International Society
of Philosophy and Cosmology

Future Human Image

Volume 17



Kyiv, 2022

Future Human Image, Volume 17, 2022
The Academic Journal

ISSN 2519-2604 (Online), ISSN 2311-8822 (Print)
The State Registration Certificate of the print media KB No.20662-10462P, April 17, 2014

http://fhijournal.org/
E-mail: mfkoorg@gmail.com
It was printed as a collective monograph, "Future Human Image: Whom and How to Educate in the Rising Generations?" since 2011.
Printed Academic Journal "Future Human Image" since Volume 4, 2014.

Printed according to the resolution of the Scientific Board of *International Society of Philosophy and Cosmology* (Minutes of meeting No 14, May 25, 2022)

Editor-in-Chief

Sergii Rudenko, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (Ukraine)
Denys Svyrydenko, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (China)

Editorial Board

Mohamad Awwad, M.Sc., Lecturer, (Canada)
Oleg Bazaluk, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (China)
Galyna Beregova, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (Ukraine)
Enric Cabrejas, M.Sc. (Spain)
Danny Dubé, Ph.D. (Computer Science), Professor (Canada)
Eric G. Frost, Ph.D., Professor (United States)
Tracey Isaacs, Ph.D. (South Africa)
Nataliia Kharchenko, Doctor of Psychological Sciences, Assistant Professor (Ukraine)
Iryna Liashenko, Ph.D. (Philosophy), Associate Professor (Ukraine)
Tetiana Matusevych, Ph.D. (Philosophy), Associate Professor (Ukraine)
Tomasz Mróz, Ph.D., Professor (Poland)
Olga Petriashvili, Doctor Philological Sciences, Professor (Georgia)
Raushan Shindaulova, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Associate Professor (Kazakhstan)
Sergiy Terepyshchyi, Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor (Ukraine)
Bogdan Trocha, Dr. Habil. (Liberal Arts, Philology), Professor (Poland)
Nataliya Yukhymenko, Ph.D. (Philosophy), Associate Professor (Ukraine)

The FHI is indexed in the following international databases:
Central and Eastern European Online Library (CEEOL); Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ); Directory of Open Access Repositories (OpenDOAR); EBSCO (Sociology Source Ultimate); ERIH Plus; Index Copernicus; Open Academic Journals Index; Registry of Open Access Repositories (ROAR); Science Index; ResearchBib; The Philosopher's Index; Ulrich's Periodicals Directory; WorldCat

International Society of Philosophy and Cosmology:
http://www.bazaluk.com/

© International Society of Philosophy and Cosmology, 2022

The "Soft Power" of Chinese Marxism as a Factor in the Educational Landscape of the Future

Serhii Terepyshchyi

Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor,
Taras Shevchenko National University of (Kyiv, Ukraine),
Dragomanov National Pedagogical University (Kyiv, Ukraine)
E-mail: s.o.terepyshchyi@npu.edu.ua
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5506-0914

Terepyshchyi, Serhii (2022) The "Soft Power" of Chinese Marxism as a Factor in the Educational Landscape of the Future. *Future Human Image*, Volume 17, 47-59. https://doi.org/10.29202/fhi/17/7

This paper presents the concepts of regionalization and globalization in the context of higher education. The analysis was carried out in the light of the explication of the concept of "soft power" of Chinese Marxism. The methodological basis of the work is the statement that globalization does not create a conflict between homogeneous and heterogeneous, moreover, the latter contributes to the topological flow of the global to the localized. The ambiguity of the driving forces of educational reforms is emphasized, which leads to the presence of only speculative constitution of globalization. Nevertheless, its consequences are a number of reforms and facts that have provided a good basis for revealing the phenomenon of glocalization of the educational landscape on the example of China. It was found that the specificity of the latest epistemological doctrine within the Western educational landscape is closely related to the postmodern method of knowledge production, the implementation of which leads to crisis and asynchronous changes in higher education. At the same time, Chinese Marxism reveals and intensifies a number of productive practices in Chinese higher education, which makes it part of China's "soft power" in the global arena.

Keywords: soft power, educational landscape, regionalization, globalization, Chinese Marxism.

Received: 9 March 2022 / Accepted: 3 April 2022 / Published: 29 May 2022

© Terepyshchyi, Serhii, 2022

Introduction

In the socio-humanitarian discourse of our time, the term "soft power" has long been firmly established. This concept is primarily associated with the expansion of Western culture and is extremely close to the process of formation of cosmopolitanism and a liberal market economy. However, the obvious phenomena of global unification are only a superficial sign of today's economic, political and cultural processes. Despite the strengthening of ties between states, along with trends in the interdependence of national structures, there is also localization. Everything that is borrowed by cultures from the global heritage gradually adapts to the requirements of the local population and becomes a "hybrid" of the national and world one.

The combination of theory and practice in its implementation is not a new problem. Researcher Adrian Chan in the fundamental work "Chinese Marxism" rightly emphasizes that "a basic question for the founders of the Chinese Communist Party, after they had read Marx, was whether his message was appropriate. Was it atimely for them to embrace his analyses of economic and social developments and to abort his praxis in order to bring about the desired changes – for a society based on Marxist socialism" (Chan, 2003: 8).

Chinese Studies in Ukrainian Philosophy have a long and fruitful theoretical history (Rudenko & Liashenko, 2020). In this article, we will focus on one of the most important components of socio and economic development – the higher education sector. After all, in our time, we can observe the development of states that most actively localize the associated elements of the economy, politics and culture. Such system formations on the world map are called by researchers *globalizing regions*. It is no secret that one of the most ambitious and alternative projects of Western liberal globalization is China.

Describing the modern socialist system of China, researcher R. Boer calls education one of its defining components: "At the widest level, such a system includes economic, political, social, educational and cultural components. It is in this sense that we may distinguish between a capitalist system and a socialist system" (Boer, 2021: 310).

Unfortunately, the educational policy is now a politicized tool that is used not for cooperation, but for marking "their" territories. From a Chinese perspective, "internationalization of HE is, doubtedly, an expedient way of building an environment conducive to China's national rejuvenation, but would become dysfunctional if too politicised by national agenda and priorities that further intensify other nations' perception of the "China threat." Thus, appealing to the people of the world by using international HE as soft power for the re-globalisation of values and norms shaped by 'Chinese characteristics' remains a daunting and Sisyphean task in the face of the resurgence of the realistic Cold War mentality in the world system" (Tin & Suyan, 2020: 14-15).

Speaking about the philosophy of education, Jin Shenghong and Jau-wei Dan emphasize that "There are three main influences on the contemporary Chinese philosophy of education: classical Chinese philosophy, western philosophy and Marxist theory" (Shenghong & Dan, 2004: 575). Similar (but not identical) triple attribution is offered by Qin Zhu, Brent K. Jesiek: "Confucianism (historical), Marxism (ideological), and economic pragmatism (economic)" (Zhu & Jesiek, 2015: 151). Nevertheless, it is an indisputable fact that it is Chinese Marxism as the ideological core of Chinese education and culture, it determines the existence of a special educational region and "purpose of responding to the high-quality development trend of the transformation of liberal arts education, and cultivating professionals to meet the development needs of the country in the new era" (Ma & Hou, 2021).

There is reason to assume that the socio and educational changes of our time have a double essence. On the one hand, there is undoubtedly a phenomenon of unification of education, which is due to the development of communication tools, the geometric growth of educational markets, and the expansion of labor resources. On the other hand, all branches of social existence, including education, have a monolithic regional essence, which gives individual joint new formations a specific content in each region.

This dialectical combination of regional and global polarization is not new in the theoretical plane, it has already received its own new term – *Glocalisation.* The founder of this concept, R. Robertson emphasizes with such a hybrid neologism that the phenomenon of globalization does not give rise to a conflict between the homogeneous and heterogeneous, such a dichotomy is present in scientific discourse only about this phenomenon (Robertson, 1992). The latter forces the topological flow of the local into the global and vice versa – its content, mixing of features and exchange of structural elements of social systems. Therefore, it is advisable to talk not about globalization, but about *glocalization of education.*

In recent years, industry-specific research on globalization has become increasingly popular. This trend is expected given the historical depth and source complexity of the phenomenon of the world integration. One of these separate areas of global studies has become *globalistics of education*. Such search works have become particularly relevant in the measurement of higher education, since it is the latter that has undergone the most obvious changes under the influence of modern requirements. Chinese universities have not been spared this process either: the need to participate in global rankings, one way or another, will raise the question of common and honest criteria for comparing, for example, American and Chinese universities. Thus, according to the Academic Ranking of World Universities, in the top 100 in 2005, there were 5 universities from this region, and in 2020-already 11. Moreover, 6 higher education institutions are from China, while in 2005, they were not represented (Academic Ranking, 2022). This shows how quickly the growth of "soft power" in the field of higher education can occur, of course, provided that targeted activities under the leadership of the government, because "a major objective of China's public diplomacy has been to expand its soft power through internationalization HE" (Tin & Suyan, 2020).

American economist G. Freedman considers modern higher education as an area that demonstrates the growing potential for profitability and connects such new formations with the economic conditions of the global market (Freedman, 2010). Another American researcher of Indian origin, S. Chinnammai attributes an important role to technological mediation on the issue of globalization's impact on education. In his opinion, it is the development of communication technologies that contributes to increasing the scale of educational opportunities (Chinnammai, 2005). The transformation of the requirements of education and university management is a major aspect of the globalistics of the French thinker J. Hallak. The latter rightly emphasizes the change in the model of educational management from strictly vertical to network and mixed (Hallak, 1998). Similar thoughts were expressed by the famous British researcher B. Readings. In his opinion, modern educational institutions have lost their essence (the unity of research work and training under the auspices of national culture) and can hardly be called universities in the classical sense of the word (Readings, 1996).

Criticism of the current educational situation from the point of view of the consumer and the manufacturer of educational services

In addition to the diversity of scientific views on the phenomenon of globalization in education, there is also the problem of differentiated response to counter-conditions within individual educational structures in different countries and regions. Swedish researcher of the problem of the expansion of globalization in teaching P. Sahlberg appropriately emphasized in this regard: "Educational systems respond differently to changes in the new economic, political and cultural orders of the world" (Sahlberg, 2004). That is why the globalism of higher education is a radical intersectoral view of the educational process and its purpose, it is an attempt to get the clearest possible picture of what is happening, to predict possible consequences.

In this context, China's approach to higher education and education in general is interesting. "Chinese educational administration has an increased self-confidence which permits the consideration of a range of national and local activities, of past and present ideas, and overseas practices, particularly American. This compares with earlier attitudes that saw educational programmes hailed or proscribed according to narrowly conceived political criteria. A more 'open' approach to ideology has encouraged China to look back, forwards, and outwards for educational ideas" (Cleverley, 1984: 115).

The view of globalization only as homogenization is a significant problem not only of everyday knowledge, but also of scientific knowledge. There is no universal recipe for success in the context of integration localization of production and culture models. The modern world of educational services is based on the binary division of participants into those who experiment, looking for benefits in the pursuit of innovation, and those who adapt, perceiving innovation from the outside or as a necessity. P. Sahlberg rightly notes: "in recent years, the main goal of the policy of structural adjustment in the field of education has been the transition to "global educational standards" (Sahlberg, 2004). This is often done by comparing the entire system of less developed countries with those that are economically more advanced. Unfortunately, governments often believe that there is only one correct approach to adjusting education and that the need for certain "global educational standards" is indisputable if the system is built with international competition in mind. Research on educational reforms and experience in structural adjustment suggest that governments should understand that there is more than one way to get on the path to recovery (Sahlberg, 2004).

Borrowing the experience of foreign education systems should be carried out, taking into account the fact that the educational landscape over time is not reduced to a common denominator, but rather differentiates (Terepyshchyi, 2017). In addition, any extrapolation of educational management models should not conflict with the purpose of national education and, above all, should be carried out with the interests of citizens in mind. However, "When the Party-state engages in global outreach through HE as cultural diplomacy, its stringent control and coercive measures inevitably draw the suspicion of and criticism from foreign stakeholders and partners. China's cultural and economic attractiveness notwithstanding, a coercive approach to soft power might harm rather than benefit its image and global influence" (Tin & Suyan, 2020: 8).

The latter statements are particularly relevant for Chinese higher education, which is therefore extremely important to draw correct conclusions from the situation in which Chinese higher education has found itself, and the first of them are short-term causal relationships between the level of education, information security and the well-being of the state.

Chinese Marxism vs. information capitalism

Education in the West is one of the most advanced branches of modern information capitalism. Its essence has been bifurcated since the beginning of informatization of society in the 60s. Dutch scientists S. Marginson and M. Van der Wende's collaboration focuses on this: "Deeply immersed in global transformations, higher education itself is divided into two sides – economic and cultural symbiosis. Higher education is visible in global market relations" (Marginson & Van der Wende, 2006: 5). But education in China is based on Marxism. "Marxism is core and centre of the Chinese project. For foreigners, this emphasis may be surprising, frightening, or heartwarming – depending upon one's political persuasions" (Boer, 2021: 296).

As we can see, the antinomy of modern education consists in the need for a losing choice in advance between economic and ideological expediency. Until the last contradiction is resolved, higher education will remain at a transitional stage.

According to K. Olds and S. Robertson, the globalization of education in the information society is determined by the presence of "three main levels of structural transformations of higher educational institutions: *new logic*; *new models*, *new mechanisms and practices*" (Olds & Robertson, 2014: 9). Universities are organized according to a new logic, and new models and current mechanisms of their functioning are adopted.

The new logic of university development

The problem of the new logic of university development relates to the general question of the meaning of changes in the educational landscape: is this a certain fashion for internationalization, or is there a deep essence behind it? Why is the globalization of universities becoming a "branding tool" in the latest communication space of the global economy? There are quite a lot of answers to these questions. Starting from the proposed triple attribution of international changes in higher education, we propose for discussion the following structure of the new logic:

I. *Corporatization.* It is related to the new theory of public management, which applies business laws (laws of risk, conservation of resources, expansion of markets, etc.) to increase the efficiency and productivity of social systems, in this case higher education.

II. *Comparative competitiveness.* This transformation logic raises the question of what we can produce (sell or get more volume) while outperforming our competitors. The answers to these questions in various aspects make it necessary for universities and the Ministry of education and science to open their activities to other stakeholders.

III. *Competitive comparison.* It is based on a positive answer to the question about the effectiveness of similar borrowing of the characteristics of one unit of the system (faculty, university, region, etc.) with another unit or structure. According to this logic, rankings of world and domestic universities are created in order to form the directions of successful change of universities.

IV. *Cooperation.* It consists in the expediency of cooperation between various educational institutions to regulate the unstable and competitive situation in the market of educational services. A vivid example of the effectiveness of this logic is the creation of educational consortia of Ukrainian and China universities, the practice of double diplomas, and so on.

Models for involving universities in internationalization

Taking into account the need for internationalization of higher education in the space of modern globalization, K. Olds, S. Robertson substantiates four possible models of their involvement in internationalization (Olds & Robertson, 2014: 11-13).

Import model it is an orthodox approach to internationalization. It can be most broadly illustrated as the establishment of campuses by universities abroad or the cooperation of the latter with local institutions. This also includes the establishment by the management of foreign programs, policies, projects for obtaining an academic degree by foreign students, or even the establishment of a foreign faculty. In this model, the campus is the main authority that helps students study at other institutions in the same city. Most universities today operate on this model.

Export model is related to preserving the core of the foreign faculty on the central campus for the production and dissemination of knowledge. Globalization of the information received occurs through the export of courses that are taught from the "home" location of the faculty, that is, the central campus. Flights of faculty representatives to teach abroad also belong to this model. This also includes the latest technology courses used for distance learning. This model is often used in combination with other models.

Partner model takes place within universities, for which internationalization is dictated by the requirements of the state or other external official authority and should be most precisely regulated by law. The scope of this partnership can be very diverse: the exchange of students and faculties, joint participation in the learning and research process, and even the co-establishment of new higher schools and universities. For example, the UW-Madison-Nazarbayev University Project is a research university founded in Astana (Kazakhstan) by joint efforts of Kazakh and American teachers.

Network model to a certain extent, uses the characteristics of all other models, in general, and is the least used today. This model is associated with the merger of various geographically remote institutions into one whole, or the establishment of geographically remote industry (rather than a branch) campuses in other countries. This network model is based on clear hierarchical codependency of established campuses that share common quality standards and important roles in a single task of knowledge production. This model requires resource sharing, which means that it is the riskiest of all other models. It functions well in megacities of world significance, since such cities have the necessary infrastructure of international and transport links (Olds & Robertson, 2014: 14-16).

Mechanisms. There are quite a lot of mechanisms, and they are specific and individual. For example, the international system of joint accreditation levels (double and fully joint degrees), international research, organization of branches, online-MOOC systems, joint scientific councils, joint programs, memoranda of understanding, joint publication of works in institutions, etc. The list could go on and on.

It is worth noting that the regionalization of education took place before the information revolution in the modern world, in particular, after WWII it existed in the form of opposition to the Western and Communist bloc. But today, the algorithm itself and the signs of regionalization have changed significantly, which has become a much more complex phenomenon and has ceased to be a certain calculation of the political preferences and views of national states.

With the formation of the new regionalism policy, the structural depth and strategic orientation of educational blocks increases, their activities are regulated by a much wider

range of subjects, and the results are recorded on the basis of more indicators. An increase in the number of actors in educational blocks leads to the democratization of the regulatory apparatus of the educational space, but at the same time such changes increase the complexity of implementing a particular event.

However, the main relationship between the development of the region and higher education is political. It is forced by states and is only formulated by university associations and regional organizations. Regionalization of higher education is the expansion of political and economic administration to universities (De Prado, 2006).

Orientation of the educational sphere to the needs of the economy

Starting from the second half of the twentieth century, signs of typical economization begin to appear within the European educational landscape – the orientation of the educational sphere primarily to the needs of the economy and production. The decline in the role of the national state in the global political arena has affected the situation of higher education in Europe. The already archaic academic doctrine of the classical university is now under the pressure of purely pragmatic issues of survival in the world of culture as a commodity (Terepyshchyi, 2017).

The peculiarity of European social existence has always been a focus on global expansion, whether it is actual colonization or economic. Most European countries still have a number of surprisingly cheap suppliers of raw materials, including some of their former colonies. The situation is similar in terms of sales markets for finished products. The extraversion of Europe's social existence is also reflected in the modern European educational landscape, which is now characterized by the search for a global, rather than a national consumer.

The process of economizing education is becoming a fundamental trend, it affects not only the administrative structure of higher education institutions, but also the epistemiological doctrine of the educational space of the Old world itself. Up to this point, the rather abstract teleology of European universities gradually begins to artificially crystallize in the form of concrete pragmatic goals and objectives, the goal of which is to achieve individual, collective and national economic success.

The problem of ideology and epistemiological attitudes of the newest university has long been on the agenda of the academic community of the West. Being at the stage of active inclusion in the global production of knowledge, universities, of course, must adapt to the new conditions and rules of the economic game, which quite often hangs over the borders. In this context, a separate concept of "postmodern university" was put forward, denoting a certain way of rebirthing classical educational and scientific institutes, their exit from the closed academic space to the space of the "real" labor and information market. However, as the Spanish researcher García Ruiz rightly noted, that despite the increasing amount of literature on the postmodern university, there is currently no consensus among scientists on the extent to which a university institution should, in fact, change its ethos, its goals and traditional social functions, there is also no consensus as to whether the evolutionary process of the university leads to such changes (Ruiz, 2010: 44). It is also clear that the situation of ideological uncertainty around the university adds fuel to the fire of disputes between conservative and progressive reformist forces.

Some of the researchers claim that the logic of post-thinking is still purely theoretical, and at the moment it has only to become a real social structure, and therefore the post-university

as a scheme of a heterogeneous and pragmatic educational and scientific institution is a phenomenon that is not yet destined to become an effective model for the reorganization of higher education. In particular, a similar opinion is held by P. Filmer, he believes that the logic of post – is one that informs about speculative theorizing, but it is not yet social logic; it also does not have significant correlates among social and cultural institutions and therefore cannot provide sufficient attention to the social role of higher education (Filmer, 1997: 66).

According to scientists who are supporters of the idea of post-university, this direction of educational reform is a natural way to reflect transformations in the structure of light production and the status of knowledge. In their opinion, knowledge has finally lost the barrier of sacredness that gave it an aristocratic touch, thereby reducing its accessibility. In the light of such epistemiological shifts dictated by scientific, technological, and democratic progress, the very purpose of education and its goals must change.

Postmodernism in modern Western philosophical thought is associated not with a peculiar methodological trend, but rather with a special socio and cultural situation in the capitalist world, which requires decentralization and heterogenization from most spheres of human activity. As one of the most famous postmodern researchers Lyotard predicted at the time, along with the geometric growth of the importance of knowledge in the modern world, their strict objectification will also be carried out. In his opinion, "the old principle, according to which the acquisition of knowledge is inseparable from the formation (Bildung) of the mind and even from the individual itself, is becoming obsolete and will fall out of use. Knowledge is produced and will be created to be sold, it is consumed and will be consumed to gain value in a new product, and in both of these cases, to be exchanged" (Lyotard, 1984). J. Lyotard connects the formation of postmodern trends in the development of higher education and culture in general with a change in the mechanism of legitimization of knowledge, which is now outside the discourse of the so-called "grand narratives" – the great stories that formed the metaphysical framework of European thinking.

From now on, there is no unified system for assessing the validity of knowledge, the process of legitimization takes place within the framework of local speech games, which resembles the process of spraying. In such a world, "universitas" based on the metaphysics of a systematic and universal "logos" simply cannot exist (Lyotard, 1984). J. Lyotard aptly emphasizes the difference between modern postmodern pragmatism and 19th century utilitarianism – practicality is now involved in a narrow kind of functions that exist within heterogeneous discourses.

According to postmodern theorists in education, a university must meet the social situation that surrounds it in order to realize both humanistic and pragmatic goals. It can no longer be the standard of detached "*disinterestedness*", which is promoted in the ideas of thinkers such as Humboldt and Newman. In this logic, the university should adopt the necessary social role and market laws. This opinion, in particular, is shared by the British researcher P. Scott, who also emphasizes that the university should expand its functions to an institution dedicated to lifelong learning and even leisure (Scott, 1997: 39–62).

Another British scientist, M. Gibbons also believes that the changes that are taking place in the academic space of Europe are natural and are a consequence of a key factor in the University crisis – the massification of research (Gibbons, 1994: 76). This, in turn, leads to natural shifts that deprive the university of the privileged status of a scientific monopoly and put the latter in a situation of typical capitalist competition.

Transformation of epistemological doctrine

The postmodern attitude to university reform is not a "cosmetic" repair of educational institutions, it is a fundamental turn of education towards production – a movement from the "temple of knowledge" to the "factory of research and professions."

This can be denoted as a transformation of epistemiological doctrine. This refers to the transition to a new way of producing knowledge. As G. Ruiz points out, at this transitional stage of the educational history of the Western world, it is possible to observe the coexistence of opposite ways of producing knowledge – the first, or traditional, and the second, or the newest (Ruiz, 2010: 45). Let us show the main differences between these two epistemological doctrines:

The first way to produce knowledge:

1. Research is implemented in terms of mainly cognitive utility. Their application is associated with the epistemological, sometimes purely individual interests of the institution or researcher. Knowledge, in this case, is the patrimony of humanity in perspective, not for specific purposes. The purpose and direction of research is set by the scientific subject itself without external intervention.
2. In the first type, knowledge production is carried out by a broad homogeneous academic community. Knowledge is developed within the educational institution and the national state.
3. The production of knowledge is dictated by the outstanding canons of a specific academic co-society. The latter operates within the disciplinary division. Interdisciplinary synthesis is carried out by post factum.
4. It is associated with the existence of long-term cognitive and social norms that regulate the production of knowledge and strictly define what should be considered significant problems. In particular, what problems should be solved in the practice of science, as well as what constitutes the so-called "good science" in general.
5. Quality is determined by judging the degree of research contribution. The latter are carried out by individuals, and their verification is supported by careful selection of those who are competent as reviewers for colleagues.

The second way to produce knowledge:

1. It is characterized by the presence of short-term social responsibility and sensitive social reflexivity. Reactivity to the impact of research and the broad implications of knowledge production is included in the research rules from the very beginning of scientific practice. Research systems are open.
2. Knowledge production is generated in the context of their application. The imperative of utility is present from the very beginning. The production of knowledge is intended to be useful for some specific (industry, government, society) or for a potential consumer-agent. In this case, knowledge production is the result of a process in which supply and demand are active factors.
3. The subject is heterogeneous in terms of the skills and experience of the people involved. There is an inherent increase in the number of potential places where knowledge can be created.
4. It is characterized by a set of theoretical constructions, research methods and methods of practice, which may not be located on the dominant disciplinary scheme in the academic space.

5. The second method of production knowledge is constantly looking for additional criteria that can be added in the quality control process through the application context, which includes a wide range of external and internal interests.

Gradually, elements of the second type of knowledge production occupy a key place among the world's leading universities, especially when it comes to technical universities. A postmodern university is a phenomenon that has a certain antagonism in the concept itself, in particular between the heteronenicity of postmodernism and the homogeneity of the university (Lipstreu, 2014: 102). It is quite difficult to predict the consequences of such a transformation in the field of higher education, but, of course, the future of education will change radically over the next 50 years.

The university of the postmodern era is primarily associated with the formation of a new "space" of knowledge, the way it is used in the social system. As noted by an American researcher in the field of philosophy of education C. Raschke, the landscape of knowledge, as a social space, and as a space of cathedrals and palaces, which formed the political and cultural context of life itself, could be displayed on a vertical axis. Knowledge "begins" from above, from the authoritative top (Raschke, 2003: 77). However, the hierarchical landscape of the social existence of knowledge since the beginning of the twentieth century has become more and more similar to the rhizome, aptly described in the works of Deleuze and Guattari (Deleuze & Guattari, 1988). The distribution of knowledge ceases to be systematic and becomes functional.

In these circumstances, Chinese higher education chooses its own path. As Yun notes, "for China (and more broadly East Asia), improvement can rarely be made if self-understanding is constrained or distorted by relentlessly applying the frameworks shaped by the European 'Enlightenment'" (You, 2018:14).

Conclusions and discussion

In the context of countering the educational landscapes of the future, it was possible to consider the relationship between regionalization and globalization in the context of educational problems. The analysis was carried out in line with the explication of the "soft power" concept in Chinese Marxism. It is clear that "The soft power with 'Chinese characteristics' in internationalising HE could demonstrate that China has borrowed Nye's soft-power concept to brand the national image and cushion the shock generated by the 'China threat' perception in order to sustain the Party-state's legitimacy and security" (Tin & Suyan, 2020: 13).

The methodological basis of the work is the statement that globalization does not generate a conflict between the homogeneous and heterogeneous, moreover, the latter contributes to the topological flow of the global into the localized. The ambiguity of the driving forces of educational reforms is noted, which leads to the presence of only a speculative constitution of globalization. Nevertheless, its consequences are a number of reforms and facts that have provided a good basis for revealing the phenomenon of glocalization of the educational landscape on the example of China.

In the course of analyzing the heterogeneous nature of world unification, it was revealed that the existence of a universal recipe for successful educational policy in the conditions of integration localization of production and cultural models is impossible. The example of China shows the presence on the world stage of the educational policy of countries that pay special attention to innovation in education.

It is revealed that the specifics of the latest epistemiological doctrine within the Western educational landscape are closely related to the postmodern way of knowledge production, the implementation of which leads to crisis and asynchronous transformations in the field of higher education. In the course of rapid inclusion in the global production of knowledge, universities are definitely determined by new attempts to adapt to the conditions and rules of the information and capitalist game, which now overcomes the limitations of national states.

The phenomenon of "postmodern university" as a way of transformation of classical educational and scientific institutions, their exit from the closed academic space to the space of the "real" labor and information market is described. Some researchers believe that post-university is only a hypothetical stage in the development of higher education in the future, while others emphasize that this is the reality of the present. However, it is an absolute fact that this phenomenon has a significant place in the Western educational landscape and somehow affects a number of reforms in this area.

Educational landscapes of the future unfold against the background of two processes: glocalization and radical pragmatization of educational and scientific goals. In particular, the transformation at the stage of transition from a classical university to a post-university is associated with the diversification of educational functions, social restructuring of participants in the pedagogical process, the emphasis on the gradual separation of education from science, the problem orientation of research, the expansion of the sphere of responsibility of institutions, the diversity of funding sources, technologization and bureaucratization of universities. At the same time, Chinese Marxism reveals and strengthens a number of productive practices in Chinese higher education and is an important factor in the educational landscape of the future, which is short-sighted to ignore.

Acknowledgements

This research is done in the framework of the project "Chinese Marxism and its socio-cultural implications" (scientific supervisor – Prof. Dr. Sergii Rudenko, reference number 0122U001967).

🕮 References

Academic Ranking of World Universities (2022) Available online: http://www.shanghairanking.com/

Boer, Ronald (2021). *Socialism with Chinese Characteristics*. Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-16-1622-8

Chan, Adrian (2003) *Chinese Marxism* Continuum, London & New York.

Chinnammai, Singh (2005) Effects of globalization on education and culture. *Materials of the ICDE International Conference*. Vol. 5, 2-6.

Cleverley, John (1984) Ideology and Practice: a decade of change and continuity in contemporary Chinese education, *Comparative Education*, 20:1, 107-116, https://doi.org/10.1080/0305006840200111

De Prado, Yepes C. (2006) World regionalization of higher education: Policy proposals for international organizations, *Higher Education Policy*. Vol. 19, Iss 1, 111-128.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari (1988) A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Filmer, Paul (1997) Disinterestedness and the Modern University. *The Postmodern University? Contested Visions of Higher Education in Society*, Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Freedman, Gordon (2010) *Unlocking the Global Education Imperative Core Challenges & Critical Responses.* Educational researches center "Blackboard". Available online: http://blackboard.com/blackboard/gordon_freedman

Gibbons, Michael, et al. (1994) The New Production of Knowledge. *The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*, London: SAGE Publications.

Hallak, Jacques (1998) Education and globalization. *IIEP Newsletter*. Vol. XVI, Iss. 2, 1-6.

Lipstreu, Otis (2014) Consumer Education: Modern Style, *The School Review*, Vol. 57 Iss. 2, 101-103.

Lo, Tin Yau Joe, and Pan, Suyan (2020) The internationalisation of China's higher education: soft power with 'Chinese characteristics', *Comparative Education*, https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2020.1812235

Lyotard, Jean-Francois (1984) The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge *Theory and History of Literature*, Volume 10

Ma, Bo and Hou, Yuhuan (2021) Artificial Intelligence Empowers the Integrated Development of Legal Education: Challenges and Responses. *Future Human Image*, Volume 16, 43-54. https://doi.org/10.29202/fhi/16/4

Marginson, Simon and *Van der Wende,* Marijk (2006) *Globalisation and higher education,* OECD Press.

Olds, Kris and Robertson, Susan (2014) *Globalizing Higher Education and Research for the Knowledge Economy* Coursera, Available online: https://www.coursera.org/course/globalhighered

Raschke, Carl A. (2003) *The Digital Revolution and the Conning of the Postmodern University*, NY.: Routledge Falme

Readings, Bill (1996) *The university in ruins*, Harvard University Press.

Robertson, Roland (1992) *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture (Theory, Culture & Society Series)*. SAGE Publications.

Rudenko, Sergii, and Iryna Liashenko (2020) Chinese Studies in Ukrainian Philosophy of the Soviet Period, *Studia Warmińskie,* 57: 85-100.

Ruiz, García M. J. (2010) Implications of the New Social Characteristics of Knowledge Production. *Changing Educational Landscapes (Editor D. Mattheou)*, Athens: Springer.

Sahlberg, Pasi (2004) Teaching and Globalization. *Managing Global Transitions*. Volume 2 (1), 65-83.

Scott, Peter (1997) The Postmodern University? *The Postmodern University? Contested Visions of Higher Education in Society*, Buckingham: SRHE and Open University Press.

Shenghong, Jin, and Dan, Jau-wei (2004) The contemporary development of philosophy of education in mainland China and Taiwan, *Comparative Education*, 40:4, 571-581, https://doi.org/10.1080/0305006042000284556

Terepyshchyi, Serhii (2017) Educational Landscape as a Concept of Philosophy of Education. *Studia Warmińskie*, 54, 373–383, https://doi.org/10.31648/sw.78

Tin, Yau Joe Lo and Suyan, Pan (2021) The internationalisation of China's higher education: soft power with 'Chinese characteristics', *Comparative Education*, Vol. 57 Iss. 2, 227-246, https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2020.1812235

You, Yun (2018) The seeming 'round trip' of learner-centred education: a 'best practice' derived from China's New Curriculum Reform?, *Comparative Education*, https://doi.org/10.1080/03050068.2018.1541662

Zhu, Qin, and Jesiek, Brent K. (2015) Confucianism, Marxism, and Pragmatism: The Intellectual Contexts of Engineering Education in China. *International Perspectives on Engineering Education, Philosophy of Engineering and Technology*, Vol. 20, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-16169-3_7