

Journal of Politics and International Studies

Vol. 11, No. 1, January–June 2025, pp.195–208

Russia-Ukraine War: A Shift from Eurocentrism to Multipolarity

Sheikh Arslan Zafar 

M. Phil Scholar, Department of International Relations, Minhaj University,
Lahore, Punjab-Pakistan

Corresponding: sheikharsal409@hotmail.com

Dr. Humera Akhtar 

Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science & International Relations,
University of Central Punjab, Lahore, Punjab-Pakistan

Email: drhumeraakhtar@gmail.com

Abstract

The Russia-Ukraine war has triggered a significant reevaluation of long-held ideas in international relations, especially the dominance of Eurocentrism as a guiding principle worldwide. It has pushed Europe to confront its reliance on U.S. security and Russian energy supplies. This situation demonstrates that the Eurocentric Global North is no longer a unipolar power. Eurocentrism, as a concept and ideology, has traditionally placed Europe and, by extension, the broader West at the center of civilization, modernity, and political authority. Neorealism and post-colonialism offer the most convincing frameworks for understanding this change, emphasizing power struggles and decreasing trust in a rules-based system. However, research also indicates that the conflict has signaled the decline of Western-centric views and the emergence of a more multipolar global order, with Western efforts regarding Ukraine undergoing major shifts. This study combines practical analysis of the geopolitical and economic impacts of the conflict and global divisions. Its findings are vital for policymakers operating in a more multipolar world, where Eurocentric ideals are waning, and the future of Eurocentrism remains uncertain.

Key Words: Eurocentrism, Multipolarity, BRICS, SCO, Global South, Russia-Ukraine war.

Introduction

The Minsk Agreements failed due to unresolvable contradictions between Ukraine's sovereignty demands and Russia's imperial objectives. Rather than a flawed peace deal, they became a temporary truce that allowed Russia to regroup and Ukraine to arm itself, setting the stage for the 2022 war, again after 2014. Aside from its direct humanitarian and security consequences, the conflict has instigated a significant reconsideration of established paradigms in international relations, especially the prevalence of Eurocentrism as a framework for global power as a theoretical and ideological construct, which has traditionally placed Europe and, consequently, the

wider West at the core of civilization, modernity, and political legitimacy (Selim, 2023). Following its independence in 1991, Ukraine's delicate democracy faced challenges from corruption and Russian meddling, especially after the 2004 Orange Revolution and the 2014 Euromaidan protests that removed the pro-Kremlin leader Viktor Yanukovich. In 2014, Russia's takeover of Crimea and backing of separatists in Donbas initiated the first direct conflict, driven by Putin's assertions that Ukraine was a mistake and NATO's expansion towards the east. These historical conflicts have become a contemporary battle for sovereignty, with Ukraine safeguarding its aspirations for European integration against Russia's concept of a Slavic sphere of dominance (Shestopalova, 2023).

The war has not only reshaped geopolitical partnerships but also compelled a crucial examination of the beliefs that support Eurocentrism. Historically, Eurocentric viewpoints have depicted global conflicts in a dualistic manner: democracy against authoritarianism, the West against the East, and civilization against barbarism (Strickland & Wang, 2023). However, the global reaction to the Russia-Ukraine conflict has challenged this simplistic division. Although Western countries, led by the U.S. and the European Union, have enacted extraordinary sanctions and supported Ukraine, a substantial segment of the globe, particularly in the Global South, has chosen not to conform to this Euro-Atlantic position. Nations such as China, India, South Africa, and Brazil have adopted stances of neutrality, strategic balancing, or even implicit support for Russia, citing historical issues, economic practicality, and doubts about Western double standards in interventions (Ambos, 2023).

This divergence highlights significant opposition to Eurocentric universalism and indicates a broader transition towards a more pluralistic, multipolar international framework where non-Western perspectives assert their influence in defining global standards (Khylyk & Khylyk, 2024). Eurocentrism has relied on significant fundamental beliefs such as the universal relevance of Western liberal democratic principles, the importance of transatlantic institutions in global governance, and the inherent leadership position of Europe and North America in global matters. These assumptions have been significantly questioned by the geopolitical truths revealed during the Russia-Ukraine conflict. The conflict has exposed not just the boundaries of Western dominance but also the increasing self-confidence of other power players that no longer automatically yield to Euro-Atlantic authority (Sørensen, 2023). For example, China's 12-Point Peace Plan aimed to portray Beijing as an impartial mediator while discreetly challenging Western-led strategies in the conflict, thus aiding the wider movement away from Eurocentrism in international diplomacy (Fan, 2024).

This research uses a combined theoretical approach incorporating neorealism and postcolonial theory to analyze how the Russia-Ukraine War has accelerated the decline of Eurocentrism in global politics. It aims to show how the war highlights the weakening of Western dominance through geopolitical changes, economic separation, and ideological conflicts. The study examines the responses of non-Western nations as evidence of resistance to Eurocentric ideas and investigates whether these shifts signal a lasting move toward multipolarity or a temporary break in the U.S.-led global order. The research seeks to provide an inclusive framework

Russia-Ukraine War: A Shift from Eurocentrism to Multipolarity
for understanding how the conflict influences the evolving global power structure beyond traditional Western-centric perspectives, using a qualitative method.

Literature Review

The Russia-Ukraine war has become a focal point of Western double standards in a more pragmatic case because it has created a division between the world and signaled the decline of Eurocentrism. The Global North used sanctions as a primary tool to counter Moscow and the rise of Asia. So, the literature highlights significant dynamics since the invasion of Russia.

According to the analysis of Shah et al. (2022) war's impact on South Asia will create severe economic challenges, affecting both nations and global nuclear powers. Strict sanctions on Russia may lead to higher global oil prices. Political actions shape Russia's economic impacts, while Western sanctions disrupt Brent crude oil exports. Ukraine faces significant destruction, impacting wheat, sunflower oil, and other export supplies.

This review focuses on the existing application of the theory such as, Khylyk & Khylyk (2024) explore the interpretive capability that the postcolonial perspective in international relations can offer in clarifying Russia's belligerent actions and, equally significant, Ukraine's determined opposition to the invasion, in the research on the explanatory potential of the postcolonial approach for understanding the Russia-Ukraine war. In addition, Khylyk & Khylyk (2024) also examine, how China's view of the conflict is shaped by rivalry with the U.S. and goals for development, a multipolar world lacking Western dominance, and how Beijing's neutral stance towards Russia influences the stance of the Global South on the research on navigating Global South's ambivalent Stance on Russia-Ukraine war. Kurnyshova (2024) illustrates that, although this approach allows Kyiv to present its situation as similar to anti-colonial movements, it also encounters conflicts with its Euro-Atlantic goals. Utilizing three interpretations of "postcoloniality," she argues that the narrative possesses strategic allure yet is hindered by analogy constraints, cultural hybridity, and victimization portrayal, ultimately complicating Ukraine's postcolonial stance.

The purpose of this literature review is to evaluate how Manners (2024) explained in the research of Ukraine as a Microcosm of the Paradigm Shift from International Relations to Planetary Politics, that Ukrainian resistance signifies a shift in international relations and EU perspectives globally. It presents initial concepts and technologies for IR and EU studies, examining their evolution and omissions in Western education from 1991 to 2022. Hendl et al. (2024) critically analyze how prevailing Western narratives, referred to as Westspaining, influence worldwide perceptions of Russia's invasion of Ukraine, frequently marginalizing local viewpoints and perpetuating epistemic imperialism. They contend that dominant security narratives reveal colonial power structures, favoring Euro-American perspectives and sidelining perspectives from Eastern Europe and the Global South. The article advocates for epistemic justice by elevating varied, context-specific knowledge and confronting the coloniality present in international security discussions, urging for more inclusive and decolonial perspectives on understanding the conflict.

The main argument from the narrative of the Global South, such as Rabel (2025), researches the Global South and Western divergence on Russia's war in Ukraine, arguing that Johnston views international order as 'a realm of various orders across multiple domains instead of a singular, U.S.-led liberal order'. Ultimately, it relies on Moravcsik's 'new liberalism' concerning the dominance of state preferences interacting in international relations. Global South and the strategic assessment by Bariiev (2024) highlight, Ukraine's engagement with the Global South includes peace efforts for regional stability, diplomatic strategies, and positioning itself as a defender of global liberty amidst various geopolitical factors.

However, from the main organization of Europe, strategic alignment Foley & Unkovski-Korica (2025), the strongly moralized concept of epistemological and mental decolonization has hindered a thorough examination of the extent of accountability for, and the NATO powers' role in, the Russia-Ukraine conflict. To achieve a detailed examination of the motives and rationalities of all actors, we contend that it is essential to grasp the conflict's historical and structural aspects in the research of Decentering the West.

The dual standards of the contemporary global north, the perspective of Mozahid et al. (2025), results indicate that sanctions serve as both an economic and strategic instrument capable of altering international relations and internal stability. Moreover, the national identities of Russians and Ukrainians significantly influence their strategies, as Russian imperial aspirations and Ukrainian opposition are profoundly embedded in their historical and cultural contexts in the research of revitalizing neoclassical realism and the asymmetric conflict in geopolitics. The research of Huber (2025) conducted a comparative examination of EU policies to guarantee accountability regarding serious breaches of international law in Russia vs. Ukraine, versus the Israel and Gaza War. This research identifies systematic inequalities, especially concerning Palestine, which are articulated through narratives in official EU discourse where Russia, Ukraine, and Israel are positioned within a Eurocentric temporal-spatial context relative to Europe, whereas Palestine is stripped of its historical context, disconnected from any relationship to Europe, and represented as a partially rights-less entity in official EU discourse.

Existing extensive research on Eurocentrism and realist interpretations of the Russia-Ukraine conflict reveals numerous significant gaps, primarily due to the insufficient integration of realism and postcolonial criticisms of Eurocentrism. This gap stems from inadequate attention to the contributions of non-Western countries in redefining the global order. It remains uncertain whether the rising multipolarity will lead to the stabilization or fragmentation of global systems. Research addresses these voids by combining realist power analysis with decolonial critiques to assert that the Russia-Ukraine War is a driving force for a lasting, multipolar restructuring of global politics in a new era.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework, relying mainly on structural realism and postcolonial theory, offers a critical perspective to unpack the ideological aspects of Eurocentrism's decline. Whereas the combined framework tackles important shortcomings of both viewpoints when utilized separately, integration facilitates a

more comprehensive grasp of how power functions both materially and conceptually in the ongoing shift of global order.

The main objective of employing these theories is that Waltz (1979) argues that the anarchic character of the international system and the distribution of power among states influence how states engage with one another and pursue their interests. While offensive realist Mearsheimer (2001) asserts that countries are driven by the ambition to enhance power and pursue regional dominance within a chaotic international framework. It is based on neorealist principles but highlights those states are not only focused on survival but also on continuously enhancing their power to control their neighbors. Postcolonial theory is a framework by Said (1978) and Chakrabarty (2000) that analyzes the cultural, political, and economic effects of colonialism and imperialism, emphasizing the repercussions of European colonial dominance on nations that were once colonized. It challenges the inclination to perceive European culture as supreme and prevailing, along with the Orientalism or clichéd portrayal of non-European societies.

Realists' analysis of the material bases of power dynamics as fundamental principles of realism, the chaotic nature of the international system, the importance of state survival, and the focus on maximizing power clarify the geopolitical motivations and outcomes of the war. The security dilemma stemming from NATO's expansion to the east, Russia's view of existential threats to its sphere of influence, and the inability of economic interdependence to avert conflict all confirm realist forecasts regarding the actions of great powers, which shows how the conflict has highlighted the constraints of Western coercive authority, demonstrated by Russia's effective defiance of sanctions and the rise of alternative economic frameworks that bypass Euro-Atlantic supremacy (Lambert-Deslandes, 2022). So, how is it possible that the Ukrainian failure in the European security dilemma will not create curiosity for the NATO forces for action? If any significant member takes an offensive step, the whole region will gradually decline.

Postcolonialism analyzes how the conflict has transformed into a battleground for challenging Western universalism and regaining epistemic authority. The Global South's prevalent rejection of Western stances on the conflict demonstrates postcolonial opposition to what is viewed as yet another form of imperial power exertion (Khylo & Khylo, 2024). Therefore, Russia's strategic use of anti-colonial language, despite its imperial past, has successfully resonated with postcolonial frustrations regarding Western hypocrisy and double standards, which highlights how alternative entities such as BRICS serve not only as material counterbalances but also as challenges to Eurocentric knowledge creation. The Western response can also be analyzed through postcolonial critique (Moskalenko et al., 2024). As the Global North supported Ukraine, some critics contend that comparable conflicts in non-European nations, such as Iran's nuclear facilities bombing by the U.S, were not legitimate. This selective empathy showcases a Eurocentric bias, exposing inconsistencies within Western liberalism.

This synthesis aims to provide distinct analytical advantages to elucidate the material and discursive aspects of the paradigm shift, moving beyond the Eurocentric limitations of traditional theory. However, the framework proposes innovative theoretical interventions such as extended realism, which includes

civilizational identity as an influencing factor in security assessments while opposing essentialism; a new postcolonial realism, which reinterprets international anarchy as historically shaped by colonial power dynamics; and a perspective of decolonial geopolitical economy that examines how material power dynamics and knowledge hierarchies jointly shape the development of multipolarity.

Overview Russia-Ukraine War and Eurocentrism

Eurocentrism has extensively influenced global narratives by placing Europe and, consequently, the West at the core of political, economic, and cultural dominance, frequently sidelining non-Western viewpoints. What could be observed in the situation in Ukraine has uncovered cracks in this Eurocentric perspective, highlighting a multipolar reality where non-Western entities like China, India, and African countries play a crucial role in influencing global reactions (Peters, 2023). The origins of the Russia-Ukraine conflict date back many centuries, yet the immediate triggers can be linked to the 1991 collapse of the Soviet Union. Ukraine's independence initiated a conflict between pro-Western and pro-Russian political factions within the nation. The Orange Revolution, ignited by claims of voting fraud benefiting pro-Russian candidate Viktor Yanukovich, revealed Ukraine's significant divisions. Even after pro-Western leader Viktor Yushchenko assumed power, internal instability continued. Russia anticipated a rapid triumph, intending to capture Kyiv and set up a client regime. Yet, strong Ukrainian opposition, logistical issues, and inadequate Russian military strategy resulted in a deadlock. Ukrainian troops effectively safeguarded Kyiv and recaptured land in the northeast, Kharkiv, and south, Kherson (Kasianov, 2024). The conflict has revitalized NATO, prompting Finland and Sweden to give up neutrality and enter the alliance, or it has compelled Europe to re-evaluate its defense strategies, as Germany has revealed a significant rise in military expenditures. This war has therefore turned into a central topic for examining the waning of Western dominance and the rise of new powers that confront conventional Eurocentric beliefs. While a notable feature of the Russia-Ukraine War is the disparity in global reactions, which challenges the idea of a cohesive Western-led international framework (Forsberg & Vaahtoranta, 2001). Although the United States and the European Union have enacted extensive sanctions against Russia and offered significant military support to Ukraine, numerous nations in the Global South have taken a neutral position or even implicitly backed Moscow. It has highlighted the constraints of Russian military strength, transformed European security, and significantly changed the division of global order into rival factions (Ajiya, 2022). Regardless of Ukraine's potential triumph, a halted conflict, or a mediated agreement, the war's impacts will resonate for years, shaping aspects like energy strategies and the evolution of global law.

Russia-Ukraine War: Rise of a Multipolarity

After the Soviet Union's fall in 1991, the U.S. became the only superpower, influencing global organizations like the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Trade Organization to align with liberal democratic ideals. NATO's move toward eastward expansion damaged the cooperation, the NATO-Russia Founding Act of 1997 (Mälksoo, 2024), and Western economic frameworks prevailed in the globalization era, while parallel American troops were combating terrorism to sustain a unipolar world by the Global War on Terror. Nevertheless, this

unipolar framework encountered increasing opposition from Russia, China, and various nations pursuing strategic independence. Russia's invasion of Ukraine was, in part, a response to NATO's movement to the east, which Moscow viewed as an offensive and a threat to its existence. Although the West portrayed the conflict as a safeguard for democracy, numerous non-Western countries perceived it as a geopolitical battle for areas of power, emphasizing that U.S. dominance is now challenged (Hendl et al., 2024). Sanctions imposed on Russia, though harsh, did not undermine Moscow's economy because of alternative trading relationships with China, India, and the Global South. Beijing's reluctance to denounce Moscow highlights its challenge to the U.S. and its perspective on a post-Western global order. The "no limits" partnership between China and Russia indicates a strengthening anti-Western alliance. India's involvement in the Quad alongside the U.S. while also interacting with BRICS and SCO emphasizes multipolar diplomacy, striking a balance between blocs instead of yielding to unipolarity (Mozahid et al., 2025). The enlarged BRICS, comprising Egypt, Ethiopia, Iran, and the UAE, signifies an increasing alliance of nations aiming for autonomy from Western-led institutions.

The petrodollar system is declining as a greater number of transactions take place beyond Western-dominated markets. The inability of the UN Security Council to take decisive action because of veto power has underscored the organization's dysfunction. Non-Western countries are increasingly perceiving it as an instrument of major power politics instead of a neutral mediator (Ajiya, 2022). Which is similar to the League of Nations after the First World War, today's order faces institutional faults. The UN Security Council's impasse on Ukraine reflects the League of Nations' inability to address 1930s aggression, with both organizations experiencing issues of structural veto power misuse and selective compliance from great powers (Yilmaz, 2023). Turkey's capacity to keep open lines of communication with both Moscow, a key trade partner and energy supplier, and Kyiv, a NATO ally supplying Bayraktar drones, illustrates the evolving diplomatic flexibility. On the other hand, in 2023, after a year of war, Africa's peace mission, spearheaded by South Africa, Senegal, Zambia, and other countries, signified the continent's most important unified diplomatic effort in a European conflict. Although the mission did not achieve a significant breakthrough, its occurrence demonstrated the Global South's dismissal of Eurocentric conflict resolution methods and laid down the foundation for the need for alternative diplomatic strategies that focus on sovereignty and development issues rather than ideological conformity (Staeger, 2023). Russia's reliance on Iranian Shahed drones has grown to over 2,400 plus, and on North Korean artillery shells, around 1 million rounds estimated, while also becoming China's leading oil supplier, a partnership that hit 2.3 million barrels per day (Mahmoudian, 2023).

These changes demonstrate how secondary powers are taking advantage of great power rivalry to strengthen their strategic roles, as Tehran and Pyongyang acquire political influence and economic gains from their weapon sales because cumulative impact has led to the rise of parallel security ecosystems that diminish reliance on Western defense systems and contest the dominance of U.S.-led alliance networks in global arms markets. The war in Ukraine has simply highlighted this transition, which signals the conclusive end of the unipolar era following the Cold War.

Geopolitical Divisions: Global South Narrative

While the U.S. and Europe characterize the conflict as a struggle to protect democracy from authoritarianism, numerous countries in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East dismiss this simplistic narrative. Rather, they perceive the conflict through the perspective of post-colonial autonomy, neutrality, and opposition to Western dominance. Numerous nations in the Global South are puzzled by the West's extraordinary resource mobilization for Ukraine while displaying indifference or complicity in other conflicts, like unwavering support for Israel, misleading claims regarding the Iraq invasion, the disintegration of Libya, and bombings in Yemen (Ambos, 2023).

Nations such as India, South Africa, and Brazil dismiss the West's portrayal of the conflict as a global fight for democracy, focusing instead on territorial integrity, albeit inconsistently, as seen in the West's backing of Kosovo's independence, which contrasts with its denunciation of Crimea. The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) clarifies why key developing countries, such as India, South Africa, and Indonesia, have declined to participate in Western sanctions against Russia. They believe that upholding an independent foreign policy is essential for protecting national interests (Khyliko & Khyliko, 2024).

The entrenched skepticism towards Western interventionism, refined through years of anti-colonial battles and Cold War proxy wars, has caused numerous Global South countries to dismiss the moral dichotomies of the Ukraine story, recognizing similarities to previous Western military actions in Iraq, Libya, and Yugoslavia for the prevention of terrorism. As well as the institutional memory of NAM's mediation diplomacy reemerging in contemporary peace efforts, illustrated by the peace mission of African leaders and China's 12-point proposal, which reflects the movement's historical focus on negotiated conflict resolution rather than bloc confrontation, this approach has been fragile due to ideological warfare in the past. By the attack on nuclear facilities in Iran, the Indian Ocean region, the geo-political shift has arisen against offensive acts of the U.S and allies of the unipolar order. This double standard strengthens doubts about Western moral authority, as many perceive the Ukraine conflict as a Eurocentric focus on white lives rather than on issues in the Global South.

Economic Separation: Expected Decline of Western Financial Supremacy

The Western bloc faces a complex crisis in maintaining its financial dominance as the Russia-Ukraine conflict intensifies systemic threats to dollar predominance and Western-controlled payment systems. Initially, the use of dollar-denominated sanctions has driven a push for de-dollarization, with BRICS countries creating alternative payment methods such as China's Cross-border Interbank Payment System (CIPS), engaging in bilateral currency swap deals, and proposing a unified trade currency. This has reduced the dollar's share of global reserves from 71% at the start of 2000 to 58% in 2023, marking one year after the Ukraine invasion (Obasun, 2025). Additionally, the development of alternative systems, like Russia's SPFS messaging network, overseen by the Central Bank of Russia, and China's digital yuan, has enabled sanctioned countries to bypass SWIFT. Although SWIFT is a global system, it is often associated with the West due to its origins and dominance in global finance, which has led to an 86% increase in cross-border yuan

transactions since 2021. The war has also shifted commodity trading, exemplified by India's rupee-ruble system for oil purchases, resulting in increased imports of Russian crude. Furthermore, China's energy agreements in yuan have reduced the dominance of the petrodollar and fostered mutually reinforcing economic alliances (Ehlke et al., 2025). These interconnected trends, currency diversification, alternative banking systems, and resource-backed monetary movements suggest that Western financial tools are becoming regionally confined rather than globally dominant, with IMF forecasts indicating the dollar could lose its reserve currency status to a multipolar system by 2040 (Office of the Director of National Intelligence, 2021).

These challenges reveal declining coercive influence, institutional irrelevance, and conceptual inertia, showing that Western financial supremacy is not being dismantled through direct conflict but slowly circumvented through what economic historian Adam Tooze calls "stealth decoupling." The irony is that the instruments designed to sustain Western dollar seigniorage, sanctions, and multilateral financial governance are now contributing to its division, as the global economy splits into competing liquidity zones with different risk assessments and settlement practices. "Stealth decoupling" describes the ongoing, often subtle, process of decreasing economic integration between the United States and China in trade and finance, despite official statements and political rhetoric. This "stealth" occurs because these changes can happen quietly, without formal policies or major public announcements, through shifts in investment patterns, supply networks, and monetary movements (Beckley, 2023). Global structural changes also suggest that Western financial dominance is not being replaced by a single challenger but is fragmenting into rival liquidity pools. Hyman Minsky's American economist financial instability hypothesis (FIH) suggests that during prolonged periods of economic prosperity, capitalist systems tend to shift from a stable, hedge finance-led framework to one increasingly driven by speculative and Ponzi finance, which is unstable and may indicate internal failures of credit systems that overextend geopolitical power (Minsky, 1992). The emerging multipolar monetary landscape signifies a shift in economic power and a fundamental restructuring of the institutional and knowledge foundations underlying global capital flows.

Ideological Conflicts: The Future of Eurocentrism

The Russia-Ukraine war has not only unsettled the geopolitical equilibrium but has also hastened a critical ideological evaluation, exposing essential tensions that are redefining the future of the international order.

The idea of "mimicry," as presented by an Indian scholar, enhances the psychological and institutional frameworks of postcolonial control because numerous elites in postcolonial nations educated in Western institutions and adept in Western political discourse embrace the superficial appearance of democracy, liberalism, and capitalism not as a true reflection of national sentiment but as a tactical means of survival in a global system still influenced by Euro-American dominance, generating "ambivalence," a colonial state that perpetuates dependency, as local leaders imitate Western structures without being able to genuinely embody them. This imitation is clear in how numerous postcolonial nations associate themselves with U.S. interests to the detriment of their citizens, whether by joining

U.S.-led coalitions, engaging in structural adjustment programs, or entering regional security partnerships. Rather than functioning as independent entities, these nations frequently find themselves ensnared in a neocolonial framework that restricts their autonomy and relegates them to inferior roles in the global hierarchy. This structure continues to be predominantly Eurocentric in its beliefs, representations, and institutions (Bhabha, 2021).

The crisis of universalism has become more evident as the Western portrayal of the war as a defense of liberal democratic principles faces significant skepticism in the Global South. Western moral assertions are seen as hypocritical, pointing to past interventions in Iraq, Libya, and Syria as proof of selective indignation (Lewis, 2022), along with aggressive strikes on Iranian nuclear sites, reports that Iran operated nuclear facilities in violation of international agreements (Sanger & Erdbrink, 2025). This dismissal is not just rhetorical but indicates a profound epistemological transformation, which postcolonial theorists term "the provincialization of Europe," in which Eurocentric paradigms are no longer viewed as natural or unavoidable but are challenged as local viewpoints posing as universal realities. The conflict has revealed the constraints of Western moral influence, showing that the Global South is no longer prepared to accept Eurocentric interpretations of democracy, human rights, or sovereignty without thorough examination (Chakrabarty, 1992).

Russia's assertions of civilization over Ukraine, presented as a safeguard of traditional values against Western decline, resound with conservative groups globally, especially in areas where anti-colonial feelings persist. Simultaneously, China's anti-colonial narrative, expressed through its Community of Shared Future concept, establishes Beijing as the head of a post-Western global order. These stories are becoming popular not due to their intrinsic validity, but because they take advantage of the increasing dissatisfaction with Eurocentric history, which has consistently portrayed European modernity as the pinnacle of global progress. The outcome is referred to as a "pluriversal" epistemic battlefield, where various civilizational narratives vie for supremacy, and no sole viewpoint can assert universal credibility, which marks a significant shift from the post-Cold War period, when the "end of history" idea proclaimed Western liberal democracy as the ultimate expression of human governance, while history has not concluded but has instead fragmented into numerous debated futures, each asserting validity founded on different civilizational, economic, and ideological frameworks (Fasting & Fukuyama, 2021).

The creation and sharing of knowledge previously controlled by Western institutions, media outlets, and research organizations are experiencing profound decentralization. China's strategy of "discourse power," supported by an annual investment of billions of dollars in international media and cultural organizations, aims to challenge Western narrative supremacy by advancing alternative perspectives on development, governance, and human rights (Zhao, 2016). At the same time, decolonial studies have gained remarkable popularity in universities of the Global South, with enrollment in programs that question Eurocentric perspectives rising by 40% since 2020. Even in numerical terms, the West's dominance in knowledge creation is decreasing because Western think tanks now represent just 58% of global policy research, a decline from 82% at the start of the

century. The outcome is a reality where ideological conflicts are waged not just on a singular, Eurocentric ground but throughout various, intersecting, and frequently incomparable discursive spheres (Ensuncho, 2023).

Conclusion

The Russia-Ukraine conflict has seemed to be an unalterable shift from Western dominance to a multipolar civilizational order. Eurocentrism is not vanishing but is rather being broken down and diminished from a universal perspective to one of many rival worldviews. In this contemporary age, ideological disputes will not be settled by the victory of one system over another but rather through the challenging coexistence of various modernities, each asserting legitimacy grounded in unique historical backgrounds, cultural principles, and political goals. The future of global order will be determined not by the triumph of a single ideology but through the continuous negotiation among these diverse viewpoints, aptly characterized as a period of conflicting universalisms. At the core of this change exists a crucial conflict between the West's attempts to maintain its supremacy and the Global South's demand for a fairer allocation of power. The exploitation of financial systems, previously seen as an unbeatable instrument of Western pressure, has backfired, leading to the swift emergence of alternative economic frameworks. The emerging multipolar order requires a fresh intellectual humility and an acknowledgment that no civilization possesses a monopoly on truth, governance, or advancement. The future is not for those who hold on to old hegemonies, but for those who embrace differences, navigate conflicting interests, and create systems that represent the variety of human experiences. The path away from Eurocentrism has merely started, and its complete effects will reveal themselves in the years ahead.

Conflict of Interest

The authors showed no conflict of interest.

Funding

The authors did not mention any funding for this research.

References

- [1] Ajiya, M. (2022). The Battle of the Titans: ‘Russia’ Versus ‘Ukraine and US Led NATO Expansionism’ and Its Consequences to the Globe. Available at SSRN 4319278.
- [2] Ambos, K. (2022). Ukraine and the Double Standards of the West. *Journal of International Criminal Justice*, 20(4), 875-892.
- [3] Bariiev, R. (2024). The Global South and the Russo-Ukrainian war: A strategic assessment. *Rocznik Strategiczny*, (29), 356-376.
- [4] Beckley, M. (2023). Delusions of Détente: Why America and China will be enduring rivals. *Foreign Aff.*, 102, 8.
- [5] Bhabha, H. K. (2021). Of mimicry and man: The ambivalence of colonial discourse. In *Literary theory and criticism* (pp. 171-181). *Routledge India*.
- [6] Chakrabarty, D. (1992). Provincializing Europe: Postcoloniality and the critique of history. *Cultural studies*, 6(3), 337-357.
- [7] Ehlke, R., Salzer, T., & Westermeier, C. (2025). Increasing State Capacity through Central Bank Digital Currencies: A Comparative Account of the Digital Yuan and the Digital Rouble. In *State, Capitalism, and Finance in Emerging Markets* (pp. 231-254). Bristol University Press.
- [8] Fan, W. (2024). China's Approach to Addressing International Hotspot Issues: Concepts, Principles and Practices. *China Int'l Stud.*, 105, 5.
- [9] Fasting, M., & Fukuyama, F. (2021). *After the End of History*. Georgetown University Press, Washington.
- [10] Foley, J., & Unkovski-Korica, V. (2025). Decentring the West? Civilizational solidarity and (de) colonization in theories of the Russia-Ukraine War. *Globalizations*, 22(4), 613-633.
- [11] Forsberg, T., & Vaahtoranta, T. (2001). Inside the EU, outside NATO: Paradoxes of Finland's and Sweden's post-neutrality. *European Security*, 10(1), 68-93.
- [12] Hendl, T., Burlyuk, O., O’Sullivan, M., & Arystanbek, A. (2024). (En) Countering epistemic imperialism: A critique of “Westsplaining” and coloniality in dominant debates on Russia’s invasion of Ukraine. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 45(2), 171-209.
- [13] Hoyos Ensunchoa, M. (2023). Decolonial practices in higher education from the Global South: A systematic literature review [Peer-reviewed article]. *Journal of Comparative & International Higher Education*, 15(5), 12–26. <https://doi.org/10.32674/jcihe.v15i5.5299>

- [14] Huber, D. V. (2025). Organized Hypocrisy and the Logic of Coloniality. Explaining the EU's Divergent Response to Grave Violations of International Law in Russia/Ukraine and Israel/Palestine. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*.
- [15] Kasianov, G. (2024). Nationalist Memory Narratives and the Politics of History in Ukraine since the 1990s. *Nationalities Papers*, 52(6), 1235-1254.
- [16] Khylyko, M., & Khylyko, O. (2024). Navigating the Global South's Ambivalent Stance on the Russia-Ukraine War. *Evropský politický a právní diskurz*, 11, 4, 5-15.
- [17] Khylyko, O., & Khylyko, M. (2024). Explanatory Potential of the Postcolonial Approach for Understanding the Russia–Ukraine War. *Topos*, (2), 18-41.
- [18] Kurnyshova, Y. (2024). Ukraine and the global south: The ambiguities of a postcolonial perspective. *New Perspectives*, 32(3), 272-289.
- [19] Lambert-Deslandes, É. (2022). Balancing, Bandwagoning and Power Maximization: Nato Enlargement Through the Lens of Offensive Realism. *Journal of Military and Strategic Studies*, 22(1).
- [20] Lewis, A. M. (2022). Humanitarian and military intervention in Libya and Syria: Parliamentary debate and policy failure. Routledge.
- [21] Mahmoudian, A. (2023). Russia-Iran Military Cooperation: The Dynamic Is Changing Dramatically Because of Drones in the Ukraine War.
- [22] Mälksoo, M. (2024). NATO's new front: deterrence moves eastward. *International Affairs*, 100(2), 531-547.
- [23] Manners, I. (2024). Teaching the Russian War Against Ukraine: Ukraine as a Microcosm of the Paradigm Shift from International Relations to Planetary Politics1. *Journal of Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics and Society*, 10(1), 1-31.
- [24] Minsky, H. P. (1992). The financial instability hypothesis (No. 74). Working paper.
- [25] Moskalenko, K., Yu, X., & Rahaman, M. A. (2024). Russia's Strategic Shift from European Integration to Eastern Alliances after the War in Ukraine: A Postcolonial Perspective. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 12(12), 370-388.
- [26] Mozahid, F. A., Mondal, S., & Rahamatullah, M. (2025). The Russia-Ukraine Conflict, Sanctions, and Power Politics: Revitalizing Neoclassical Realism and Asymmetric Conflict Perspective on Identity in Geopolitics. *International Social Research Nexus (ISRNX)*, 1(1), 1-20.
- [27] Obasun, O. (2025). The BRICS Rebellion: Local Currencies, Payment Networks, and the Unmaking of Dollar Hegemony.

- [28] Office of the Director of National Intelligence. (2021). Global Trends 2040: A more contested world [PDF]. U.S. Government. https://www.dni.gov/files/ODNI/documents/assessments/GlobalTrends_2040.pdf
- [29] Peters, M. A. (2023). The emerging multipolar world order: A preliminary analysis. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 55(14), 1653-1663.
- [30] Rabel, R. (2025). Global South and Western divergence on Russia's war in Ukraine: implications for world order. *International Affairs*, 101(3), 1005-1021.
- [31] Sanger, D. E., & Erdbrink, T. (2025, June 24). Iran defied nuclear curbs at secret sites, U.S. says. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/06/24/us/politics/iran-nuclear-sites.html>
- [32] Selim, K. U. R. T. (2023). An Analysis of the Motives of the Russian Federation–Ukraine War within Dugin’s Understanding of Neo-Eurasianism. *Codrul cosminului*, 351.
- [33] Shah, S. N. A., Majeed, G., Ali, R. A., & Hussain, T. (2022). Russia-Ukraine Crisis and Its Impact on South Asia. *Review of Applied Management and Social Sciences*, 5(2), 141-148. <https://doi.org/10.47067/ramss.v5i2.219>
- [34] Shestopalova, A. (2023). Constructing Nazis on political demand: Agenda-setting and framing in Russian state-controlled TV coverage of the Euromaidan, annexation of Crimea and the war in Donbas. *Central European Journal of International and Security Studies*, 17(2), 112-137.
- [35] Sørensen, G. (2023). Liberal World Order after Ukraine. Towards a New European Security Architecture, ELF Study, 6, 1-7.
- [36] Staeger, U. (2023). The war in Ukraine, the African union, and African agency. *African Affairs*, 122(489), 559-586.
- [37] Strickland, L., & Wang, J. (2023). Racism and eurocentrism in histories of philosophy. *Open Journal of Philosophy*, 13(1), 76-96.
- [38] Yilmaz, İ. I. (2023). Ukraine War and the us Hegemony: A Neo-Gramscian Analysis of Economic Sanctions (Master's thesis, Middle East Technical University (Turkey)).
- [39] Zhao, K. (2016). China’s rise and its discursive power strategy. *Chinese Political Science Review*, 1-25.