarology course in higher educational institutions. The authors use a complementary concrete historical method to identify and adjust solidarity concepts, dating back to the 19th century, to contemporary Russian educational system [33]. The study bases on the study of broad theoretical material, including reflected in world-class high-ranking publications [3; 8]. Among the empirical materials analyzed are tutors’ methodical developments [15] for the upbringing social solidarity among students [25], legal documents regulating educational process and organization [19], international education initiatives documentation on the incorporation of solidarity principle to educational process [37; 38], ethical codes and recommendations in educational management [28].

This paper proceeds from the historicity principle entailing that changes in forms of social solidarity correlate with changes in types of society. It implies the continuity of solidarity practices within particular societies and their transformations together with sociocultural, economic, and political changes. The paper appeals to the Russian social thought legacy as research material due to the keystone role of solidarity for the first Russian scholars, their social studies and public administration theories, as it was for the first Western social theorists, E. Durkheim, A. Saint-Simon, A. Comte, and T. Parsons. Additionally, the early concepts of solidarity that arose in 19th century are still shaping the cultural code of contemporary society and solidarity practices.

Results

The analysis of socio-philosophical literature and regulatory documents has shown that the advantage of the religious-idealist interpretation of solidarity, based on the concepts of sobornost and vseedinstvo (all-unity), is its orientation toward the organic integrity of the solidary community and everyone’s commitment to commonly shared values. This concept’s representatives saw the disadvantages of representative democracy in comparison with direct democracy practiced in the Russian commune (obshchina) embodying the spiritual principle of sobornost in the earthly life. Community truth is objective and it is not the sum of opinions, it cannot be determined by a majority vote. It is inwardly accessible to all “God’s co-workers”, although revealed to each person individually [17]. Sobornost does not imply a static, “ready-made” state of collegiality, but involves its active creation through everyone’s spiritual self-improvement, communication, and shared life activities. The ability and willingness of each to “remain an inner council together with all” [22, p. 495], to creatively express the society’s self-consciousness, moral values and guidelines is not automatically given but requires the personality transformation [23].

While Slavophiles idealized the Russian community [2; 24], later concepts of the early 20th century already treated sobornost, being increasingly penetrated by the ecclesiastical
spirit, getting material embodiment in the earthly projection of the obshchina [5]. At the same time, different forms of sobornost are varying stages of perfection: for S.N. Bulgakov, communal “natural unity” is only a prerequisite and basic form of sobornost [5], but not its full embodiment. Thus, sobornost is reduced neither to the traditions of mutual aid in the peasant commune within the feudal order nor to mutual en masse help in emergencies.

The ideal of sobornost and vseedinstvo was positioned as a “golden mean” or an alternative to the binary oppositions between egoistic liberalism and totalitarianism (“personalistic solidarism” of S.A. Levitsky [16]), individualism and socialist collectivism [22], atomism of the West and despotism of the East [26]. The “reconciliation” of freedom and social unity in the form of sobornost “synthesis” [23] and vseedinstvo [20] was considered possible by advances of Orthodoxy over Catholic authoritarianism’s [4] unity without freedom [24] and Protestant individualism’s [4] freedom without unity [24].

As can be seen, the religious-idealist interpretation of solidarity as sobornost, despite its aspiration to universal spiritual values and brotherhood, is still genetically linked to the confessional framework of the spirit of Orthodoxy and only potentially embraces the global community. Even when interpreted as a concept beyond Orthodoxy, sobornost remains tied to religion and morality, and more broadly to the spiritual and ideal sides of solidarity, largely abstracted from the structural conditions and everyday needs of members of society.

B. Kistyakovsky laid the responsibility of Slavophiles for neglecting “Western” civics [12] to the extent of glorifying legal nihilism, for “ensuring” solidarity and the ideal social organization through Russian sobornost and peculiarities of Russian morality alone.

The authors of earlier concepts of sobornost [2; 24] considered the law not as an instrument for maintaining stability in society, but as a set of coercive and repressive norms restricting the arbitrary behavior of atomized, disconnected individuals who had gone outside the community and lost its moral and spiritual ties. The unfortunate solitude turned into non-freedom for a peasant, pushing him to the brink of survival in the conditions of “non-fraternal”, not yet organic civil relations. K.S. Aksakov believed that the source of law as an “external means” and a formal social regulator is the “lack of truth”, conscience, and a “declining soul” in Western countries, which had to compensate for the inferior position of morality through regulating life and “policing improvements”. [2; 9, p. 36-37]. Compliance with legal norms was seen as unfree, dictated by fear and shame rather than good will. Law is needed where a person does not follow conscience as an internal guide [23].

Thus, the supporters of the sobornost and all-unity ideal contraposed the positive law to “inner” truth, love and justice [10, p. 355]. According to that interpretation, the moral elevation of a person excludes the satisfaction of egoistic needs requiring the protection of citizens from each other by the state.

None of the representatives of modern Russian social thought denies that morality deprived of legal protection can make an individual dependent on the mercy of the sovereign or on the level of moral development of other individuals, which is especially dangerous during social crises. Legislation, designed to provide necessary protection and equal retribution for similar misdeeds in case of significant deviation from social norms, regulates all spheres of life in contemporary Russian society.

The representatives of the religious-idealist interpretation paid insufficient attention not only to the law but also to scientific achievements, including social science, which prevented them from adequately assessing the most probable scenarios of social processes in Russia and the world and their consequences. For instance, they rightly criticized the phenomena of legal and economic inequality, the emergence and aggravation of social
contradictions and their escalation into conflicts from a moral point of view, but they did not explain them scientifically. The historical change of society types, social revolutions, and the socioeconomic aspects of solidarity, such as the division of labor and the distribution of its results, remained unexplored by scientific methods.

In any case, it was in the 19th century that “great” anonymous solidarities, such as class solidarities, based on formal interactions and subordination to abstract rules, replaced the society of primordial groups and interpersonal contacts. The new positivist-practical interpretation of solidarity focused precisely on the dynamic aspect of solidarity. It saw it as a stage in the evolution of society and a condition for social progress, linking different types of cooperation and mutual aid to cycles and meaningful shifts in social processes.

The consolidation of a complex society through a common goal and mysticism became problematic even then, which explains the criticism of the concept of sobornost for being “detached from life” and the impossibility of realizing its ideal of solidarity in its entirety. The concept of sobornost and all-unity idealized the established, deeply rooted values of social cohesion in the “body of the Church” and a relatively independent community. Its contemporaries [14; 18, pp. 291-292], and even its representatives, already noted the inconsistency of transcendental ideals with the real practice of excessive exploitation of the majority. For example, N.A. Berdyaev noted the discrepancy between the positioning of the people as the autocrat and God-bearer who carried universal values of positive freedom, and the scale of coercion, lack of rights of serfs and abuse of landlords [4, p. 163], because of which a peasant needed the community.

A comparison of sources on Solidarology from the 19th century to the present has shown that the positivist-practical interpretation focuses on the scientific characterization of the phenomenon and practices of solidarity. The value of this approach lies in its universality, applicability to various socio-historical conditions with unchanging reliability of results [6]. Russian semi-positivism and socialist orientation was typical for the thinkers of anarchist, populist, or revolutionary type. The modernization of society led to physical and social mobility, reduced family ties, and destroyed bonds of mechanical solidarity. The cohesion of people, individuals and groups was now based on shared interests, ideology, and political solidarity. Concepts aimed at practice as a criterion of truth replaced the sacral explanation of solidarization and consolidation, which had lost its persuasion. They relied on the scientific data of emerging sociology (from E. Durkheim to K. Marx) and biology (Darwinism, evolutionism). These and other differences identified between the two interpretations can be seen in Table 1, the basic structure of which students are invited to complete by introducing specific authors and adding two new parameters of comparison when reading the academic literature as homework.

The research results show that despite the fact that the inclusion of positivist-practical interpretation ideas into Solidarology course may be perceived as hazardous for the ideological unity of society because of its radical reorganization ideas, many more than just representatives of Russian semi-positivism and Marxism advocates were in opposition to their contemporary authorities and even prophesied the extinction of the state as an institution [14; 18] and denied the constructive impact of religious institutions and the coercion associated with them.

Although the concepts of sobornost and its Slavophile proponents are associated with the idea of a strong state, in reality, they appealed to the self-sufficiency of a distinctive, “non-statist” Russian people, “not requiring” external regulation of their life [2]. Evaluating Slavophilism, V.S. Solovyov stated that the Christian Russian people did
not see the state as a practical ideal and an independent institution [20, p. 371], but as “a forcedly-preserved state of balanced particular forces”, a necessary evil. Whereas the sobornost collectivity being the goal for human society constitutes a free equilibrium, and, hence, the state must help the society or “not hinder it in reaching” the ideal of “free ethic all-unity” [20, p. 371-372].

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison parameter</th>
<th>Classical Religious-Idealist Interpretation</th>
<th>Classical Positivist-Practical Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical and ideological foundations</td>
<td>Philosophical and religious views evolving in Russia since the 11th century</td>
<td>Objective (scientific) knowledge on people and society: sociology, biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject of research</td>
<td>Viewing solidarity from the perspective of the due rather than matter. A unique, extratemporal, and transcendental ideal of sobornost, opposing the multiple distorted forms</td>
<td>Not a metaphysical essence but real existing practices. The natural historicity and multiplicity of forms of solidarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rationale for solidarization</td>
<td>The need for harmony between individual freedom and social unity, as opposed to selfish individualism and totalitarian collectivism</td>
<td>The superiority of free collaborative activity over coerced activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards egoism</td>
<td>Egoism is associated with ignoring moral standards and public condemnation</td>
<td>Egoism is fraught with severe individual and group survival problems, increasing interpersonal and institutional mistrust, and identity crises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards morality as a factor of solidarity</td>
<td>Solidarity is a measure of morality and humanity having a universal nature (the validity of a single and ideal version of public ethics is based on divine unity)</td>
<td>Morality emerges in different groups (moral relativism), contributing to social integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The extent of solidarity</td>
<td>Macrosocial, megasocial (global, all-human), and even more: the all-unity includes not only the collegial personality but also the divine humanity together with the world it transforms.</td>
<td>Particularistic and macrosocial, due to the multiplicity of actors and forms of solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidarization factors</td>
<td>Spiritual and moral self-improvement of the individual, free choice of ethical behavior and beneficence</td>
<td>Objective factors: social structure, socio-cultural and economic conditions; subjective ones – interests, inclinations, awareness of them (shared life-worlds), which require information and education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, representatives of the religious-idealist interpretation of solidarity not only used the consolidating potential of philosophy and its universal values and defended traditional moral values and patterns of the peasant community, but also advocated the freedom (svoboda, “sloboda”) of social groups, self-government [1; 24] and personal development
The consequences of such freethinking included restrictions on their artistic self-expression (the ban on staging K.S. Aksakov’s plays, the censorship of I.S. Aksakov and A.S. Khomyakov’s publications, the closure of I.V. Kireevsky’s publications) and freedom (the arrest of D.F. Samarin).

Discussion

Unlike most of recent research, focused on one of the interpretations of solidarity in Russia, mostly on religious-idealist [30; 34], and less often on positivist-practical that accentuates particularistic type of solidarity and rigorous scientific approach of evaluating solidarity degree [6; 21]), this study indicates both the advantages and extremes of two basic treatments of solidarity. The suggested module layout encourages future professionals from different fields to develop their understanding of the criteria, excesses and deformations of solidarity converting it into something else, even into its opposite, i.e. disunity, leading to conflicts and disintegration, or totalitarianism.

Traditionally criticized both in previous and contemporary research, the utilitarian orientation of positivist-practical treatment of solidarity [29; 31] shows great attention to existing particularistic solidarities based on common needs and interests. Marxist concept of solidarity, being one of the lines in the positivist-practical approach, stands for consolidation of exploited classes against poverty social oppression. The findings suggest that Marxism is a spawnpoint of contemporary concepts of risk victims solidarities [39] and “solidarities of the shaken” developing as a response to a collective situational, historical or cultural trauma [26], reinforcing the unique values and shared sentiments of the community [32; 36], which could erode before the trauma. They frequently associate with the physical or psychological suffering of certain groups, such as solidarities of genocide victims or of mutual assistance groups [39] of the pandemic and self-isolation period.

Both Russian and worldwide pedagogy, education, and management should consider the immense consolidating force of mutually helping informal communities based either on altruism, promoted by the concepts of sobornost and vseedinstvo, and on private interests of creating and maintaining a positive image of helping to the needy, stressed by positivist-practical concepts.

In addition, highly mobile, rapidly evolving and disintegrating solidarities, peculiar to network communities and virtual interaction of liquid modernity, focus on practical interests in solving local issues, and lack lofty uniting values and long-term goals.

Consolidating groups feature a limited existence in time and space and have social influence mainly at the micro- and meso-level, which actualizes the appeal to the legacy of the positivist-practical interpretation of solidarity.

All of the above gives reasons to put new practice-oriented accents in Solidarology educational course, without abandoning the religious-idealist heritage of the concepts of sobornost and all-unity, which was revealed when studying the concept of cadet education. This coincides with the recent results of O.N. Yanitsky’s research: professional and labor activities in social work also require updating the cultural and historical memory and knowledge about the role of voluntary work and volunteerism in the practices of social consolidation [39], which prepare for the work in emergency situations and with vulnerable groups of population, for the promotion of peace, friendship and harmony in society and for counteraction to the transformation of grassroots solidarity into asocial and anti-state solidarity.
The practical significance of the study lies in the formation of students’ readiness to engage independently in creative solidarity practices and to assess their prospects for sustainable development under conditions of uncertainty.

The historical and philosophical section of Solidarology and the proposed development of Russian Solidarology theme used in classroom discussions have instructional and social value for future managers, political scientists and all enrolled in tertiary education. These training developments could also constitute research material for further international comparative studies.

**Conclusion**

Based on Russian social thought, the study shows that Solidarology is designed to systemize and integrate the interpretations of solidarity existing within fragmented approaches, including not merely sociological and philosophical, but also religious, anthropological, economic, and psychological concepts. The paper demonstrates that religious-idealist and positivist-practical treatments of solidarity are consistent regarding solidarity as not simply the quality or state of society or a separate group. Solidarity manifests the needs and capacities of human beings endowed with consciousness and biologically predisposed to communication in the diversity of it forms from forced cooperation to cultural engagement and building joint relations. These relations themselves can base on satisfying both lower basic (solidarities of the exploited, of risk victims, of crisis situations) and higher needs (volunteer solidarity, self-sacrificing, and other altruistic actions).

The proposed elaboration of Solidarology in Russia enables students and the scientific community to discover how throughout history, the universal anthropological parameters (positivist-practical interpretation) combined with specific historical conditions and individual abilities and needs (religious-idealist interpretation). Together, all these factors evolve and manifest in varying options of solidary society, reflecting widely recognized universal human values in their most perfect forms.
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