

RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
ST. PETERSBURG INTELLIGENTSIA CONGRESS

ST. PETERSBURG UNIVERSITY OF THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

under the support of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation

THE CONTOURS OF THE FUTURE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WORLD'S CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

The 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference

May 17–19, 2018

The conference, originally called 'The Days of Science in St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences' is the 26th in number and the 18th in the status of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference

The Conference is held in accordance with the Decree of President of Russia V. V. Putin 'On perpetuating the memory of Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov' No 587, dated from May 23, 2001

In 2018 the socially important project 'The 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference' was realized with the help of the Grant of the President of the Russian Federation for civil society development provided by the President's Grants Fund in accordance with the Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of April 3, 2017 No 93-rp



**St. Petersburg
2018**

Scientific editor

A. S. Zapesotsky, Chairman of the Organizing Committee of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference, President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Congress of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia

Recommended to be published by the Editorial and Publishing Council
of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences

The Contours of the Future in the Context of the World's Cultural Development : the 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, May 17–19, 2018. – St. Petersburg : SPbUHSS, 2018. – 242 p., il.

ISBN 978-5-7621-0992-5

This collection contains materials of the 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference held on May 17–19, 2018 in St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences in accordance with the Decree of the President of the Russian Federation V. V. Putin "On Perpetuating the Memory of D. S. Likhachov". On the list of the participants of the 18th Conference were guests from over 20 countries.

Among the 68 authors of the collection are outstanding Russian scientists, members of the Russian Academy of Sciences: I. O. Abramova, S. Yu. Glazyev, A. I. Gromyko, A. A. Guseynov, A. S. Zapesotsky, V. L. Kvint, G. B. Kleiner, A. V. Kuznetsov, V. A. Lektorsky, A. G. Lisitsyn-Svetlanov, V. L. Makarov, V. V. Mironov, V. V. Naumkin, A. D. Nekipelov, R. I. Nigmatulin, V. S. Styopin, V. A. Tishkov, Zh. T. Toshchenko, L. L. Fituni, V. A. Chereshev and others; directors of academic institutions and research centers, representatives of higher education institutions, well-known state and public figures, media leaders: R. Zh. Alyautdinov, Director of the Department for Humanitarian Cooperation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation; G. A. Hajiye, Judge of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation; M. S. Gusman, First Deputy Director General of TASS Russian News Agency; A. S. Maksimov, Chairman of the Committee for Science and Higher Education of St. Petersburg Administration; V. K. Mamontov, Director General of *Govorit Moskva* (Moscow Speaking) radio station; H. M. Reznik, Vice-President of the Federal Chamber of Lawyers; V. T. Tretyakov, Dean of Higher School of Television of Lomonosov Moscow State University; M. V. Shmakov, Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia; A. V. Yakovenko, Ambassador of the Russian Federation to the United Kingdom; prominent representatives of the sphere of culture and art and others.

Among the foreign authors of the collection are: Sh. Aziz, Prime minister of Pakistan (2004–2007); A. A. Akayev, President of Kyrgyzstan (1990–2005), academician; E. Bağış, Minister of European Union Affairs of Turkey (2009–2013); P. Bülbüloğlu, Ambassador of Azerbaijan to the Russian Federation; J. Wiatr, Minister of National Education of Poland (1996–1997); M. Dell'Ambrogio, Minister of Education and Research of Switzerland; G. W. Kolodko, Deputy Prime Minister, Minister of Finance of Poland (1994–1997, 2002–2003), academician; J. A. March, Ambassador of Spain to the Russian Federation (2008–2011); M. A. Moratinos Cuyaube, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Spain (2004–2010); M. Sanayee, Ambassador of Iran to the Russian Federation; M. Harputlu, Governor of Alanya (Turkey); members of foreign academies of sciences: V. Prodanov (Bulgaria), P. P. Tolochko (Ukraine); professors: A. Bebler (Slovenia), P. Dutkiewicz (Canada), V. Ingimundarson (Iceland), H. Köchler (Austria), R. Lewis and R. Matthews (Great Britain), J. A. Scholte (Sweden) and others.

President of the Russian Federation V. V. Putin highly appreciated the role of the Likhachov Conference: "The organizers and participants of the Conference keep the established traditions alive and pay the most serious attention to challenging pivotal issues of development of civilization and dialogue of cultures".

БКБ 72



**DECREE
OF PRESIDENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION
'ON PERPETUATING THE MEMORY
OF DMITRY SERGEYEVICH LIKHACHOV'**

Given D. S. Likhachov's outstanding contribution to the development of the home science and culture I enact:

1. the Government of the Russian Federation should:
 - establish two personal grants in honour of D. S. Likhachov at the rate of 400 roubles each for university students from the year 2001 and to define the procedure of conferring them;
 - work out the project of D. S. Likhachov's gravestone on a competitive basis together with the Government of St. Petersburg;
 - consider the issue of making a film devoted to D. S. Likhachov's life and activities.
2. the Government of St. Petersburg should:
 - name one of the streets in St. Petersburg after D. S. Likhachov;
 - consider the issue of placing a memorial plate on the building of the Institute of Russian Literature of the Russian Academy of Science (Pushkin's House);
 - guarantee the work on setting up D. S. Likhachov's gravestone in prescribed manner.
3. According to the suggestion from the Russian Academy of Science the Likhachov Memorial Prizes of the Russian Academy of Science should be established for Russian and foreign scientists for their outstanding contribution to the research of literature and culture of ancient Russia, and the collected writings of the late Academician should be published.
4. **According to the suggestion from St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress the International Likhachov Scientific Conference should be annually held on the Day of the Slavonic Letters and Culture.**

VLADIMIR PUTIN,
President of the Russian Federation
Moscow, the Kremlin, May 23, 2001

GREETINGS OF VLADIMIR PUTIN TO THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

Dear Friends!

I'd like to welcome you on the occasion of the 17th International Likhachov Scientific Conference that opens today.

Your meetings have become an important, expected event in the public life of St. Petersburg and the whole country. It's encouraging that in all those years organizers and participants of the Conference have been keeping alive the established traditions, paying most serious attention to important, basic issues referring to civilization development and dialogue of cultures. They follow the precepts of the great humanist and educator Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov.

I'm sure that this forum will work creatively and constructively, will be remembered for interesting, productive discussions, informal and really friendly atmosphere.

I wish you every success.

President of the Russian Federation

V. PUTIN

May 18, 2017



Dear Friends!

Greetings to you all on the occasion of the opening of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference, which has been held in our Northern Capital for many years now.

Your authoritative forum, bringing together the elite of the Russian and global intelligentsia, prominent scientists and cultural figures, has truly become a cornerstone event and grand tradition in the country's public and spiritual life. Importantly, the meeting agenda always tackles the most pressing humanitarian and civilizational problems that are of such critical importance to Russia's present and future.

Today, you have convened to discuss such a fundamental topic as "Modern Global Challenges and National Interests", share your experience, and tally the results of joint projects. I am confident that the proposals and recommendations formulated in the course of the Conference will further the careful preservation of our national cultural heritage and the advancement of the humanitarian ideas of Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov.

I wish everyone productive, mutually-beneficial discussions, much success and all the very best.

President of the Russian Federation

V. PUTIN

May 16, 2016



Dear Friends!

I am happy to welcome you in St. Petersburg and to congratulate you on the opening of the 12th Likhachov Conference.

Your forum is an important event in the social life of Russia and of a number of foreign countries. It traditionally brings together representatives of scientific and artistic communities and competent experts.

Under globalization, the issues of extending the dialogue of cultures, preventing ethno-confessional conflicts are of paramount importance. There is compelling evidence that the humanistic ideas of academician D. S. Likhachov, an outstanding Russian enlightener and public figure, are still up-to-date.

I am convinced that the suggestions and recommendations drawn up in the course of your meeting will be sought after in practical terms.

I wish you new achievements and all the best.

President of the Russian Federation

V. PUTIN

May 17, 2012

**Dear Friends!**

I would like to welcome participants, hosts and guests of the 11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference!

Your forum, traditionally gathering the cream of the Russian intellectual community, prominent scientists and public figures from all over the world in St. Petersburg is an outstanding and remarkable event in the international scientific and cultural life. It is crucial that the topics of the Conference precisely reflect the most urgent and acute humanitarian issues, the main of them being promotion of the dialogue of cultures and civilizations in the modern world, establishment of moral and spiritual foundations of the society. And certainly, one of the priority tasks for you is preserving the invaluable legacy of Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov, which is as relevant and significant as before.

I wish you fruitful and constructive discussions, interesting and useful meetings.

Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation

V. PUTIN

May 5, 2011

**Dear Friends!**

I am sincerely pleased to see you in Saint-Petersburg and open the 10th Anniversary International Likhachov Conference.

This reputable forum is always notable for the substantial membership, comprehensive and effective work, and wide spectrum of issues to be discussed.

I am sure that the today's meeting devoted to the dialogue of cultures and partnership of civilizations should be one more step forward in promoting interconfessional and international communication to bring people closer to each other. And, certainly, again we can see so many prominent people together, among which are scientists, public figures, intellectuals, representatives of arts community, everyone who shares notions and opinions of Dmitry S. Likhachov.

I wish you good luck and all the best!

Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation

V. PUTIN

May 11, 2010



I want to extend my welcome to hosts, participants and guests of the 8th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

Holding this scientific forum has become a good and important tradition. It helps not only to realise the value of humanistic ideas of Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov, but also to understand topical issues of the modern world.

That is why the agenda of the Conference involves problems vital for everyone, like personality and society in a multicultural world; economics and law in the context of partnership of civilizations; mass media in the system of forming the worldview; higher education: problems of development in the context of globalization and others.

I am sure that a lively discussion closely reasoned and utterly transparent in its exposition and logic will contribute to the development of the humanities, steadfast and righteous moral norms.

I wish the hosts, participants and guests fruitful cooperation and all the best.

Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation

V. PUTIN

May 22, 2008



I should like to welcome the guests, participants, and the organization that is holding the 6th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

I note with satisfaction that for many years this forum has been carrying out a very noble and important mission of preserving, analyzing and popularizing Likhachov's scientific works. The International Likhachov Scientific Conference has become a very important forum where people can exchange ideas and discuss the topical issues of the present time. Likhachov's spiritual legacy is an integral part of our science, of the science all over the world. And we are proud to see Likhachov's 100th anniversary, this memorable event, being celebrated on a great scale in Russia and abroad. I wish a successful discussion to all the participants and guests of the conference.

President of the Russian Federation

V. PUTIN

May 25, 2006



I should like to welcome the guests, participants, and the organization that is holding this remarkable event, the International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

The most influential and outstanding representatives of intellectual elite – scientists, artists, political figures – participate in this conference to keep up with the tradition. It affords me deep satisfaction to see this forum acquire an international standing. I note with pleasure that its agenda contains the most significant and topical issues of our time. This year you are discussing one of the fundamental problems – impact of education on humanistic process in the society.

The fact that this forum is organized regularly is a great tribute to the memory of D. S. Likhachov, an outstanding scientist, citizen and patriot. His spiritual legacy, scientific works dedicated to the problems of intellectual and moral development of younger generations, has great significance. I wish you a fruitful discussion.

President of the Russian Federation

V. PUTIN

May 20, 2004



I should first like to welcome the participants of the International Scientific Conference "The world of culture of academician D. S. Likhachov". The most prominent scientists and political leaders come together to discuss at this conference the most important issues of the scientific, moral and spiritual legacy of the remarkable Russian scientist D. S. Likhachov. I strongly believe that this tradition will be followed up in the future and the most distinguished successors will develop Likhachov's humanistic ideas and put them into practice while creating the Universal Home for all people of the 21st century.

I should like to express my hope that the Likhachov scientific conferences will be held in all regions of this country as well as in St. Petersburg, and we will feel part of this remarkable tradition.

I wish you a fruitful discussion and a good partnership that will bring many useful results.

President of the Russian Federation

V. PUTIN

May 21, 2001

WELCOME ADDRESSES TO THE PARTICIPANTS AND GUESTS OF THE 18th INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

**To the participants and guests
of the 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference**

Dear Friends!

I sincerely welcome you in St. Petersburg and congratulate with the opening of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

The interest to the Likhachov Scientific Conference has been growing from year to year, the number of participants is increasing. The issues discussed at this unique humanitarian forum are important not only for today's Russia but for the whole world as well. A vivid example is the topic of this meeting – "The Contours of the Future in the Context of the World's Cultural Development".

The dialogue between countries with the help of culture acquires special importance in the today's realities, when the mankind runs across new challenges. People understand each other better, friendly and good-neighbour relations between states strengthen, cooperation develops thanks to culture and arts.

Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov's words are urgent today as well, the words that culture is a great, integral phenomenon, that makes people inhabiting a certain space a nation from just population. Animosity to another nation, to opinion of the others are not typical for high-cultured people.

I am sure that the 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference will provide an opportunity for the participants to share opinions, find answers to the questions worrying you, and the offers and recommendations that will be presented in the course of the forum, will help to realize interesting projects and programs, help further strengthening of humanitarian cooperation.

I wish you fruitful work and all the best.

Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation

D. A. MEDVEDEV

Moscow, May 17, 2018

**To the organizers, participants and guests
of the 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference**

I welcome the organizers, participants and guests of the 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

Your forum annually unites tens of the leading Russian and foreign researchers, public figures, politicians. Academician Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov made a giant contribution to the development of world science, and his words about the necessity to preserve and augment culture are especially urgent today.

The topic selected for the Conference – "The Contours of the Future in the Context of the World's Cultural Development" – is not accidental as exactly mutual respect of nations and humanitarian cooperation can become the basis of international stability.

I'm sure that scholarly and creative comprehension of academician D. S. Likhachov's legacy will allow to work out specific recommendations for the future development of our country.

I wish you successful work and all the best.

Chairman of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation

V. V. VOLODIN

May 17, 2018

**To the organizers, participants and guests
of the 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference**

I sincerely welcome the organizers, participants and guests of the 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

Your annual meetings at the St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences have become a good tradition. They have been established over nearly two decades as a competent discussion venue, where representatives of academic, expert circles, political scientists, civil society representatives from Russia and a number of foreign states assemble. Efforts directed to the non-charged politically discussion of contemporary urgent trends in various fields, in the current turbulent environment in the world, acquire special importance.

The topic of this meeting sounds especially urgent. It's difficult to overestimate the role of culture in strengthening the foundation of inter-state relations, maintaining trust and mutual understanding on the international scene. Russia will go on promoting cultural and civilization variety, expansion of inter-civilization and inter-confession dialogue as a consistent supporter of respect and originality of nations and their right to independently determine the models of their political and socioeconomic order.

There is no doubt that your Conference will make a useful contribution to common efforts in this direction. I wish you productive work and all the best.

Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation

S. V. LAVROV

Moscow, May 17, 2018

**To the organizers and participants
of the 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference**

Dear Colleagues, dear Friends!

I'm happy to welcome the organizers and participants of the 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

Your forum becomes an important event in the public and cultural life of St. Petersburg every year. Prominent representatives of the Russian and world humanities traditionally assemble at it, and the forum serves as an authoritative discussion venue. Discussion of civilization problems of pressing concern, comprehension of global changes taking place and the role of Russia in the today's world are given an important place here.

I'll especially mention that the intellectual dominant of the Conference is invariably priceless Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov's legacy, that is not becoming less urgent. And currently, the humanistic ideas of this outstanding scientist provide the atmosphere of mutual respect, openness to variety of voices and opinions at the forum.

I'm sure: meetings of experts as a part of the Conference will not only help to strengthen spiritual and moral foundations of the society but also to preserve inter-national and inter-cultural accord inside the country.

I sincerely wish you fruitful and successful work!

Minister of Culture of the Russian Federation

V. R. MEDINSKY

**To the Rector of the St. Petersburg University
of the Humanities and Social Sciences, organizers and participants
of the 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference**

Dear Alexander Sergeyevich! Dear Colleagues!

I welcome you on the occasion of the opening of the 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference on behalf of the Ministry of Labour and Social Security of the Russian Federation and on my own behalf!

The issues and topics discussed at the forum touch upon contemporary global challenges and national interests of Russia and are of big importance for peace and progress on the globe.

I'm sure that the participants of the forum will offer specific initiatives to advance social and labour relations that will be in demand and taken into account in the Russian legislation.

I wish you fruitful work, interesting and informative discussions!

Minister of Labour and Social Protection of the Russian Federation

M. A. TOPILIN

**To the participants, organizers and guests
of the 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference**

Dear Friends!

I'm happy to welcome all of you in St. Petersburg – the city where the great scientist, outstanding culture and art expert, academician Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov lived and worked!

The International Likhachov Scientific Conference is highly reputed in the global academic community. The large-scaled discussion venue, where various issues of civilization development are discussed, traditionally unites the leading scholars, statesmen and public figures from various regions of Russia, CIS states and other foreign countries.

The participants of the Scientific Conference will have to outline the contours of the future in the context of the world's cultural development basing on academician Likhachov's ideas that are becoming especially urgent in the contemporary world. According to the academician's deep-rooted conviction, it's culture that is the essence and the main value of the mankind's existence.

I'm sure that the forum's work will help further strengthening of humanitarian ties and search for ideas for new educational projects.

I wish the participants of the 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference fruitful contacts and dialogue as well as vivid impressions of St. Petersburg!

St. Petersburg Governor

G. S. POLTAVCHENKO

**To the organizers, participants and guests
of the 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference**

I welcome the participants and guests of the 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference on behalf of the Russian Academy of Sciences!

The Likhachov Scientific Conference has become the recognized and important venue over the years for scholarly discussions of the main issues of our times.

The urgency of the issues discussed, the impressive participants, variety of topics made the Likhachov Scientific Conference a kind of mobilization of the scholars' intellectual resources, a festival of humanitarian views and ideas, a significant event in the scholarly life not only in St. Petersburg and Russia but also on international scales. I'm sure that your forum will make a considerable contribution to development of stable future models and establishment of the unity of human culture.

I wish all participants of the scientific forum fruitful academic discussions and good results in searching for answers to the challenges on the way of settling today's international conflicts by interaction of world cultures.

President of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Academician

A. M. SERGEYEV

**To the Rector of the St. Petersburg University
of the Humanities and Social Sciences, organizers and participants
of the 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference**

I sincerely welcome the organizers, participants and guests of the 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

Outstanding representatives of the Russian and world humanities and culture assemble at the University according to the established tradition in order to try to comprehend cardinal changes taking place in the world, the ideas of great thinkers, determine the contours of the future world's cultural development in the course of constructive dialogue. There are not simple tasks set for prominent figures in the fields of culture and science: to develop the dialogue of cultures and civilizations in the today's world, determine the place of our country in the context of new geopolitical challenges. The creative climate at the Likhachov Scientific Conference helps searching for the answers to urgent questions, worrying the Russian and international community. The topics reviewed at this forum are as always urgent, permeated with the spirit of the contemporary times, civic spirit and social responsibility.

It's difficult to overestimate the importance of the Conference, dedicated to such urgent problems and challenges as modern international relations, economic law, social and labour relations and conflicts, to the Russian trade unions. The Russian trade unions are fighting for the rights of working people, worthy labour and high social standards of life and inevitably abide by the principles of international solidarity, they strengthen cooperation and unity.

I wish the organizers and participants of the Conference fruitful work and creative success in comprehension of the urgent problems of the contemporary times.

Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia
M. V. SHMAKOV
May 17, 2018

**To the organizers, participants and guests
of the 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference**

The 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference is an important milestone to assess the evolution of the educational, scientific and cultural dimensions of globalization.

This year's theme of the "The Contours of the Future in the Context of the World's Cultural Development", recognizes the importance of cultural dimension in shaping the course of human development.

Due to technological advances, we live in an era which has opened up the possibilities for cultural development. But with this emerging technology comes an ethical responsibility to use this enormous potential to promote tolerance, peace and human rights.

Dmitry Likhachov too lived through turbulent times of change but retained a deep conviction that power of culture and intercultural dialogue lay at the heart of bulding the resilient societies.

Likhachov's work recognised the importance of the past in informing the future. He also understood the extent to which intercultural dialogue can inspire current generations and deepen our shared humanity.

A courageous intellectual, his steadfast work dedicated to both science and culture was guided by his vision that complex issues can only be addressed in an interdisciplinary approach.

Today, we need to bring together the expertise of diverse fields to shape our collective future, which is the vision of the United National Sustainable Development Goals.

Saint Petersburg, a city which combines culture and science, embodies this spirit of collective intelligence. Its historic centre is a UNESCO World Heritage site and its founder, Peter the Great, was determined to attract the best minds and to transform Russia into a state at the forefront of technological progress.

I thank St. Petersburg University of Humanities and Social Science, and the participants of the conference, for their continued efforts and commitment to such principles.

Director-General of UNESCO
Au. AZOULAY

ABOUT THE INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

Information

The International Scientific Conference at St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences first took place in May, 1993. It was timed to the Day of Slavonic Letters and Culture. It was initiated by academician Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov. Since then the conference has been held every year. After academician Likhachov had passed away this academic forum received the status of International Likhachov Scientific Conference from the government (by the Decree of President of the Russian Federation V. V. Putin 'On perpetuating the memory of Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov' № 587, May 23, 2001).

The co-founders of the Conference are the Russian Academy of Sciences, St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress (founders: J. I. Alferov, D. A. Granin, A. S. Zapesotsky, K. Yu. Lavrov, D. S. Likhachov, A. P. Petrov, M. B. Piotrovski). Since 2007 the conference has enjoyed the support of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation.

Traditionally, the most universal debatable challenges of the present time are put on the agenda of the conference: 'Dialogue of cultures under globalization', 'Education in terms of the new cultural type formation', 'Culture and global challenges of the world development', 'Humanitarian issues of the contemporary civilization', 'Contemporary global challenges and national interests', 'Global world: system shifts, challenges and contours of the future' etc.

Every year the greatest figures of the Russian and foreign science, culture and art, public and political leaders take part in the conference. The following academicians of the Russian Academy of Sciences have taken part in the conference in recent years: L. I. Abalkin, G. A. Arbatov, N. P. Bekhtereva, O. T. Bogomolov, V. N. Bolshakov, Yu. S. Vasilyev, S. Yu. Glazyev, M. K. Gorshkov, R. S. Grinberg, An. A. Gromyko, A. A. Guseynov, A. V. Dmitriyev, T. I. Zaslavskaya, M. P. Kirpichnikov, M. I. Kleandrov, G. B. Kleiner, A. A. Kokoshin, A. B. Kudelin, V. A. Lektorsky, A. G. Lisitsyn-Svetlanov, I. I. Lukinov, D. S. Lvov, V. L. Makarov, V. A. Martynov, V. V. Mironov, N. N. Moiseyev, V. V. Naumkin, A. D. Nekipelov, R. I. Nigmatulin, Yu. S. Osipov, A. M. Panchenko, N. Ya. Petrakov, V. F. Petrenko, E. I. Pivovarov, M. B. Piotrovski, N. A. Platch, V. M. Polterovich, E. M. Primakov, B. V. Rauschenbach, Yu. A. Ryzhov, N. N. Skatov, A. V. Smirnov, V. S. Styopin, M. L. Titarenko, V. A. Tishkov, J. T. Toshchenko, V. A. Chereshev, A. O. Chubarian, N. P. Shmelyov, B. G. Yudin, V. L. Yanin and others. Academicians of the Russian Academy of Education who have taken part in the conference are the following: S. A. Amonashvili, V. I. Andreyev, G. M. Andreyeva, A. G. Asmolov, A. P. Beliyeva, M. N. Berulava, I. V. Bestuzhev-Lada, A. A. Bodalev, E. V. Bondarevskaya, G. A. Bordovsky, V. P. Borisenkov, G. N. Volkov, Yu. S. Davydov, A. V. Darinsky, E. D. Dneprov, S. F. Yegorov, V. I. Zagvyazinskiy, I. A. Zimniaya, Yu. P. Zinchenko, V. G. Kineliov, I. S. Kon, A. S. Kondratyev, V. G. Kostomarov, V. V. Krayevsky, A. A. Likhachov, G. V. Mukhamedzianova, V. S. Mukhina, V. A. Miasnikov, N. D. Nikandrov, A. M. Novikov, O. A. Omarov, A. A. Orlov, Yu. V. Senko, A. V. Usova, Yu. U. Fokht-Babushkin, G. A. Yagodin, V. Mitter (Germany) and others. Such public and state figures as A. A. Akayev, F. A. Asadullin, N. S. Bondar, A. E. Busygin, P. Bülbüloğlu, G. A. Hajiyev, G. M. Gatilov, Al. A. Gromyko, M. S. Gusman, A. K. Isayev, S. L. Katanandov, K. I. Kosachov, S. V. Lavrov, E. I. Makarov, T. A. Mansurov, V. I. Matviyenko, V. V. Miklushevsky, A. A. Pankin, V. N. Pligin, H. M. Reznik, K. O. Romodanovsky, A. L. Safonov, A. A. Sobchak, E. S. Stroyev, V. Ye. Churov, M. V. Shmakov, A. V. Yakovenko, V. A. Yakovlev have also participated in the conference. Among the figures of culture and art who have taken part in the conference are the following: M. K. Anikushin, N. V. Burov, A. A. Voznesensky, I. O. Gorbachov, D. A. Granin, N. M. Dudinskaya, Z. Ya. Korogodsky, K. Yu. Lavrov, A. P. Petrov, M. M. Plisetskaya, M. L. Rostropovich, E. A. Riazanov, N. S. Safronov, G. V. Sviridov and others.

Since 2007 in the framework of the Conference there has been held Likhachov forum of senior high-school students of Russia (from 2014 r. — International forum of senior high-school students), which gathers winners of the annual competition of creative projects entitled 'Dmitry Likhachov's Ideas and Modernity' from all over Russia and abroad.

Supported by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, the Diplomatic Programme of the conference 'International Dialogue of Cultures' has taken place since 2008. Ambassadors of foreign states present their reports and give their opinions on acute challenges of present time.

In 2001, 2004, 2006, 2009–2012, 2016, 2017 the hosts and participants were greeted by Presidents of the Russian Federation V. V. Putin and D. A. Medvedev, in 2008, 2010–2018 by Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation.

The collection of articles is published on the results of the Conference every year. The copies of the volumes are present in all major libraries of Russia, the CIS countries, scientific and educational centers of many countries in the world. The Proceedings of the conference are also available on a scientific website 'Likhachov Square' (at www.lihachev.ru).

CONTENTS

Decree of President of the Russian Federation “On perpetuating the memory of Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov”	3
Greetings of Vladimir Putin to the participants of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference	4
Welcome addresses to the participants and guests of the 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference	7
About the International Likhachov Scientific Conference (Information)	11

REPORTS

I. O. ABRAMOVA , <i>Director of the Institute for African Studies of the RAS, member of the Presidium of the RAS, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor</i> BIG CHALLENGES OF THE FUTURE: RESOURCE DEFICIT AND INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS IN AFRICA	17
A. A. AKAYEV , <i>President of the Kyrgyz Republic (1990–2005), foreign member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Engineering), Professor;</i> Yu. V. YAKOVETS , <i>President of the Pitirim Sorokin – Nikolai Kondratiev International Institute, Dr. Sc. (Economic), Professor, Deserved Scientist of the Russian Federation</i> THE SCIENTIFIC PRINCIPLES FOR THE STRATEGY OF SUSTAINABLE MULTIPOLAR WORLD ORDER’S ESTABLISHMENT BASED ON PARTNERSHIP OF CIVILIZATIONS	21
R. Zh. ALYAUDINOV , <i>Director of the Department for Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation</i> PRESENT-DAY INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS AND WAYS TO SETTLE THEM	25
Sh. AZIZ , <i>Prime Minister of Pakistan (2004–2007)</i> CONTEMPORARY GLOBAL CHALLENGES AND NATIONAL INTERESTS	28
E. BAĞIŞ , <i>Minister of European Union Affairs of Turkey (2009–2013)</i> TURKEY AND THE WORLD: NEW POLITICAL REALITIES	30
A. BEBLER , <i>Professor Emeritus of Political Science at the University of Ljubljana (Slovenia)</i> SANKT PETERSBURG AND THE GLOBAL IMPACT OF THE OCTOBER 1917 REVOLUTION	32
P. BÜLBÜLOĞLU , <i>Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Azerbaijan to the Russian Federation, Professor, Azerbaijan SSR National Artist</i> CULTURE AND DEVELOPMENT: THE CHALLENGES OF THE CONTEMPORARY PERIOD	37
V. A. CHERESHNEV , <i>Chief Researcher at the Institute for Immunology and Physiology (the Urals Branch of the RAS), member of the Presidium of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Medicine), Professor, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS;</i> V. N. RASTORGUEV , <i>Professor at Lomonosov Moscow University, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Honorary Higher Education Lecturer of the Russian Federation</i> HOW TO SAVE THE FUTURE AND WHAT DIFFERENTIATES UTOPIA FROM STRATEGY?	40
M. DELL’AMBROGIO , <i>Minister of Education and Research of Switzerland, Dr. Sc. (Law)</i> THE CONTOURS OF THE FUTURE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WORLD’S CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT	45
B. DESGARDINS , <i>General Manager of Banque Eric Sturdza (Geneva, Switzerland)</i> THE FRAGILE AND THE RESILIENT	46
P. DUTKIEWICZ , <i>Director of the Center for Governance and Public Policy at Carleton University in Ottawa (Canada), Ph.D., Professor of Political Science</i> KEY CONTRADICTIONS OF THE WORLD SYSTEM	49
L. L. FITUNI , <i>Deputy Director of the Institute for African Studies of the RAS, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor</i> CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES: SCIENCE AND CULTURE BETWEEN THE JUST WORLD ORDER AND THE “ICE WAR”	52
S. Yu. GLAZYEV , <i>Academician of the RAS, advisor to the President of the Russian Federation V. V. Putin, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor</i> THE CONTOURS OF THE RUSSIAN ECONOMY’S FUTURE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WORLD CRISIS	56
An. A. GROMYKO (1932–2017) , <i>corresponding member of the RAS;</i> Al. A. GROMYKO , <i>Director of the RAS Institute of Europe, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Political Studies), Professor</i> THE FOOTHOLDS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORDER	59
A. A. GUSEYNOV , <i>Principal Adviser for Academic Affairs of the Institute of Philosophy of the RAS, full member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i> THE NOTION OF CULTURE IN THE MEANING OF MARX’S ELEVENTH FEUERBACH THESIS	61

M. S. GUSMAN , <i>First Deputy Director General of TASS Russian News Agency, Professor, Merited Man of Culture of the Russian Federation</i> THE ROLE OF MASS MEDIA IN SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS	65
G. A. HAJIYEV , <i>Judge of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation, Dr. Sc. (Law), Professor, Honored Lawyer of the Russian Federation, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i> ABOUT THE ARGUMENT “THE WORLD IS TIRED OF PEACE” – THE OPTIMISTIC POINT OF VIEW	67
M. HARPUTLU , <i>Governor of Alanya (Turkey), Dr. Sc. (Political Studies)</i> THE EFFECTS OF THE WAR IN SYRIA TO THE TURKEY’S SOCIAL AND LABOUR RELATIONS AND SECURITY	68
V. INGIMUNDARSON , <i>Professor of Contemporary History at the University of Iceland (Reykjavik), Ph.D.</i> ARCTIC GOVERNANCE IN AN AGE OF GEOPOLITICAL ANXIETY	69
G. B. KLEINER , <i>Deputy Director of the Central Economics and Mathematics Institute of the RAS, Chair of the System Analysis in Economics at the University of Finance under the Government of the Russian Federation, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor</i> “CONSENT OF DISSENTERS”: THE ROLE OF CULTURE IN PROVIDING SUSTAINABILITY OF THE GEOPOLITICAL SYSTEM	72
G. W. KOLODKO , <i>Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of Poland (1994–1997, 2002–2003), Director of the Research Institute at the Kozminski University (Warsaw), foreign member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor</i> CHINESE ECONOMY AT THE ERA OF GLOBALIZATION	75
V. A. KONEV , <i>Professor at the Academician S. P. Korolev Samara National Research University, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Honored Worker of Science of the Russian Federation</i> FROM THE PRESENTATION CULTURE TO THE CULTURE OF PRESENCE	80
H. KÖCHLER , <i>President of the International Progress Organization (Vienna, Austria), Professor Emeritus at the University of Innsbruck, Ph.D.</i> CULTURE IN THE AGE OF GLOBALIZATION	83
A. M. KRAMARENKO , <i>Director of Development of Russian International Affairs Council, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Russian Federation</i> THE FUTURE OF THE WEST–RUSSIA RELATIONS: THE ROLE OF CULTURAL AND CIVILIZATION FACTOR	87
A. B. KUDELIN , <i>Research Advisor of A. M. Gorky World Literature Institute of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Philology), Professor</i> ALIVE AND ‘TANGIBLE’ EMBODIMENT OF THE WORLD LITERARY PROCESS (D. S. Likhachov and the Literary Monuments Academic Series)	89
A. V. KUZNETSOV , <i>Deputy Director of the Primakov National Research Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the RAS, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics)</i> THE FACTOR OF LANGUAGE AND OTHER CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL PROXIMITY IN THE PROCESSES OF BUSINESS’ TRANSNATIONALIZATION	92
V. L. KVINT , <i>Foreign member of the RAS (USA), Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor, Honorary Figure of Russian Higher Education</i> THE ROLE OF PROPHETS, PREDICTORS, LEADERS AND STRATEGISTS IN DEFINING CONTOURS AND SCENARIOS OF THE FUTURE	95
Ch. T. LAUMULIN , <i>Researcher at Centre of Development Studies, University of Cambridge (Great Britain)</i> THE ROLE OF SCIENCE AND CULTURE IN EAEU REINDUSTRIALIZATION	100
L. F. LEBEDEVA , <i>Head of the Center for Socioeconomic Research and Projects of the Institute for the USA and Canadian Studies of the RAS, Professor at the State Academic University of the Humanities (Moscow), Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor (World Economy)</i> GLOBAL CHALLENGES AND NATIONAL PRIORITIES IN THE SOCIO-LABOR FIELD: “TRUMP’S REVOLUTION”	102
V. A. LEKTORSKY , <i>Chief Researcher at the Institute of Philosophy of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor</i> INDEFINITENESS, UNPREDICTABILITY AND SUPER-DEFINITENESS	104
R. LEWIS , <i>Founder of the International Institute of Language and Cross-Cultural Training “Richard Lewis Communications Ltd.” (Great Britain), Professor</i> THE CULTURAL IMPERATIVE – GLOBAL TRENDS IN THE 21st CENTURY	107
A. G. LISITSYN-SVETLANOV , <i>Chief Researcher fellow of the Institute of State and Law of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Law), Professor</i> CULTURE AS FACTOR INFLUENCING DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL LEGAL SYSTEMS AND INTERNATIONAL LAW	110
G. LITTLEJOHN , <i>Economist, sociologist (Great Britain)</i> INFORMATION WARS AND GLOBAL CULTURAL CHANGE: A SEGMENTED INTERNET?	113
V. L. MAKAROV , <i>Academic Advisor of Central Economic and Mathematical Institute of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor</i> THE DIGITAL WORLD AND THE CONTOURS OF THE FUTURE: CREATIVE ACTIVITIES ARE CHANGING THEIR DIRECTION	116

J. A. MARCH , <i>Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Kingdom of Spain to the Russian Federation (2008–2011)</i> MOVING FOR A NEW WORLD; FROM SUCCESS IN SCIENCES TO EFFICIENCY IN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL OPERATIONAL THINKING AT GLOBAL SCALE	118
A. P. MARKOV , <i>Professor at the SPbUHSS, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Dr. Sc. (Pedagogy), Merited Man of Science of the Russian Federation, Professor Emeritus of SPbUHSS</i> POST-CAPITALIST FUTURE: HOPES AND CONCERNS	121
R. MATTHEWS , <i>President of the International League of Strategic Management, Assessment and Accounting, Professor Emeritus at the Kingston University (Great Britain)</i> RE-THINKING MACROECONOMIC POLICY AND THE COMING OF SINGULARITY: BEYOND THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD	123
A. M. MELIKHOV , <i>Deputy Chief Editor of the journal "Neva", writer, publicist, literary critic, Cand. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics)</i> ACADEMICIAN LIKHACHOV AS A MIRROR OF RUSSIAN PATRIOTISM	125
G. METTAN , <i>President of the United Chamber of Industry and Commerce "Switzerland – Russia and CIS States", Executive Director of the Swiss Press Club (Geneva)</i> AN EMPIRE BUILDING, NOT A PEACEFUL WORLD	128
V. V. MIRONOV , <i>Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy at the Lomonosov Moscow State University, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Honorary Worker of Higher Professional Education of the Russian Federation</i> MARX AND RUSSIA	130
M. A. MORATINOS CUYAUBE , <i>Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Spain (2004–2010), Dr., Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i> GLOBAL WORLD: SYSTEMIC CHANGES, CHALLENGES AND PROFILES OF THE FUTURE	133
D. V. MOSYAKOV , <i>Head of the Center for Southeast Asia, Australia and Oceania Studies at the Institute of Oriental Studies of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor</i> THE SOUTH CHINA SEA: TRANSFORMATION OF REGIONAL CONFLICT INTO GLOBAL CONFLICT	138
V. V. NAUMKIN , <i>Research Advisor of the Institute of Oriental Studies at the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor</i> SPLIT BETWEEN THE WORLD OF BELIEVERS AND THE WORLD OF DISBELIEVERS: A GLOBAL MEGATREND?	141
A. D. NEKIPELOV , <i>Director of the Moscow School of Economics at the Lomonosov Moscow State University, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i> ON SOCIETY AS OBJECT OF THEORETICAL STUDIES AND THE CURRENT ECONOMIC THEORY CRISIS	145
R. I. NIGMATULIN , <i>Research Advisor of P. P. Shirsov Institute of Oceanology RAS, member of the presidium of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor</i> RUSSIA AND GLOBAL CIVILIZATION	148
S. A. OSKOLKOV , <i>Head of the Audio Engineering Department of SPbUHSS, Professor, Honored Artist of the Russian Federation, member of the Union of Composers of Russia, Professor Emeritus of SPbUHSS</i> THE TIME-BINDING THREAD... ABOUT THE ROLE OF ARTS IN THE DIALOGUE OF CULTURES	151
V. PRODANOV , <i>Director of the Thracian Scientific Institute, Professor at the University of National and World Economy (Sofia), corresponding member of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy)</i> THE FOURTH INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION AND THE RISE OF THE DIGITAL RISK SOCIETY	153
H. M. REZNIK , <i>Vice-President of the Federal Chamber of Lawyers, Cand. Sc. (Law), Honoured Lawyer of Russia, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i> THE POLITICAL CULTURE OF POST-SOVIET RUSSIA: HISTORICAL CONTINUITY AND TRANSFORMATION	156
N. S. SAFRONOV , <i>Academician of the Russian Academy of Arts, Professor at the Ulyanovsk State University, Honoured Artist of the Russian Federation, People's Artist of the Republic of Dagestan</i> THE ARTS AS A FORM AND SPHERE OF THE DIALOGUE OF CULTURES	158
M. SANAYEE , <i>Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the Russian Federation, Cand. Sc. (Political Studies)</i> CONCERNING THE VECTOR OF NEW PROCESSES IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY	160
J. A. SCHOLTE , <i>Professor of the Peace and Development Department at the University of Gothenburg (Sweden)</i> A TRANSCULTURAL FUTURE?	161
M. V. SHMAKOV , <i>Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia, President of the Universal Confederation of Trade Unions, Chairman of the Trustee Council of SPbUHSS, Professor Emeritus of SPbUHSS</i> MARXISM, CULTURE OF ECONOMIC VIEWS AND IDEAS, AND TRADE UNION IDEOLOGY	164
V. S. STYOPIN , <i>Head of the Section of Philosophy, Political Science, Sociology, Psychology and Law of the Department for Social Sciences of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i> SOCIAL SYSTEMS AND METHODOLOGY FOR FORECASTING THEIR FUTURE STATES	166
V. A. TISHKOV , <i>Academician Secretary of the Division of Historical and Philological Sciences, member of the Presidium of the RAS, research supervisor of the Miklukho-Maklay Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor, Honoured Scientist of the Russian Federation</i> ETHNIC AND RELIGIOUS VARIETY OF RUSSIA: RESULTS AND PROSPECTS OF THE RESEARCH	169

P. P. TOLOCHKO , <i>Member of the Presidium of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Honorary Director of the Institute of Archeology of the NAS of Ukraine, Academician of the NAS of Ukraine, foreign member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i> “STOP POKING THE BEAR”	172
Zh. T. TOSHCHENKO , <i>Chairman of the International Editorial Board of the RAS journal “Sociological Studies”, Chief Researcher of the Institute of Sociology of the RAS, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor</i> THE PAST, THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE IN THE RUSSIAN INTELLIGENTSIA’S MEANINGS OF LIFE	174
V. T. TRETYAKOV , <i>Dean of the Higher School (Department) of Television of Lomonosov Moscow State University</i> CONTOURS OF THE FUTURE: DEGENERATION OR REGENERATION?	179
Yu. L. VOROTNIKOV , <i>Grammar and Lexicology Department Manager, V. V. Vinogradov Russian Language Institute of the RAS, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Philology)</i> D. S. LIKHACHOV AND THE HUMANITIES IN RUSSIA: “THE PAST – TO THE FUTURE”	180
J. WIATR , <i>Minister of National Education of Poland (1996–1997), deputy to the Polish Parliament (Sejm) (1991–1997, 2001), Dr. Sc. (Sociology), Professor</i> NATIONAL SECURITY IN THE UNSAFE WORLD: A CENTRAL EUROPEAN PERSPECTIVE.	182
A. V. YAKOVENKO , <i>Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Russian Federation to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Dr. Sc. (Law), Professor;</i> I. D. DIMITROV , <i>Head of Seldon information and analysis company (Moscow), Executive Director, E-Trading Venues Association</i> THE DIGITAL WORLD: THE CONTOURS OF THE FUTURE	185
A. S. ZAPESOTSKY , <i>President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation</i> LABOUR ETHICS IN THE SYSTEM OF POST-SOVIET RUSSIA’S TRANSFORMATIONS	186

Plenary Session

THE CONTOURS OF THE FUTURE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WORLD’S CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT	190
--	-----

Participants: I. O. Abramova, A. A. Akayev, R. Zh. Alyautdinov, E. Bağış, V. A. Chereshnev, M. Dell’Ambrogio, G. A. Hajiyeve, H. Köchler, A. V. Kuznetsov, V. L. Kvint, Ch. T. Laumulin, V. A. Lektorsky, A. G. Lisitsyn-Svetlanov, V. L. Makarov, A. S. Maksimov, V. K. Mamontov, J. A. March, G. Mettan, M. A. Moratinos Cuyaube, R. I. Nigmatulin, N. S. Safronov, J. A. Scholte, M. V. Shmakov, P. P. Tolochko, Zh. T. Toshchenko, J. Wiatr, A. S. Zapesotsky

Panel Discussion

FUTURE OF THE WORLD ORDER IN THE 21st CENTURY	206
--	-----

Speakers:

Alexander ZAPESOTSKY, *President of SPbUHSS, corresponding member of the RAS (moderator)*

Rinat ALYAUTDINOV, *Director of the Department for Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation*

Shaukat AZIZ, *Prime minister of Pakistan (2004–2007)*

Egemen BAĞIŞ, *Minister of European Union Affairs of Turkey (2009–2013)*

Polad BÜLBÜLOĞLU, *Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Azerbaijan to the Russian Federation, Professor, Azerbaijan SSR National Artist*

Alexey GROMYKO, *Director of the RAS Institute of Europe, corresponding member of the RAS*

Grzegorz KOŁODKO, *Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of Poland (1994–1997, 2002–2003), Director of the Research Institute at the Kozminski University (Warsaw), foreign member of the RAS*

Miguel Angel MORATINOS CUYAUBE, *Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Spain (2004–2010), Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS*

Amr MOUSSA, *Minister of Foreign Affairs of Egypt (1991–2001), Secretary General of the League of Arab States (2001–2011)*

Vitaliy NAUMKIN, *Research Advisor of the Institute of Oriental Studies at the RAS, Academician of the RAS*

Mehdi SANAYEE, *Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the Russian Federation*

Panel Discussion

RUSSIA IN THE GLOBAL WORLD: CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS	214
---	-----

Speakers:

Alexander ZAPESOTSKY, *President of SPbUHSS, corresponding member of the RAS (moderator)*

Askar AKAYEV, *President of the Kyrgyz Republic (1990–2005), foreign member of the RAS*

Abdusalam GUSEYNOV, *Principal Adviser of the Institute of Philosophy of the RAS, full member of the RAS, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS*

Alexander KRAMARENKO, *Director of Development of Russian International Affairs Council, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Russian Federation*

Alexander NEKIPELOV, *Director of the Moscow School of Economics at the Lomonosov Moscow State University, Academician of the RAS, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS*

Robert NIGMATULIN, *Research Advisor of P. P. Shirshov Institute of Oceanology RAS, Member of the Presidium of the RAS, Academician of the RAS*

Henry REZNIK, *Vice-President of the Federal Chamber of Lawyers, Cand. Sc. (Law), Honoured Lawyer of Russia, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS*

Vitaliy TRETYAKOV, *Dean of the Higher School (Department) of Television of Lomonosov Moscow State University*

Mikhail SHMAKOV, *Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia, President of the Universal Confederation of Trade Unions, Chairman of the Trustee Council of SPbUHSS, Honorary Professor of SPbUHSS*

Round Table

PROBLEMS AND WAYS OF SETTLING CONTEMPORARY INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS 221

Participants: I. O. Abramova, Sh. Aziz, R. Zh. Alyautdinov, E. Bağış, H. de Chavagnac, V. A. Chereshnev, L. L. Fituni, S. Yu. Glazyev, Al. A. Gromyko, V. Ingimundarson, G. W. Kolodko, H. Köchler, A. M. Kramarenko, A. V. Kuznetsov, V. L. Kvint, Ch. T. Laumulin, R. Lewis, V. L. Makarov, J. A. March, R. Matthews, G. Mettan, M. A. Moratinos Cuyaube, D. V. Mosyakov, A. Moussa, V. V. Naumkin, R. I. Nigmatulin, H. M. Reznik, P. P. Tolochko, J. Wiatr, A. S. Zapesotsky

INDEX OF NAMES 242

REPORTS

I. O. Abramova¹

BIG CHALLENGES OF THE FUTURE: RESOURCE DEFICIT AND INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS IN AFRICA²

The modern stage of the world civilization development is characterized by completion of transfer from the monocentric to the polycentric model of the world. This transfer affects all without exception fields of human activities – economic, political, social, cultural, etc. New active players, who recently occupied peripheral positions in global civilization space, appear on the international scene. Their growing influence on international processes is manifested not only in socioeconomic and political spheres but in cultural as well. China, India, Brazil, Southeast African countries actively engage “soft power” elements, including the cultural component, to promote their interests in all locations on the globe. The continent of Africa is referred to the new world development poles. Just by virtue of the fact that this is the region with the population exceeding 1 billion people, covering approximately one fifth of the inhabited land area, it’s impossible to create a scientifically reliable polycentric world picture without fully taking into account special features and characteristics of this element of the total global system. At the same time, the increasing inter-dependence of elements of the globalized world system means increase of reverse influence on it by the most urgent and pressing socio-political, economic, ethnic and confessional, and other problems of Africa of global dimension. Africans directly affect transformation of Western culture and formation of a new European identity already today via increasing migration flows.

Africa will play a special role in the forming world order today and in the foreseeable future as well as in global transformations of the future. Here contradictions of transfers that are taking place are interlaced. Collision of old and new meanings spills beyond the limits of ideological and cultural discourse and goes into the material sphere. It’s well-known that besides semantic definitions of the meaning, there are also pragmatic ones that assess this phenomenon from the actor’s position as of a subject of activities.

Exactly because of that collision of new and old meanings is nothing else but fighting for the future. It takes the form of new and old power centers’ struggle for resources and markets, for preservation or taking over economic, political and cultural positions in the world. In this case, the meaning becomes the value, significance or characteristic of the expansion object’s usefulness for the user.

Fighting for leading positions by old and new players in the environment of the world economic, political and cultural space breakup will grow incessantly and affect all without exception fields of human activities.

The escalating resource deficit is one of the real, root motives for the already aggravated and brewing everywhere local, regional and global conflicts of the new millennium. The living standards of the residents of the globe, prospects of socioeconomic development of states, world economy’s stability and international security directly depend on availability or lack of the required natural resources. As numerous events in the beginning of this millennium clearly demonstrated, it turns out that the basis of the states’ real actions on the international scene is to a considerable extent their striving to control scarce natural resources, which are running short. At the same time, selfish and mercenary interests are camouflaged by the highest goals and ideals – protection of the world, freedom, democracy, fighting against proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and change of climate, environmental protection, etc.

The contemporary state of the society is characterized by the highest natural resources consumption rates, and that in its turn provokes the disturbance of balance in reproduction of the components, comprising the biosphere affected by the all the time increasing human economic activities. Inequality in distribution of natural resources on the Earth makes states not only integrate into the world economy, but also fight for the spheres of influence on the world resource market. The sphere of vital interests of highly economically developed countries spreads both to the territories with resource potential and regions with high-quality environment, where its assimilation potential turned out to be less violated. First of all, this refers to the continent of Africa, partly to Asia and Latin America as well as some regions of Russia.

Today, the world community torn apart by contradictions, which divided the world and not once according to this or that principle, entered a new era, when territorial expansion led to resource division. Countries with natural resource potential have become the object of economic and political interests of technologically developed countries. The latter developed and go on developing their technologies at accelerated rates at the expense of energy and mineral resources of less developed countries, foredooming them to be politically, technologically and, consequently, economically dependent.

¹ Director of the Institute for African Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, member of the Presidium of the RAS, corresponding member of the RAS, Professor at the Department of African Studies and Arabic Studies, RUDN University, Dr. Sc. (Economics). Author of more than 250 academic papers, including 10 monographs: “Africa and National Interests of Russia” (coauthor), “The New Role of Africa in World Economy of the 21st Century”, “The African Population in the New Global Economy”, “Resource Potential of Africa and Russia’s National Interests in the 21st Century” (coauthor), “African Migration: The Experience in Systemic Analysis”, etc. Member of editorial boards of academic journals Asia and Africa Today, Proceedings of the Institute for African Studies of the RAS, Conflictology, Profiles of Global Transformations. Member of the Academic Council under the Security Council of the Russian Federation, Expert, International Affairs Council at the Federation Council of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation. She was awarded the medal “In Commemoration of the 850th Anniversary of Moscow”, Diploma of the Presidium of the RAS.

² The paper was prepared with the financial support of the Fundamental Research Program No. 22 of the Presidium of the RAS. “Analysis and Forecast of New Global Challenges for Russia”. Subprogram “Africa in New Global Realities: Challenges and Opportunities for Russia”.

International relations in the sphere of natural resources economy in the 21st century are determined by the following main trends:

1. The world economy entered the era of globalization with integration of ties in development, extraction and trade in natural resources and, first of all, fuel and energy, minerals (ore and non-metallic minerals), food. The similarity of economic interests of various countries leads to setting up various associations, unions for production, processing, delivery of natural resources. The natural resource rent and its components – resource and assimilative rents – are the subject of new redistribution and appropriation.

2. The main globalization factors in the raw materials sector of the economy are sustainable demand, production and consumption of natural resources with territorial inequality of their placement and unequal level of socioeconomic development of countries.

3. The economy of the United States and EU countries entered the new phase of economic growth's slowing down on the threshold of the third millennium, and that is manifested in decrease of growth rates for the total consumption and production level. The new US administration and to a less extent EU countries can find (and are already finding) a way out of the existing state of affairs in activating the military industrial complex and launching local and regional conflicts under the guise of promoting the so-called "democratic ideals" and fighting terrorism. All that leads to strengthening political tension as a part of redistribution of global natural resource rent between countries consuming and supplying natural resources in the environment of transfer from the monocentric to the polycentric world.

4. With the formation of the new power centers in world economy and politics, in particular China, India, Brazil, etc., which are also the biggest consumers and buyers of resources today, there originate new opportunities for the countries having natural wealth in their struggle for their interests on the global market.¹

In our opinion, it's especially important to acknowledge as one of the original causes *the existing disproportion between the level of the countries' socioeconomic development and the share of consumed by them resources, on the one hand, and the population of these countries and availability of scarce natural resources on their territory, on the other hand*, for understanding the main problems of global development in the 21st century. Generally, this disproportion is manifested already in the fact that the population of developed countries amounts to 16%, and the population of emerging nations amounts to 52% of the total world population, while mineral raw materials' consumption ratio is just the opposite – 52% and 21% respectively.² Even more blatant discords and contradictions are at the back of the generalized average world data. Because of that it will be hardly excessive to say that striving to provide control over the resources was and still is one of the main motives for redistribution of geopolitical realities – on the global level for some, on the regional level for the others, on the sectorial or branch level for the third. For example, it is said in the US Congress proceedings that the countries in Sub-Saharan Africa are a region rich in human and natural resources,

and the continent as a whole has a giant economic potential and because of that it is of long-term political importance for the United States.³ The economic and political interests on the continent are confirmed by increased attention of American military to Africa, expressed in establishment of the AFRICOM – the United States Africa Command as a part of the US Armed Forces top military command. One of the main tasks set for the AFRICOM is promotion of the US national security interests in Africa and the surrounding seas, including uninterrupted access to natural resources.⁴ A permanent military infrastructure of the United States on the continent has been formed, the basis of which is Camp Lemonnier in Djibuti. Besides it, Washington arranged a chain of Cooperative Security Locations (according to official Pentagon terms) on the continent in accordance with bilateral agreements in Algiers, Botswana, Gabon, Ghana, Zambia, Kenya, Mali, Namibia, São Tomé and Príncipe, Sierra Leone, Tunisia, Uganda.

In this connection, research of resource potential of African states acquires big scientific importance and urgency from the point of view of understanding the reasons and already existing conflicts and forecasting future conflicts.

Strategic rivalry of the leading world economies for African resources in today's world is increasing all the time. Africa is rich in various kinds of natural raw materials. Deposits of practically all known kinds of extractable resources have been found there. Africa is the first among the regions of the world in deposits of manganese, chrome iron ore, bauxites, gold, platinum-group metals, cobalt, vanadium, diamonds, phosphates, fluorite, the second in deposits of copper, asbestos, uranium, stibium, beryllium, graphite, the third in deposits of oil, gas, mercury, iron ore; deposits of titanium, nickel, bismuth, lithium, tantalum, niobium, tin, wolframium, precious metals, etc. are also considerable.

Today, African countries totally produce nearly 15% of world energy raw materials (if calculated per consumed energy), and there is a trend for considerable growth of this figure.⁵

The importance of hydrocarbon resources of the continent of Africa acquires some new aspects for the world economy. They are connected with at least four special features of African oil and gas extraction, transportation, consumption and sale on world markets.

First, Africa is one of the few regions of the world where, according to expert evaluations, the so-called Peak Oil (maximum rate of crude oil extraction) has not been reached yet.⁶ Second, the countries on the continent are more attractive for oil and gas multinational corporations (MNC) developing hydrocarbon resources of the sea shelf and other environmentally vulnerable territories as a result of on the whole more lenient environmental standards and requirements set forth by national governments. This allows MNC to save a lot of money. Third, Africa is a fairly attractive source of raw materials geographically from the point of view of their transportation to both old centers of con-

¹ Abramova I. O. The New Role of Africa in World Economy of the 21st century. Moscow, 2013. P. 116.

² Calculated by us according to: Eremin A. I., Dergachev A. L. The Economy of Mineral Raw Materials. Moscow: University Book House, 2007. P. 4.

³ US 110 Congress, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The Strategic Competition for the Continent of Africa. Washington, 2007.

⁴ <http://www.africom.mil/AfricomFAQs.asp>

⁵ Oil and Gas in Africa. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. P. 75.

⁶ However, it's already over for many North African states (Libya, Algeria, Egypt). At the same time, the said critical figures are the issue of the middle-term or long-term future for most oil exporters from SSA. Besides, certain countries joined the globally important oil exporters only recently.

sumption (North America, Western Europe, Japan) and new centers (China, India, South-East Asia, Brazil).

Another factor, the fourth one, is no less important. The West proceeds from the fact that its military, political and geostrategic risks will reduce in case sustainable-supply sources, providing its economies with hydrocarbons, shift from the Middle East and Russia to Sub-Saharan Africa.

According to open data, most oil fields are territorially concentrated in five countries – Libya, Nigeria, Algeria, Angola and Sudan. More than 90% of proved oil resources on the continent belong to them. Gas fields (91.5% of proved resources) are on the territory (and within the boundaries of exclusive marine economic areas) of Algeria, Egypt, Libya and Nigeria. It seems that exactly these states, with the exception of Angola only, are either the arena for civil wars and conflicts (Libya, Sudan) today, or the territories where various terrorist organizations operate (Boko Haram in Nigeria, Al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb and ISIL in Egypt, Algeria and Libya).

If we speak about the resource component of the Libyan conflict, fighting for oil (Libya has the biggest oil fields in Africa – about 6 billion tons) is developing both between two competing parliaments and governments based in Tripoli and Tubruq, and external powers at the back of them – Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar, Turkey, Egypt, Algeria and Western powers. One of the most negative consequences of the Libyan crisis is the end of the state monopoly for selling oil. National Oil Company (NOC) broke into “Eastern” and “Western”, which opens a lot of opportunities for the black market. Today, foreign investors and businessmen don’t see a single state subject of economic activities in this principally important sector of Libyan economy. Western Oil Company established close relations with Swiss dealer Glencore and ships big volumes of oil to it at reduced prices. The state of affairs in the eastern part of the country is even worse, the main oil terminal there, Marsa Al Hari-ga Oil Terminal, is controlled by Ibrahim Jadran’s fighters. There is direct oil smuggling, and that is used by French Total, Spanish Repsol, Italian Saras, Chinese Sinopec. Some of these companies are trying to provide for their interests, including by armed forces. The King of Jordan Abdullah told in January, 2016 about English special mission units of the English SAS on the territory of Libya. At the same time, there was information in Arab mass media that French special mission units assisted the government in Tubruq when Benghazi was stormed. “National unity” of Libya stays fictitious and just on paper, while there are no ruling mechanism, commanders fight incessantly and with foreign intervention, and foreign companies will continue looting the country. We should not stop reminding of these “fruits” of Western intervention in Libya.

In recent 5–6 years, the geography of oil and gas fields on the continent of Africa considerably expanded at the expense of such countries from East Africa as Tanzania (gas), Uganda (big oil field of Albertine Graben was discovered), Kenya (oil) and Mozambique, where giant gas reserves on the shelf were discovered. It is supposed that new big oil and gas fields will be discovered along the East African Rift in the near future.¹ It’s rather noteworthy that terrorist organizations activated in recent 1–2 years exactly in these countries. We all remember atrocious terrorist attacks

in Kenya: in Nairobi in 2013 and carnage in Garissa, at the University campus in 2015, Al-Shabaab militant group took the responsibility for that. According to terrorists, the reason for the carnage was “the Christian government of Kenya invading the territory of our country”.² This happened in 2011, when Al-Shabaab controlled the capital of Somali and half of the territories of this state, which disintegrated into several parts. Kenyan military units entered Somali as a part of the peace-bringing mission of the African Union. They pushed radical Islamists from its border with the support of the US unmanned aerial vehicles and helped to throw Al-Shabaab out of all big cities. At the same time, the Americans, providing help for Kenyan units in Somali, got preferences in development of oil fields of this country on Lake Turkana after that, pushing away the English who discovered this field, and the Chinese. In 2017, a terrorist group calling itself Al-Shabaab appeared in the north of Mozambique. At the same time, it’s rather noteworthy that in 2015 the international consortium with American corporation ExxonMobil at the head won the right to geological prospecting on the Mozambique shelf.

Actually, Al-Shabaab is turning into Al-Qaeda on the Horn of Africa, mingling with the population of the surrounding countries and actively maintaining contacts with its fellows all over the globe.³ Besides ideological goals, the group can be used in the interests of various international players in their struggle for control over fuel and other resources of East and Southeast Africa.

Africa is rich in another kind of fuel – uranium. In the end of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century, uranium reserves in Africa amounted to 570 thousand tons, or 16% of world reserves. The biggest resources of uranium ore are in South Africa, the proved reserves are estimated at 337 thousand tons, which make 60% of total African reserves. The biggest owners of uranium deposits in Africa are Niger (166 thousand tons), Namibia (97 thousand), Algeria (26 thousand), Central African Republic (16 thousand) and Gabon (15 thousand).⁴ Increase of demand for uranium on the world market is accompanied by intensification of competitive struggle for the right to survey and development of uranium deposits on the continent between European, Canadian, Chinese and Russian companies. One immediately remembers the conflict between Moslems and Christians in the Central African Republic, which in 2013 transformed into civil war. The number of refugees, who left their homes over the three years of the conflict, amounted to 20% of the population. The interests of the Western capital, first of all French, were at the back of the ethnical and confessional conflict. France is one of the world leaders in nuclear power engineering, and exactly 1,200 Frenchmen entered the country to maintain order as a part of the UN resolution.

Africa stays a big player on the world diamond market. The continent’s share amounts to 82% of world reserves of these precious stones. The biggest diamond deposits were discovered in Ghana, Angola, Democratic Republic of the Congo, South Africa, Tanzania and Namibia as well as Burundi, Central African Republic, Cote d’Ivoire, Mali

¹ Fituni L., Abramova I. Resource Potential of Africa and Russia’s National Interests in the 21st Century. Moscow, 2013. P. 113.

² <http://www.pravmir.ru/den-uzhasa-dzhihadisty-ubili-147-chelovek-v-universitete-kenii>

³ <https://ria.ru/analytics/20130924/965475032.html>

⁴ Abramova I., Fituni L. Competing for Africa’s Natural Resources. // International Affairs: A Russian Journal of World Politics, Diplomacy and International Relations. 2009. V. 55, No 3. P. 47–48.

and Togo. In recent years, the whole complex of problems related to the origin of conflicts in the vicinity of the African Great Lakes is concentrated exactly in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Illegal exploitation of the Democratic Republic of the Congo's resources is the source of enrichment of multinational corporations and the narrow circle of the local political elite and the military. Illegal export of diamonds, gold and tin from Congo goes on, especially from the Eastern province as well as South Kivu and North Kivu. At the same time, there is connection between profits from sale of smuggled raw materials on the world market and illegal arms traffic in the Eastern regions of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.¹

The United States are a big player in the vicinity of the African Great Lakes. Their defense industry and power engineering depend on the import of African cobalt for more than a half – it's the metal used for making heat resistant and especially strong alloys, including for turbine blades, turbines for jet engines among them. Another important sector of cobalt use is production of magnetic alloys for electronics. There are cobalt deposits in the USA but most of them are already exhausted, and extraction of the rest is too expensive and noncompetitive as a consequence. Because of that, all cobalt consumed by the US industry has been also brought from abroad since 1971. 52% of world resources are in four African countries – Democratic Republic of the Congo, Zambia, Morocco and Botswana. The lion's share of that amount (60% of world output without taking the former USSR republics into account) is mined by the Democratic Republic of the Congo, it alone satisfies 65% of the US requirements in this metal.²

Besides, it should be taken into account that in contrast to nickel and chrome, which can be substituted by other materials to a certain extent, cobalt can't be substituted in a big number of production processes. Thus, it can be supposed that the resource component of the conflict in the vicinity of the African Great Lakes will preserve its importance for a long time.

Former European mother countries cannot allow themselves to lose positions in the environment of global resource deficit either, even to strategic allies or partners in associations for integrative activities, to say nothing of new rivals from Asia or Latin America. To put it differently, rivalry between Western countries in Africa objectively exists and tends to intensify.

American-European rivalry mostly refers to traditional competition between MNC on African markets, both com-

modity and capital markets. However, the political component of the rivalry cannot be written off either. The latter, first of all, took the form of the United States advancement on the positions of France on the Black Continent in the end of the 20th century and the very beginning of the 21st century. There were riots and armed conflicts of various intensity in a number of states, which some time in the past were considered traditional areas of French influence – Burundi (1993–2005), Ruanda (1990–1994), Zaire/Democratic Republic of the Congo (1998–2002), Chad (2006, 2008), Togo (2005), Cote d'Ivoire (1999, 2002). Though these actions of "democratic forces" were never anti-French from the outside, they nevertheless were objectively directed against pro-French governments in these states, and they were often replaced by pro-American leaders. Actually, they were African-style colour revolutions.

And still the United States and former mother countries gradually lose their positions as the main importers of African resources and the main suppliers of finished products to African countries. The states on the continent of Africa now have a rather alluring alternative in the face of China, India, Brazil, Turkey and other quickly developing economies, at the same time the latter are historically not antagonistic to African countries as formally they are still with them in the same "boat" of emerging nations or periphery countries. The loss of its position on the continent of Africa by the West, which began in the 21st century, can be accompanied by intensification of competitive struggle up to employment of economic or military levers. Competition of world powers for African resources will intensify more and more in the next years. New powerful and active players on the continent of Africa – China, India, Brazil, Turkey and recently Iran as well – do not participate directly in triggering conflicts in Africa, making emphasis on development of economic relations with African states. However, the stepping up of their activities on the Black Continent escalated rivalry in struggle for resources and may indirectly become the reason of new "resource wars", including those taking forms of armed conflicts.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs S. V. Lavrov presented the standpoint of the Russian Federation on settlement of conflicts in Africa at the time of his recent tour over African states on March 5–9, 2018. He mentioned that there had been the UN resolutions adopted on all conflict situations, including on the continent of Africa. Russia is for strict fulfillment of all those decisions of the world community.³

¹ OECD due diligence guidance for responsible supply chains of minerals from conflict affected and high risk areas. Paris. OECD, 2016. P. 24.

² *Fituni L. L. Africa: Resource Wars in the 21st Century. Moscow, 2012. P. 98.*

³ <http://tass.ru/politika/5007116>

A. A. Akayev¹,
Yu. V. Yakovets²

THE SCIENTIFIC PRINCIPLES FOR THE STRATEGY OF SUSTAINABLE MULTIPOLAR WORLD ORDER'S ESTABLISHMENT BASED ON PARTNERSHIP OF CIVILIZATIONS

In the end of the 20th century, the humankind entered the period of historical rift, profound, long-drawn-out global crisis brought about by the change of super-long-term civilization cycles, decline of the industrial, market and capitalist global civilization and establishment of the integral, humanistic and noospheric civilization; transfer from the fourth generation of local civilizations with the dominating West to the fifth generation with the leading East. It turned out that politicians were incapable to understand the deep-lying roots of the crisis and give an adequate answer to the threatening challenge. Scientific comprehension of the reasons of the crisis and substantiation of the long-term strategy for its overcoming and entering the sustainable development trajectory are required. This task is being solved by the leading scholars and diplomats of the world.

The global crisis encompassed all continents and all components of the civilization's genotype (the whole structure of the society). The crisis of energy and the environment is building up and is manifested in exhaustion of natural resources, accelerated pollution of the environment and increase of the number of natural disasters and technology-related catastrophes. The number of countries, where depopulation goes on, is increasing, the number of the unemployed, especially young people, reached the crit-

ical level, the migration wave swept over Western Europe, hunger is growing, epidemics are spreading, social-demographic polarization between countries and civilizations is strengthening. The rates of increase in efficiency of labour and renewal of fixed capital slowed down, the technological gap between vanguard and backward countries and civilizations is widening. The world economy is more and more turning into the virtual and parasite economy of "soap bubbles" and the sphere of transnational corporations and banks dominance, the rates of economic growth are decreasing, the gap between rich and poor countries and social strata is widening. The science growth rates and its prestige in the society are decreasing, it is becoming extremely commercial and pragmatic, mass culture is widespread and moral principles of the society and family are undermined. Geopolitical antagonisms are aggravated in the world, the number of local armed conflicts and aggressive military actions by the United States and NATO increases, the wave of international terrorism became a manifestation of barbarism's going against civilization. The ghost of the Cold War is revived again, the armaments race is strengthening.

All these manifestations of the global civilization crisis were not adequately evaluated and were not effectively answered strategically by the United Nations and other international organizations. Scholarly comprehension and long-term global strategy are required to provide sustainable social and political development and formation of the multipolar world order.

Civilizational approach to the strategy for overcoming the global crisis and entering the sustainable development trajectory is manifested first of all in the contemporary global crisis's acknowledgement as a civilization crisis, brought about by change of super-long-term cycles of world and local civilizations' dynamics. Understanding the deep-lying foundations of the contemporary global crisis proceeds from that on the declining wave of the sixth civilization cycle and the fifth Kondratiev's cycle as well as the necessity to accelerate transfer to the rising wave of the seventh civilization cycle and the sixth Kondratiev's cycle in the 2020s.

The main players on the geopolitical scene in the 21st century are no more than 220 recognized and unrecognized states (with 193 of them being the United Nations members), and 12 local civilizations of the fifth generation – social megasystems, which unite states with the common system of civilization values and history. They are three European civilizations (West European, East European, Eurasian), six civilizations from Asia and Africa (Chinese, Indian, Japanese, Buddhist, Moslem and African) and three recently formed civilizations from America and Oceania (North American, Latin American and Oceanic).

Differentiation of the mixed Moslem civilization into five local civilizations is possible in the next decades: Arab, Persian, Turkish (Euro-Moslem), Indo-Moslem (Pakistan,

¹ President of the Kyrgyz Republic (1990–2005), president of the Academy of Sciences of the Kyrgyz Republic (1988–1990). Senior Research Fellow of the Institute for Complex Systems Mathematical Research under Lomonosov Moscow State University (since 2005), a foreign member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Academy of Sciences of the Kyrgyz Republic, Dr. Sc. (Engineering), Professor. Academic supervisor of the Laboratory for Monitoring the Risks of Socio-Political Destabilization at the National Research University "Higher School of Economics". Academic supervisor of Centre of Fundamental Studies at Saint Petersburg State University of Economics. Author of over 300 scientific works, inventions and academic publications on Applied Mathematics, Mathematical Economics, Optical Computers and Information Technology. His political and philosophical views are described in the selected papers: "The Difficult Road to Democracy: a Memorable Decade", "Transition Economy as Seen by the Eyes of a Physician", "The New Strategy of Vladimir V. Putin to Achieve High Steady Growth Rates of the Russian Economy", "Modelling and Forecasting World Dynamics" (co-author), "Complex Modeling and Forecasting of the Development of the BRICS Countries in the Context of the World Dynamics" (co-author), "Thinking about Future with Optimism: reflections on Foreign Policy and World Order" and others. Member of the New York Academy of Sciences. He is awarded with the order "Badge of Honour" and Pushkin Medal. Laureate of N. Kondratiev golden medal, S. Kuznets golden medal, V. Leontiev golden medal, and Vernadsky golden medal and order.

² President of the Pitirim Sorokin – Nikolai Kondratiev International Institute, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor, Deserved Scientist of the Russian Federation. Academician of the International Global Research Academy. Author of more than 780 scientific publications, including more than 40 monographs and textbooks: "Regularities of Scientific and Technological Progress and their Systematic Use", "Acceleration of Scientific and Technological Progress: Theory and Economic Mechanism", "Cycles. Crises. Forecasts", "Russian Cyclism: New Vision of the Past and the Future", "Forecasting Cycles and Crises", "Globalization and Interaction of Civilizations", and others. Chairman of Yalta Civilization Club. Vice-president of the Supporting Global Civilization Organization, Member of the World Future Studies Federation. Founder and Academic Editorial Board Chair of "Partnership of Civilizations" international research and education journal. Awarded the Orders of Labor Red Banner and "Badge of Honor", the Order of Friendship (Kazakhstan), II degree, as well as governmental medals.

Bangladesh, Afghanistan), Pacific-Moslem (Indonesia and Malaysia).

Inter-relations between civilizations (their clashes, opposition or dialogue and partnership) will determine the courses of global civilization development and the fate of the humankind in the 21st century.

The Russian civilization school singles out the main governing laws of civilizations' formation and interaction dynamics:

- the governing law for cyclic dynamics of world civilizations, generations of local civilizations and the global civilization, going through super-long-term civilization cycles and serious civilization crises when cycles change;
- genetic governing laws expressed in transformation of the six components of the civilization genotype in the process of cyclic development (natural and environmental, social and demographic, technological, economic, social and cultural, and geopolitical);

- the law of polarization and social-political partnership in the process of civilization crises and their overcoming;

- the governing law for differentiation of local civilizations of the mixed type;

- the substantiated by Pitirim Sorokin social law of fluctuation of totalitarianism and freedom, the law of positive and negative moral and religious polarization in the periods of civilization crises and ways out of them.

The system of geopolitical relations, interaction of states and civilizations originated more than five millennia ago from the establishment of early-class world civilization and the first generation of local civilizations on the narrow stripe to the north of the Equator, in the valleys of the great historical rivers (Ancient Egyptian, Sumerian, Indian, Chinese civilizations), on the shore of the Mediterranean Sea or at the crossroads of sea routes (Phoenician and Minoan civilizations). The relations to exchange economic, technological and cultural achievements between civilizations were already being formed then, though there were armed clashes between them in their interactions. The level of intensive interaction between the first generation civilizations was still weak.

Interaction of civilizations strengthened in the course of the centuries and there were changes in the world order model. If at the first stage the borders of the first generation civilizations and states mostly coincided, their interaction in the Antique times considerably accelerated. Intensive economic and cultural ties between civilizations developed in the periods when the Greek and Phoenician civilizations were the leaders and colonized the regions of the Mediterranean Sea and the Black Sea in the 8th – 6th centuries B. C., the dynamics of their dialogue and partnership strengthened. The example is the origination of the mixed Greek and Scythian civilization in the north of the Black Sea region (The Kingdom of Bosphorus, the 5th century B. C. – the 5th century A. D.). The first world empires originated that included regions with various civilizations (the Achaemenid Persian Empire, the Hellenic Empire of Alexander the Great, the Roman Empire).

The interaction of the third generation local civilizations that encompassed the biggest part of the habitable globe, considerably increased in the Middle Ages. This was manifested both in the increase of clashes between civilizations (the Crusades) and development of big trade routes, expan-

sion of dialogue and origination of elements of civilization partnership, establishment of the empires – the Arab Caliphate, the Holy Roman Empire, the Byzantium Empire, the short-lived Mongolian Empire.

American civilizations that had developed independently, were destroyed in the process of America's conquering, and world empires of the colonial type were established – Spanish, Portuguese, British, French as well as the opposing them Russian and Ottoman Empires. Interaction between civilizations manifested in the form of wars and colonial seizures, while the processes of dialogue between civilizations strengthened in connection with accelerated development of trade routes all over the globe.

The system of colonial rule with Western Europe's domination was formed in the period of industrial civilization (19th – 20th centuries), there were clashes between civilizations in the form of the Napoleonic Wars, World War I and World War II. There were attempts made to establish the new world order model based on state partnership in the form of the Holy Alliance after the Napoleonic Wars and the League of Nations after World War I.

In 1917, the world disintegrated into two systems and interactions between the capitalist system in the monopolist stage and the socialist system originated, and that added a new aspect to interactions between civilizations, which was manifested during World War II.

Foundation of the League of Nations could not prevent World War II that started from the formation of the aggressive axis Berlin – Rome – Tokyo, aspiring to world domination. After Fascist Germany and its allies attacked the USSR, the Anti-Hitler Coalition was formed, it was a partnership of most states fighting against aggressive reactionary forces from the Fascist militarist bloc of Germany, Italy and Japan. Contradictions between socialist and capitalist states went to the background, and that allowed to combine efforts and win.

The leaders of the three leading powers from the Anti-Hitler Coalition – the USSR, the USA and the UK – laid the foundations of the Yalta world at the Yalta Conference held on February 4–11, 1945 – it was a comparatively sustainable after-war world order with the United Nations Organization formed as the regulating institution. The fundamental provision on the right to veto for permanent members of the UN Security Council was included in the UN Charter, and that excluded a possibility for the predominant group of capitalist powers to force their interests upon the others.

The United Nations managed to fulfill its main function over the seven decades, no matter the serious aggravation of contradictions during the Cold War and local armed conflicts in Korea, Vietnam, Afghanistan – to prevent a new world war. A number of civilization partnership projects were carried out, in particular the Soyuz – Apollo project and creation of the International Space Station (ISS), there is cooperation established in the Arctic and Antarctic, the system of control over the proliferation of nuclear weapons was set up as well as over termination of its testing, elimination of chemical weapons, etc.

However, the strategic function of the United Nations weakened in the last quarter of the 20th century. This trend was especially vividly manifested starting from the 1990s, when as a result of the USSR and the world socialist system's disintegration and with the Cold War's end as

the background, the United States and other Western powers demonstrated their aspirations to establish the unipolar world order based on NATO with the USA domineering. This elicited counter moves on the part of China, the economic power and political influence of which are rapidly growing, other independent countries as well as Russia from the end of the 1990s, when the course for the national and civilizational interests' priorities was restored. Contradictions between the leading powers and civilizations aggravated, and that was reflected in S. Huntington's concept about the inevitability of the clash of civilizations.

The UN General Assembly's decision to proclaim 2001 as the United Nations Year of Dialogue among Civilizations and its Resolution of November 8, 2001 "Global Agenda for Dialogue among Civilizations" could not break the trend for aggravation of contradictions. Provocative aggressive actions and armed invasions by the USA, by-passing the UN Security Council, in the Middle East, support of "colour revolutions" in North Africa and international terrorism in Syria led to origination and strengthening of reactionary Islamic movement of the global pseudo-caliphate, formation of the terrorist state of ISIL and the spread of terrorism all over the world, first of all in West European countries. There is a dangerous trend for the dispersed clash of civilizations and war of barbarism against human civilization.

Trends for polarization of the geopolitical situation, prerequisites ripening for social and political partnership of progressive and conservative forces before the growing global threat of reactionary forces and possible clash of civilizations, became apparent since 2015, with aggravation of civilization antagonisms, strengthening of international terrorism, and the United States and NATO open actions with sanctions imposed on Russia as a background.

This was manifested in strengthening of partnership between the rising civilizations and powers (BRICS, Shanghai Cooperation Organization, ASEAN) as an answer to hegemonic actions of declining civilizations and leading powers united in G7 and NATO, as well as in failure to strike Russia by imposing economic and political sanctions. The trends for opposing the reactionary way started growing in Western countries, Japan, that was manifested in the results of the Presidential elections in the United States, Brexit in the UK, Catalonia's attempt at becoming independent, new alignment of forces in the European Union and more independent Japan's politics in relations with Russia.

The strategy for establishment of the sustainable multipolar world order should be orientated for the period till 2030 and include:

- 1) acknowledgement of the civilizational character of the global crisis and necessity to lay the urgent transfer from the industrial, market and capitalist civilization to the integral, humanistic and noospheric civilization as the foundation of the strategy;
- 2) acknowledgement that the leading players on the geopolitical scene are local civilizations, and focus on constructive dialogue and partnership between them;
- 3) harmonious transformation of all components of the civilization genotype (energy and environmental, social and demographic, technological, economic, social and cultural, and geopolitical);
- 4) working out goals, mechanisms and institutions of partnership between civilizations, progressive and conservative forces as an answer to threats from reactionary forces;

5) transformation of the United Nations, expansion of competence and increase of responsibility for overcoming the civilization crisis and entering the sustainable development trajectory in cooperation with regional integration associations and nation-states. It's possible to speak about the World Confederation of civilizations and states in the long-term perspective, that will regulate the global civilization development and the society's and nature's co-evolution;

6) taking into account the fact that leadership in taking and carrying out strategic solutions transfers to the generation of the 2020s – overcoming the rift inside this generation, making life easier for it, activation of its activities in forming the new world order model and establishment of the humanistic and noospheric integral civilization.

The sustainable multipolar world order's establishment concept based on civilization partnership is built on these six principles.

The strategy's "tree of goals" includes the general goal, the goals of the first and the second level that can become the basis for working out the system of global strategies and programs, providing achievement of the set goals.

The strategic priorities include:

- global security's strengthening and eradication of wars and international terrorism thanks to practical interaction of civilizations and leading powers, non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, liquidation of other kinds of weapons and transformation of armed forces, military and political blocs into security forces with expansion of their functions, conclusion of an international agreement for exclusion of a possibility to start wars; working out global program for rooting out international terrorism, taking measures to find out the reasons of terrorism and prevention of young people's engagement in it. The long-term perspective includes bringing into life ideas of great thinkers for establishment of the world without wars, demilitarization of economy and society, and multi-purpose use of today's armed forces for prevention and dealing with consequences of natural disasters and technology-related catastrophes and carrying out other humanitarian actions. This will lead to the existence of NATO military bloc having no prospects;

- overcoming the growing energy and environmental crisis, combining efforts for preserving natural resources, processing mineral wealth and its replacement by recycled sources of raw materials and materials, reduction of harmful discharges into the environment, disposal of the accumulated stores of solid waste and improvement of the environment. The offer by the international Organization for Promoting Global Civilization could be useful for that. It offered to work out a plan for one hundred years for complex improvement of the environment presented in 2013 at the IV World Congress of Global Civilization "On the Path to the Noospheric Civilization";

- combining efforts to overcome the social and demographic crisis and depopulation, work out differentiated social and demographic policy focused on moderate increase of the population in the long term, creation of the environment for employment, especially young people, eradication of hunger on the globe, providing the environment for improvement of health and worthy standard of living for the older generation. Actions of such organizations as WHO, FAO and International Labour Organization should be focused on that. Conclusion of an international agree-

ment for regulation of migration and creation of a global food fund under the auspices of FAO;

- increase of growth rates of efficiency of labour based on scientific and technological breakthrough, mastering and distribution of innovations of the sixth technological wave. It will be required to single out an organization within the United Nations system that will be responsible for coordination of activities in the field of scientific and technological development, create a global technological foundation for “improving” backward countries. The Eurasian outrunning development strategy and setting up the Global Technology Foundation under the UNDP for reduction of the technological gap between vanguard and backward countries will help to solve the said tasks;

- restructuring of the economy's structure and foreign relations with material production as the priority and reindustrialization of the economy and increase of the agribusiness share, creation of the environment for accelerated development of small and middle-sized enterprises, more just distribution of incomes and eradication of poverty. Overcoming virtual and parasite “bubbles”, development of global anti-monopoly laws, limitation of transnational corporations' and banks' activities, optimization of the level and content of globalization. All that will mean establishment of integral economic system based on planning and market regulation of socioeconomic development. It will be required to increase the role of the United Nations and efficiency of the G20 activities for that;

- dialogue and partnership of civilizations, combining their efforts in demonopolization of the intellectual property market, measures to synthesize scientific, educational and information revolutions, improvement of quality, creativity and continuity of education, eradication of illiteracy and assistance to countries with low revenues. Taking measures to revive high culture, preserve world and national cultural heritage and variety, distribute humanistic and noospheric morals, strengthen moral principles of the society and the family. Combining efforts by world and traditional religions may play a significant role in that. It will be required to expand the UNESCO functions for that, setting up the Global Council for coordination of religions' activities under it. It will be advisable to work out and carry out the program of civilizational education and tourism, set up the Global Scientific and Educational Foundation under the auspices of UNESCO.

It will be required to work out a long-term concept of the United Nations transformation to bring these measures into life and create the institution within the United Nations system to coordinate efforts in the form of a summit of civilizations, including the leading powers from all local civilizations.

The main course to work out and implement the strategy for the sustainable multipolar world order is arrangement of these activities on the Big Eurasian scale, uniting 8 fifth generation civilizations (their number may increase up to 12 in case of differentiation of the Moslem civilization into five local civilizations) and 9 integration associations.

According to the World Bank, 73% of the world population live in these countries, 64% of global GDP are produced, 70% of energy are consumed; CO₂ discharge amounts to 76% of the global discharge; 65% of expenses for R&D are concentrated here as well as 59% of the share in revenues from intellectual property, with the 88% share

in the global high-tech export; the share of defense expenditures is 60%, the share in armed forces personnel is 78%.

The President of the Russian Federation V. V. Putin's initiative to set up the Big Eurasian Partnership as a civilization mega-project, supported by the leaders of a number of the leading powers, is the key to work out and implement the strategy for the sustainable multipolar world order based on partnership of civilizations and integration associations.

Russian academic schools, forming the integral paradigm of social sciences, worked out the scientific foundations for the Big Eurasian Partnership. This supposes first of all to strengthen coordination of such associations as the European Union, Shanghai Cooperation Organization, Eurasian Economic Union, CIS, ASEAN, Organization of Islamic Cooperation, Arab League, Organization of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation and Euro-Mediterranean Partnership in order to solve common tasks and deal with critical situations formed in the Eurasian space.

Interlinking of the Big Eurasian Partnership megaprogram offered by Russia and the One Belt, One Road Initiative offered by China, the main provisions of which were presented at the International Conference in Beijing in May, 2017, is of great importance. These two initiatives, supplementing and strengthening one another, will give a synergic effect, accelerating achievement of the goals to establish the sustainable multipolar world order and assisting creation of the bases for the integral humanistic and noospheric civilization in the Big Eurasian space.

The key role in implementation of the presented above strategy is given to the United Nations. It's necessary to prevent attempts to solve global problems by-passing the United Nations, but currently the big-numbered and big-link United Nations system is insufficiently efficient and does not correspond to the new historical period. It's necessary to strengthen the strategic civilization direction of the United Nations activities in the process of its forthcoming transformation, the main courses of which were determined in the joint statement of the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China of July 4, 2017 on the current situation in the world and important international problems.¹ It will be required to set up a special institution within the United Nations system, coordinating the activities for the dialogue and partnership of civilizations – the summit of civilizations, to introduce G20 in the United Nations system increasing its responsibility for coordination of activities in economy and regulation of world prices, currency and credit relations with weakening of the International Monetary Fund's and World Bank's role, in which the role of the “golden billion” countries is predominant.

In prospect the role of global society institutions is to be strengthened, we should achieve rational combination of interests and adjust efficient partnership of various social groups, first of all young people. It's required to assist self-organization of the younger generation and provide its sufficient representation in state, regional and global bodies of authority.

After the Western civilization's differentiation in the last quarter of the 20th century into five civilizations (West European, East European, North American, Latin American, Oceanic) differentiation of the mixed Moslem civilization is real in the next decades (Arab, Persian, Turkish,

¹ <http://www.kremlin.ru/supplement/5218>

Indo-Moslem and Pacific-Moslem). Because of that we should orientate to their representation by 22 states when determining the subjects of the strategy's realization and the composition of the leading powers of these civilizations: Germany, the UK and France (West European civilization), Czech Republic (East European civilization), Russia and Kazakhstan (Eurasian civilization), China (Chinese civilization), India (Indian civilization), Japan (Japanese civilization), Republic of Korea and Vietnam (Buddhist civilization), South Africa and Nigeria (African civilization),

Egypt, Iran, Turkey, Pakistan and Indonesia (Moslem civilization), the USA (North American civilization), Brazil and Mexico (Latin American civilization) and Australia (Oceanic civilization). Besides, the management of the United Nations, UNESCO and the UN Alliance of Civilizations should take part in such summits with full rights. Civilization summits should be held annually, with the states chairing in turn, and the main documents should be sent for the following approval by the United Nations (Security Council or General Assembly).

R. Zh. Alyautdinov¹

PRESENT-DAY INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS AND WAYS TO SETTLE THEM

A key tendency of the present time is redistribution of the global balance of power. Globalization encouraged the rise of developing countries and emerging countries. The states that used to be its drivers, primarily in the West, are gradually losing their grounds of unconditional dominance. Also, new centers of economic and, to a large extent, political influence are more and more determined to claim their rights. These countries represent almost every continent and bring their historical and cultural peculiarities in the global processes.

At the same time, a number of active participants of international relations is increasing, and the growing polycentricity doesn't fit the system of global governance institutions properly, since most of them are our legacy of the previous age with its old and well-established set of major players. The situation in its turn boosts confrontation in state-to-state relations, leads to limiting space for constructive cooperation even to address common challenges and threats for all the global community. The reason is primarily some Western countries countering today's transformation processes, since they have already charted a course toward suppressing new centers of power by putting economic, informational, military and political pressure.

It's not just about a reflexive urge of a small group of Western countries for maintaining supremacy on the global stage. The problem needs a broader look. Today the West is going through a complex crisis – economic, social, political and ideological one. A neoliberal model turned out to be unable to ensure steady development of economy and society. Income inequality in developed countries, the USA especially, triggered a crisis of confidence in traditional elites and formed a demand for national-oriented agenda in the lower classes as opposed to the globalist one. Hence attempts of these elites to switch society's attention to something else and to consolidate it in the face of an "external threat" in order to stop a swing towards neo-isolationism.

In the West this idea is demagogically amounted to the concept that emerging polycentricity equals to the world

backsliding to chaos and a war of all against all. Such a worldview is opposed to some "multilateralization" within "liberal world order" based on "rules and values": values of the Western world and rules it sets.

In practice these "rules and values" often turn out to be nothing else but a permissive interpretation, or even blatant replacement of universally received rules of law. "Multilateralization" usually comes down to making decisions on key international issues by a narrow group of countries in the name of "global leadership" of the USA bypassing the UN Security Council, at the expense of opinion of the rest of the world community and ultimate norms of the international law. It's enough to recall NATO's bombing of Yugoslavia, invasion of Iraq under a false pretense or a violent regime change in Libya.

Examples of the latest years are even more telling: from a total non-admission of the Crimean referendum based on an indisputable "value" of the West – democracy – to awkward attempts to legitimate attacks of the Western coalition on Syria obviously violating international law with their "own rules".

Such actions lead to devaluation of the international law, weakening of multilateral institutes and increasing importance of military forces. Today many countries consider it practically the only efficient warranty of their sovereignty.

However it would be oversimplified and even illegitimate to say that today's multiple conflicts, including the most troubled ones taking place in the African continent, can be seen from this perspective only. There are various reasons: social disparity, inadequacy of state institutions, ethnic and confessional antagonisms, fights for resources, and, obviously, past colonial heritage. However, it's the current geopolitical environment that makes it so difficult to settle most conflicts seamlessly. The West got so used to the successful "manageable crisis method" that began to consider it universal, but nowadays it fails more and more often.

It is particularly obvious in the UN Security Council, a body which is to bear the biggest responsibility for international peace and security according to the UN Charter. Did they manage to settle many conflicts efficiently lately? Does their work resemble a constructive dialogue aimed at looking for stable solutions for the most heated conflicts?

Unfortunately, we have seen the following chain of events lately. Crises, including internal ones, caused by

¹ Director of the Department for Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation. Minister Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the 1st class. Has been working for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs since 1981. Hold different positions at the Headquarters of the Ministry and in foreign countries. Deputy Director of General Secretariat (Department) of the MFA (2006–2012). From 2012 to 2017 – Deputy Permanent Representative of the Russian Federation to the United Nations and other international organizations in Geneva (Swiss Confederation).

some objective reasons are magnified till they reach some unprecedented scale because of interference of external actors, often involving the UN Security Council for no good reason, where the country “comes under pressure”. The most popular tool of our Western counterparts in the Security Council is sanctions. Theoretical insights are developed swiftly, mostly based on such concepts as oppression of minorities with the majority, human rights abuse, a need of protection measures for civilians and, finally, humanitarian intervention.

Currently the most turbulent regions of the world include the Middle East and North Africa (MENA region), where the abovementioned algorithm has been used multiple times already. Gaining support of allies and relying on so-called “ideals of a free world and the rule of human rights” the United States conducted a few military campaigns in that part of the world in order to bring down undesired regimes. As a result, a delicate balance of ethnic, confessional and civilizational interests of the Arabic society was tilted. Sovereign states started to weaken and collapse, and as a result non-state actors reinforced their standing in the Islamic World unprecedentedly, with their own interests that disagreed with interests of the West; radical Islamists factions pressed forward; and even a quasi-state called Islamic State (ISIS, banned in Russia) emerged to establish control over parts of Iraq and Syria and to declare its “caliphate” there in 2014. Internal conflicts were growing in number and turning into regional ones rapidly.

A patent example of fueling an internal conflict from outside is a situation in Syria. In this case inter-confessional discourse is also used actively. The Syrians who have never mused on each other's confessions now begin to see Alawis, Sunnis, Shiites, Kurds and others as “insiders” and “outsiders”. Besides, as it is typical for other communities of the Middle East, deep civilizational fault line lay between cities and the country-side. It was rural people that became a driver of armed struggle by launching a challenge against city elites and trying to divide spheres of influence.

The situation in Syria was supposed to be settled based on principles of sovereignty and territorial integrity of the country. National consent was to be achieved in order to eliminate the risk of a drift to political fragmentation and geographic partition of the country which is, fortunately, something every single Syrian actor currently opposes.

Obviously, any post-settlement political order should consider legitimate aspirations of all components of the Syrian society. It's what the Resolution of the UN Security Council states and S. de Mistura, a Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for Syria, promotes in his terms.

Efforts of the Russian side are aimed at early cessation of a violent conflict in Syria that has lasted for more than seven years already. It is through critically important actions of the Russian Aerospace Forces that Syrian government forces managed to clean the territory of the country from ISIS militants, to maintain its sovereignty and to create all necessary conditions for reconstructing the infrastructure and residential areas for refugees to come back, and to set about political settlement under the UN aegis seriously. It was particularly enabled by holding the Syrian National Dialogue Congress in Sochi in the end of January 2018 with an aim to address issues set in the UN Security Council Resolution 2254.

It cannot be disregarded that military defeats of ISIS in Iraq and Syria lead to the outflow of militants to other countries, which makes these countries particularly vulnerable for increasing terrorist threat in the context of unstable internal political situation and weakness caused by protracted conflicts. One of at-risk countries is Libya, where the ISIS “branch” still retains considerable fighting potential. It is entirely possible that after regrouping of forces this terrorist organization would intensify its offensive operations and enhance subversive activities. It should be kept in mind that militants also come to the European countries in the guise of refugees often, which increases a risk of terrorist threats exponentially.

In the context of processes in the MENA region equitable solution of the Palestinian problem should be seen as a priority instead of crowding it out. An unsettled decades-old regional conflict and the fact that Palestinian territories of the West Bank and Gaza Strip have been occupied by Israel for fifty years already serve as an additional force destabilizing the region and causing a breeding ground for extremists.

In the light of a well-known decision of the USA to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel that have already provoked another surge of tension in the region, Russia continues to maintain committed position aimed at inclusive, equitable and stable settlement of the Israeli–Palestinian conflict based on the corresponding international legislation, including the UN Security Council Resolutions and the Arab Peace Initiative that both imply finding a negotiated solution to all the issues concerning the final status of the Palestinian territories, the status of Jerusalem inclusively.

Generally, as a map of conflicts in the MENA region shows, it's impossible to reveal any definite ethnocultural and civilizational trends in the context of conflictogenity. Ethnically and confessionally homogeneous countries (Libya, Somali) faced armed clashes caused by other reasons, including tribal identity and ideological attitudes. Other countries, such as Yemen, for example, demonstrate splits both within religious communities and between the North and the South under conditions of conflict.

In this context it is presumed that all efforts aimed at returning to normality in the Middle East must be dedicated to deradicalization, improvement of interethnic and inter-confessional relations, and to prevention of establishment of new ethnic borders. A benefit of the doubt given to Russia has increased significantly in the context of our efforts in Syria and stabilization in other countries of the region, which fortifies our positions as a strong actor and partner in the MENA region.

Concerning today's conflicts and ways to settle them it is impossible to ignore the situation in Ukraine. At this point it is one of the largest trouble spots in Europe.

Due to historically formed borders of the state, Ukraine is located at the cultural and civilizational edge of the nominal West in the form of European and Euro-Atlantic structures and the nominal Eurasian region as represented by Russia. At the same time, gravitation of certain Ukrainian territories to different civilizational poles isn't implicitly explosive if the government pursues a well-balanced policy considering specificities and interests of every group of population within a multinational state.

Ignorance of those realities and Kyiv's aspiration to impose its worldview based on dogmas of the Ukrainian mo-

noethnicity were one of fundamental causes of the conflict in Donbas the Ukrainian authorities adamantly refuse to recognize. Instead of searching for a compromise today's Ukrainian authorities take actions that only escalate the civil conflict and don't enable its de-escalation.

Gross external interference of Western countries, primarily the USA, in the expanding conflict in the Ukraine since 2014 under a slogan "either with the West, or with Russia" aggravated the situation and led to a murderous civil war. By supporting the unconstitutional coup they showed their disrespect to legitimate aspirations of people living in Donbas, their choices and fundamental rights. Unfortunately, now it's impossible to find a way to deal with Donbas problem without Washington.

As the global experience in settling conflicts in ethnically heterogeneous countries demonstrates, it is inevitable to look for mutually acceptable options for opposing parties to exist within one and the same state in order to save its territorial integrity. If one of conflicting parties – Kyiv in this case – tries to gain the upper hand and to resolve the conflict by force, it will not succeed.

Minsk Package of Measures agreed on February 12, 2015 is the inclusive and mutually acceptable mechanism for the Ukrainian conflict that can lead to the long-term stabilization of the situation and a further peaceful settlement of a conflict. There is no alternative for the Minsk accords. It is an admitted fact. Potential involvement of the UN in settling the conflict in Donbas and fielding its peace-keeping forces to protect the OSCE Special Monitoring Mission shall not substitute for the Minsk accords and serve, as Kyiv sees it, some operation on "peace enforcement", which is the view of the Russian side stated in the draft of a corresponding UN Security Council Resolution.

At the same time, the Ukrainian authorities act against all commitments they undertook in Minsk. A so-called Law on De-occupation of Donbas aimed at resolving the Ukrainian conflict by force was passed by the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine in the beginning of 2018. It practically derails the Minsk accords, puts off potential reintegration of Donetsk and Luhansk regions uncontrolled by Kyiv into the Pan-Ukrainian territory, and threatens with unpredictable consequences for the European security.

The Russian side is sure, that the Ukrainian conflict with its pronounced cultural and civilizational nature can be settled peacefully only considering interests and specificities of regions, based on a well-balanced approach and an ability to conduct a dialogue with an opposing party.

Choosing approaches for maintaining peace and security Russia always adheres to such principles as the rule of international law, non-interference in the internal affairs and unacceptability of tyranny, respect of other countries' sove-

reignty, their equality, the right of peoples to determine their own destiny and the inconsistency of claims for exceptionalism.

We use these standards for Syria and Ukraine as well. Even in Africa a principle of containing conflict within the civilization finds its expression in the slogan "African solutions to African problems" supported by Russia. We are advocates of a more active involvement of regional organizations and integration associations into settlement of conflicts, such as the SCO, the African Union, the Organization of Islamic Cooperation, and the League of Arab States. We presume that the CSTO capacity can be used efficiently not at the territory of the Organization member states only, but in other states as well, for example in UN peace-building.

Russia constantly emphasizes that today's conflicts cannot be resolved by force. Any conflict has a unique set of reasons. Every single case needs careful and unbiased approach, patient analysis and the collective search for political and diplomatic decisions and a unique solution, first of all, at the national level.

Prevention and settlement of conflicts are ensured with following the principle of equal security for everybody, which our country has consistently defended for a long time. It closely echoes basic concepts of the Non-Alignment Movement, since its participants warn integration associations against turning into closed block structures. We understand and share their concerns. Politics become particularly dangerous if it is formed under the principle of civilizational, regional and confessional or value-based (in the bad sense of the word) affinity with an apparent or implied aim to confront other states belonging to the same affinity.

Today the world is at the crossroads, at the fork in the road. What lies ahead depends – either it's further degradation and increasing insecurity, or we will manage to agree on new, unified "rules of the game" that will give the world peaceful co-existence of countries and peoples, and a chance to develop not for some chosen ones, but for the whole international community.

UN remains a mandatory universal forum for developing these solutions, since during 72 years of its existence it has proven to be irreplaceable as a unique platform of a regular dialogue of nations on building stable, equitable, secure and efficient architecture of international relations.

In our opinion, such a scenario is possible so long as constructive and "true" polycentricity is established – a world order that will reflect cultural and civilizational diversity of the world, though, compared to fairly confrontational multipolarity of previous ages, it will be based on mutually beneficial cooperation and mutual respect of interests of different countries and associations.

Sh. Aziz¹

CONTEMPORARY GLOBAL CHALLENGES AND NATIONAL INTERESTS

As we prepare to move into a new decade, we are facing a rapidly shifting geopolitical environment. The power balance is no longer weighted to the West, as Asia gains more and more prominence. The role of existing multilateral alliances is diminishing, with several key global players being increasingly preoccupied with domestic concerns. At the same time, old rivalries have been re-emerging.

As a result, the geopolitical foundations we knew for decades are making way for a new normal. How we adapt to it will determine the course of our future – and that of our children. At the same time, the challenges we collectively face are changing and increase in complexity. They include the spread of extremism and terrorism, the threat of economic crises, conflicts raging in the Middle East and its fallout, including mass migration.

Our increasingly globalized world means these challenges are more wide-ranging than ever. Issues which arise in far-flung countries have the potential to affect us all.

It is important to acknowledge that geopolitical transformations can bring about periods of heightened uncertainty. Much has been said of the “Thucydides Trap” – the Ancient Greek scholar posited that conflict is inevitable when rising powers emerge to rival dominant ones. He warned that when new powers rise – and alter the establish status quo – the risk of confrontation increases. While this outcome is not inevitable, it deserves our careful attention to prevent any escalation. It is only natural that the political order installed in the last century was bound to change – and for the tectonic plates of influence to shift.

Many countries have aspirations to influence world affairs. For this, you need economic clout – and you therefore need to be engaged beyond your borders. Trade wars are not the answer. Instead of withdrawing into protectionist policies, we need more powers to come to the table – and contribute to the growth of the global economy.

Overall, a multipolar world is better than a unipolar one, and the existence of new world powers could be a source of strength for all nations. The emergence of this new balance of power must be handled maturely by all sides. Instead of seeing each other as rivals, key world players should focus on interacting more closely at the summit level and increasing their use of soft power.

On a security level, the nature of the wars we are fighting has changed. Most countries are not equipped to handle the spread of terrorism and extremism – our present world order has so far struggled to develop a coherent and adequate counter-strategy. The world needs to focus on a strategy to deal with these developments, and the sectarian, tribal, ethnic, nationalistic and religious issues which feed into them. It is still not properly understood how these organisations develop and gain ground – more sophisticated intelligence is needed to understand their funding and command

and control structures, as well as the links they have with other groups. Traditional ways of tracing and tracking communication also do not work in the same way. We should also have a strategy for addressing the issues of return risk and handling those citizens who fled to fight among extremist groups, and now wish to return to their home countries. Special programmes are needed to rehabilitate them and ensure that they are not a threat to others.

Most importantly, we must address the root causes of terrorism, which involves recognising that this is much more than a security matter – it is a hearts and minds matter. Terrorism and extremism are both factors of deprivation. This means they spread by preying on the disillusioned, people who are struggling to find a place in their own society. Deprivation manifests itself in many forms – it can be a lack of opportunity, an absence of human rights or a voice, and a lack of resolution of disputes. When deprivation reaches a tipping point, when people feel they are not heard, that is when they can become vulnerable to conversion to extreme causes. We must focus all our energy on finding solutions for these root causes. We must also develop our intelligence capabilities and our methods for fighting these non state actors. Only then can we have a chance to truncate the movement of people wishing to cross borders to give their lives for these causes.

Over the years, several mistakes have been made by the international community in its global approach. For example, not enough effort was made to generate economic activity following external interventions into other countries, from Afghanistan to parts of the Middle East. In any post-conflict environment, there should be a thought-out economic revival and growth plan, supported by the key countries and the Bretton Woods institutions. This must include credible structural reforms, tailored to the country in question. It is important to study these experiences and learn from the past. Military intervention to topple the leadership of a country, without a clear post-conflict strategy, is almost always a recipe for disaster. It increases the chance of failing states and of allowing non-state actors come in and fill the power vacuum.

It is important to stress that terrorism knows no borders or religion. Islam is a religion of peace and tolerance and the majority of Muslims are peace-loving people. But, increasingly, Islam is misunderstood and misrepresented in the West owing to the actions of fanatics. We must therefore challenge such a thesis – and promote inter-civilizational harmony and understanding through dialogue and engagement.

The emergence of attacks by lone wolves, either inspired by loosely pledging affiliation to extremist groups, makes the task of maintaining security more complicated than ever. These are not part of elaborate cross-border terrorist plots, which were often coupled with a political agenda and message. The lone wolf attacks we see today are arguably all the more dangerous because they are so hard to trace and pre-empt.

A new approach needs to be devised to deal with the countries that are being directly affected by extremist elements as well as those who may be backing them.

¹ Prime Minister (2004–2007), Finance Minister (1999–2004) of Pakistan. Senior Visiting Research Fellow at Oxford University, doctor of Business Administration. Author of a number of scientific and publicistic works, among them: “From Banking to the Thorny World of Politics”, “Contemporary Global Challenges and National Interests”, and others. He was named “Finance Minister of the year” for 2001 by both Euromoney and The Banker magazines. Honorary Doctor of Laws at The Institute of Business Administration, University of Karachi (Pakistan). Mr. Aziz was awarded Global Leadership in Islamic Finance Laureate.

This is something which needs global coordination, intelligence sharing and joint security and military action. We must ask ourselves, what were the intelligence failures that allow groups like Islamic State to spread regionally and recruit globally?

The war in Syria is now the world's single-largest driver of displacement – millions of refugees have already fled the conflict zone. More than a million have settled in Jordan and others have moved to Turkey and Europe. While there are strong humanitarian reasons for giving refugees a home, a failure to control the flow of migrants could have troubling consequences for Europe. While migration can play a positive role in society and address the problem of an increasingly ageing population, which many developed countries are having, there must be the capacity to absorb the incoming migrants. Social security systems and infrastructure have to be equipped for them – and leaders have to convince their people that this can bring long-term benefit to their country and economy. If moderate leaders do not find a way to successfully handle the migration crisis, it is in danger of playing into the hands of far-right parties and extremist groups. Most importantly, global cooperation is key – countries including Russia, Turkey, the US and Europe must find ways to working together.

However, we face a global crisis of cooperation. This is seen within Europe, with growing tensions between the main economic and political superpowers, including the US, EU and Russia, and within multilateral forums, such as the United Nations security council. The world increasingly suffers from a leadership deficit as politicians and decision-makers lack a global view and are too focused on their short-term domestic political cycles. Lines of communication are breaking down. This is not a recipe for peace in the long-run.

At the heart of this has been a disappointingly weak United Nations. Over the past nine years, this once-heavyweight institution has been largely missing in action. It has repeatedly failed to lead the charge when crises have broken out, or successfully mediated in conflicts.

The best way to safeguard ourselves during such times is by building linkages and interdependencies. This applies to neighbouring countries, regions and key global players. Establishing reasons for them to work together is a true guarantor for peace plays a key role in lowering the temperature in the event of any tension. Cooperation is the true guarantor of peace.

The historic meeting of the leaders of North and South Korea in April 2018 is an encouraging sign of progress on the turbulent Korean peninsula. It should encourage other conflicting countries to show leadership in starting a dialogue on age old issues and challenges.

Both global and regional powers have to play their role in building peace and harmony and encouraging dialogue for resolving lingering issues. The United Nations should work more to rebuild its relevance by proactively encouraging peace building, refugee settlement and disaster management.

It is important for points of potential tension to be recognized and for solutions to be sought through dialogue and diplomacy. The war of words seen within Europe must be resolved. In the long term, it does not benefit any of the European countries to be adversarial towards any of its fellow states or neighbours. Instead there should be a great-

er effort to engage, emphasise points of common ground and build linkages, in order to develop a better relationship while respecting each other's sovereignty. Increased cooperation will help lower the temperature and the peace divided will be high for both Russia and the EU countries. In the long term the security, stability and the prosperity of the whole of Europe can be attained with all major stakeholders working together.

It is worth pointing out that, in many parts of the world we have largely moved away from the scenario where conventional conflict is a viable option – in part because of the existence of a nuclear deterrent, and in part because the nature of competition itself is gradually changing. Global affairs now operate under two parallel paradigms: firstly, the traditional paradigm of power and rivalry; and secondly, the emerging paradigm of interdependence and common interest. At the present stage of history, both paradigms coexist uneasily, as evident in the seemingly contradictory behaviour of states – competing and cooperating simultaneously.

The power and rivalry paradigm remains dominant in the policy establishments of the United States, China, Russia and other countries. For example, it manifests itself in today's increasingly challenging Asian security environment, such as the alliances being built by the United States in Asia and the shift of America's naval power from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Meanwhile China has been building and developing its ties with Russia, Central Asia, Iran, Latin America and Africa, as well consolidating of old relationships, such as with Pakistan. However, whatever these movements indicate, the situation is unlikely to reach the stage where it tips over into physical conflict.

A more realistic nearer-term scenario involves continued differing economic approaches between the important stakeholders, encompassing access to natural resources, rival development models and the need to increase influence in global economic and financial institutions. That said, work is still needed to diffuse existing tension over disputed territory. Focusing on areas where diplomacy and dialogue will help establish a working relationship.

There needs to be a new architecture for global cooperation, while any potential points of tension should be worked out through diplomacy and dialogue. New global institutions such as the Asian Infrastructure and Investment Bank (AIIB) have been a promising step forward in multilateral cooperation. The AIIB is an opportunity for the region – and the world – to build a new financial infrastructure, one that more accurately reflects the realities of today's environment. It will complement the existing development institutions such as the Asian Development Bank, the Islamic Development Bank and the World Bank. The AIIB should run on four key principles – meritocracy, transparency, a level playing field for all stakeholders and high standards of governance. It has the benefit of not being hostage to history and not tied by historic rules, as is the case for the Bretton Woods institutions, which sometimes stifles their ability to adapt to the modern world.

Another important step forward towards building greater connectivity in the world is China's "One Belt One Road" initiative, an ambitious development policy launched by President Xi Jinping. It seeks to connect China to markets in Asia, Europe and further afield, and involves land and sea trade corridors, building connections along old and

new trade routes between Central Asia, South Asia, China, Russia and Europe. It is expected to contribute to the further integration of the global economy and rising prosperity across Asia as well as Europe and Africa.

There is a great opportunity for other world powers – the US, Russia and the European countries – to build on China's initiative and focus on similarly inspiring greater cooperation, collaboration and connectivity through other initiatives. While a changing world order may be unsettling for some, the number of challenges collectively faced as a world, which cannot be solved unilaterally by any country, is only growing. Existing multilateral organisations should be reformed to bring them into the 21st century.

Close collaboration is increasingly indispensable on a growing number of other challenges we face, from cyber security to climate change and nuclear non-proliferation. In areas of potential conflict, the method of communication between key countries should be institutionalised, with frequent contact, dialogue and discussion to prevent conflict escalating through misunderstanding.

One of our greatest challenges we face as a world is one of demographics. In the developed countries, this manifests itself in the form of shrinking and ageing populations, which places ever greater strain on the welfare state. Conversely, many parts of the world are witnessing a rapid population boom. With such demographic trends, broad-based educational reforms are vital. Young people trying to join the labour force should be equipped with the required skill sets, to boost the number of opportunities open to them. Failure to do this could run the risk of having an alienated generation with a limited sense of disengagement with society. Policy makers should focus on unlocking the potential talent and capacity to work in these young people could be huge boost for those countries, increasing growth and prosperity.

One of the biggest challenges for many countries is not only how to encourage growth, but how to make sure it is equitable. The economist Thomas Picketty has provided us

with a stark warning about the dangers of the increasingly widening gap between the rich and poor. If prudent policies are not undertaken to manage this transition, the social implications could be significant. Capitalising on the opportunities presented by technology – from increased automation to so-called “disruptive” innovation, which can transform old industries for the better – could be a step towards bringing our economies into the 21st century and unlocking new opportunities.

The fallout from the financial crisis a decade ago showed need to develop a way to better safeguard our systems from future economic shocks. The nature of economic cycles means there will always be another downturn. However, prudent policy-making and a commitment to ongoing structural reform can guard us against potential shocks. As economies mature, they increasingly need to change and deregulate to sustain their rate of growth. Structural reform, for many countries, should involve a programme of privatization, liberalization and deregulation. This will help open up industries to world-class standards of management, while making them more competitive.

In conclusion, the major global challenges we face – including terrorism, security failures, nuclear proliferation and natural disasters – cannot be solved unilaterally. No country or leader has an exclusive on wisdom. Before we can begin to effectively face up to the existential threat from terrorism its use by non-state actors, we must first establish a new architecture of global cooperation. It is unrealistic to expect any powers to see eye-to-eye on every issue, and disagreements are bound to arise. The challenge is to be able to work together despite this, constantly maintaining lines of communication. We need to be able to effectively share information, coordinate our responses and build a reserve of trust so that – when crises do arise – we can work effectively, and not run the risk of escalation through misunderstanding. Only by doing this can we reverse the current trends of escalating conflict and violent attacks that have been striking at the very core of our society.

E. Bağış¹

TURKEY AND THE WORLD: NEW POLITICAL REALITIES

As the title suggests, there are some new political realities emerging. Yet, there are also facts that remain unchanged. These two factors, new realities and unchanged facts, are shaping the environment surrounding Turkey. As such, they are key to understand contemporary Turkish foreign policy, and Turkey's place in the world.

Let me start with facts.

– Turkey, a member of the G20, has a globally scaled economy.

– A founding member of most European institutions, Turkey is also a candidate country for EU membership, a strategic objective for my country.

¹ Minister of European Union Affairs of Turkey (2009–2013), member of the Turkish Parliament representing Istanbul (2002–2015). Author of many academic papers published in journals and numerous articles in national and foreign newspapers as an international strategic thinker and consultant. Chairman of the “Occidental Studies Centre & Western Platform” at the Istanbul Aydin University, member of the Board of Trustees at Istanbul Ticaret University.

– Turkey is a member of NATO for the last 66 years.

We assume key responsibilities within NATO. Turkey is among the top five contributors to NATO's operations and eighth largest contributor in financial terms. Turkish armed forces are the second largest in NATO after the United States.

– Turkey follows an enterprising and humanitarian foreign policy to achieve and sustain peace, security and stability in our region and beyond. We take action with humanitarian motives in mind; because all policies are for the people. We also pursue opportunities for enhancing cooperation.

Let me now turn to the new realities.

Since the beginning of this decade, the regions that surround Turkey are undergoing a dynamic transformation.

A vast geography, spanning from Ukraine, running all the way down to the Middle East and North Africa and then turning east to South Asia is faced with different levels of conflict and instability.

In the Balkans, continued support for the achievement of Euro-Atlantic aspirations of the countries of the region is an indispensable element of our efforts that aim to secure sustainable peace and stability in this region.

In the Middle East, sectarianism, terrorism, economic underdevelopment, poor governance, geopolitical big-power proxy wars create cycles of conflict and human misery.

By virtue of our geo-strategic position, Turkey, unlike some more fortunate European partners, is directly faced with all of these complex set of challenges, particularly terrorism and irregular migration.

We directly bear the brunt, yet continue to tackle them with resolve.

We continue to fight multiple terrorist groups, including FETO, PKK-PYD/YPG, DAESH and DHKP-C.

Turkey is confronted with a “new generation” of terrorist organization called FETO. They targeted our constitutional order and the democratically elected government. They tried to overtake the government from within by infiltrating the state structure. It particularly targeted our military, law enforcement, education, and health institutions. It also operates in almost 160 countries worldwide, running an integrated crime network under the disguise of schools, companies, media outlets and NGOs. FETO is a serious threat not only for Turkey, but also for all these countries.

We are grateful to those partners that immediately reacted to the July 2016 coup attempt and condemned it. Nevertheless, not all of our friends were so forthcoming. Some still drag their feet even today. Now, the remnants of FETÖ in Europe and the US continue their smear campaign against Turkey, to slander Turkey and to drive a wedge between us and our Allies and friends. Hence, Turkey expects full solidarity in its effort to bring the perpetrators of the failed coup attempt that claimed over 250 lives to justice. The leader and members of this terror group should not be allowed safe havens anywhere. We expect full solidarity and cooperation from our Allies and friends in this regard.

Terrorist groups that find shelter in Syria stage attacks against Turkey, using their safe havens in this neighboring country. Against this backdrop, finding a just and sustainable solution to the Syrian conflict, in line with the aspirations of Syrian people, as well as elimination of terrorist threat in this country, first and foremost, is a matter of national security for Turkey.

In this vein, the Turkish armed forces have successfully completed “the Euphrates Shield Operation” in Syria last year, which pioneered the ouster of DAESH from the region, liberated an area of 2.015 km² and established a safe haven free of terror, enabling the displaced Syrians to return.

Whereas DAESH is mostly defeated in Syria, on the border regions with Turkey, it has been replaced by yet another terrorist organization (YPG/PYD: Syrian branch of PKK) – which is threatening not only the unity and territorial integrity of the country, but also conducting terror attacks in Turkey.

The threat posed by the PKK/PYD-YPG terrorist elements deployed in the Afrin region, to the lives and property of the brotherly people of the region as well as our citizens living close to the border area, is heightened due to the recent increase in the number of harassment fires and attacks.

Since the beginning of 2017, Hatay and Kilis provinces of Turkey and the military observation posts in Idlib have been targeted from Afrin with almost 700 harassment fires and attacks so far, causing civilian casualties.

The ongoing *Operation Olive Branch* aims to ensure our border security, neutralize the terrorist threat emanating from Afrin and thus, save the brotherly Syrians from the oppression and cruelty of these terrorists by preventing terrorist safe havens and *fait accomplis* that are against the will of the Syrian people.

Another dimension of the ongoing instability in our periphery is the resulting irregular migration. Nearly 4 million Syrians are now in Turkey. Turkey continues to be the biggest host country according to the UN Refugee Agency figures. Turkey has spent almost 30 billion US Dollars, whereas the total contribution we received from the international community is far from meeting expectations (526 million USD, excluding the EU’s financial assistance, which is 1.85 billion Euro).

Turkey’s efforts to provide decent conditions for Syrians, coupled with heightened measures to stem the irregular migration, as well as the successful implementation of 18 March Agreement between EU and Turkey, also help alleviate the burden.

Looking ahead to the future, we have to review the current immigration situation in Turkey and relate its context into the global surroundings. When people migrate for whatever reasons, they take with them not only their families and their belongings, but also their culture and their traditions. Their thoughts are based on personal relationships, and experiences, and are shared and often transferred to others through day to day life in their new environment. These expressions of ideas and feelings and actions can provide both positive and negative impact on themselves and those around them. This then impacts on the global network, specifically of what determines the future. Whether immigrants stay in their host country or return to their own homes also will leave lasting effects, physically, socially, and financially.

The other issue to address is that the unrest in Syria that began seven years ago has developed into a much wider global terrorism plain. ISIS emerged in this region from this conflict and over time has recruited disillusioned European citizens, many with a naive and disproportionate understanding of what jihad involves. Whilst some have realised that ISIS is in fact an overbidding terror cell, and have tasted that reality when reaching Syria, the ability to escape from the barbaric radical Islamists is invariably difficult. Then there are the few who fall in with the terror ideals and have publicly relished in their global fame through savage cruelty and executions. These terrorists are trying to infiltrate into our regions and cause untold death and disruption to our lives, as seen by recent attacks in Turkey and beyond into Europe. These terrorists are the reason we must stand shoulder to shoulder in our defense to root out the evil and regain stability to our World.

In these challenging times, while the broader region is undergoing a tumultuous transformation and is mired with significant challenges, I sincerely believe that only through dialogue and cooperation that Turkey and other countries worldwide can play constructive roles, exploiting their respective capabilities fully.

A. Bebler¹

SANKT PETERSBURG AND THE GLOBAL IMPACT OF THE OCTOBER 1917 REVOLUTION

A roughly century ago Sankt Petersburg, since 1914 officially renamed into Petrograd, became the epicenter of revolutionary events which for several decades strongly influenced the world. The first wave of this upheaval engulfed the Russian Empire in February-March 1917. Its immediate results were the replacement of the imperial government, the abdication of the head one of the oldest European monarchies and the introduction of a dual rule by the "Temporary Committee of the Duma" (Temporary government) and the "Soviets of deputies of workers and soldiers". The second revolutionary wave followed in mid-October 1917 when the Temporary government lost control of the capital and of its garrison. An almost bloodless *coup d'état* was declared by the Military Revolutionary Committee of the Petrograd Soviet at 10 a. m. on October 25. By then Prime and Defence Minister A. Kerensky already sneaked out of the besieged Winter Palace in a car provided by the US Embassy, maskading as a uniformed Serbian officer. The unopposed detention of most ministers of the already powerless Temporary government took place at 2:30 a. m. on October 26, 1917 [2, p. 489–499]. The storming of the Winter Palace by the Red guards and sailors and a blank salvo from the cruiser Aurora were later elevated into the symbols of the glorious October revolution.

The first powerful message of the October Revolution proclaimed in Petrograd was the "Decree on Peace". It was adopted by the all-Russian Congress of Soviets on November 8, 1917. The Decree appealed to all belligerent states and their peoples to stop hostilities of the First World War and during the three-month truce to open immediate negotiations for a "just and democratic peace" without annexations and reparations. Secret diplomacy was to be abolished and all concluded secret treaties were to be made public.

It was in Petrograd that the key institutions of Soviet Russia were established and functioned for about five months – the Congress of Soviets, the Council of People's Commissars (Sovnarkom) with V. I. Lenin as its chairman at. al. In March 1918, still in Petrograd, the Congress of Soviets adopted the first Constitution of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR). Thus the first communist state of "workers" and peasants" as the nucleus of the future world federation of Soviet republics was officially established in Petrograd.

Led by the Russian left-wing Social-democrats (the Bolsheviks) the narrowly successful October revolution called for the termination of the First World War with a "just and democratic peace" without annexations and reparations, for the complete abolition of world capitalism and imperialism and for its replacement with the dictatorship of prole-

tariat in classless societies of a world federation of Soviet republics. According to the Bolsheviks it was to be a step to the abolition of the state as such [3, p. 38–49, 169–176]. The October revolution also had a strong antireligious and anticlerical component.

The Russian October revolution could not stop the butchery of the First World War and actually even prolonged it, probably by several months. The breakdown of the Russian imperial army and the conclusion of the hugely rewarding and separate peace treaty with Soviet Russia in March 1918 allowed Germany and Austro-Hungary to continue fighting until November 1918. In the following decades the Russian revolution had shaken the existing political order in Europe. This order had been already badly destabilized by the ravages of the First World War, soon to be followed by the abolition of three more empires (Austro-Hungarian, German and Ottoman). The Russian revolution had exercised a notable impact on the world in several ways and with varying intensity on six continents. It generated a deep ideological and political conflict between the new communist state and other great powers whose troops invaded the territory of the defunct Russian Empire in 1918. This conflict contributed to the outbreak of the Second World War during which the Soviet Union fought in a temporary alliance with liberal "Western" powers. After 1945 the same conflict reappeared and constituted the declared key ingredient of the "Cold War" between the liberal "West" and the communist "East". However the later rebound of conflictual relations between the "West" and post-Soviet Russia shows that the ideological clash between liberalism and communism actually disguised its basic component – the power competition for influence and domination, essentially between the Americans and the Russians.

The Russian revolution has tangibly influenced the course of human history in the 20th century and also contributed to considerable changes on the political map of two continents – Europe and Asia. The most immediate impact of the Russian revolution has been expressed (1) by the geographic expansion of Soviet or Soviet-like political, economic and social systems imposed on other countries by the Russian Bolsheviks and later by the Soviet communists. The Russian revolution had also exercised (2) notable political ideological and some cultural influence in other countries on all continents. The Russian example served as (3) inspiration in a number of countries where local communists managed to conquer state power predominantly or exclusively through their own efforts. Having declared the right of peoples for self-determination the Russian revolution strongly challenged imperialism and national oppression in a number of multinational states, including those in Europe. Its proclamations echoed in colonies and semicolonial dependencies of European powers on other continents, notably in India, China and Vietnam. Lenin's proclaimed slogan of people's self-determination preceded by several months Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points and was more far-reaching and universal, being applicable also to colonies and semi-colonies of "Western" powers.

¹ Professor Emeritus of Political Science, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ljubljana (Slovenia), studied various subjects at undergraduate and graduate levels in Slovenia, Serbia, Russia, USA, UK, and France and earned his PhD in Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, USA). He authored and co-authored a dozen books in several languages and several hundred articles published in professional journals. His latest book in English is "Frozen conflicts in Europe" (2015). Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Slovenia at the UN Office in Geneva (1992–1997). Member, Executive Council, International Political Science Association (2006–2009). President, Euro-Atlantic Council of Slovenia.

Unlike in Petrograd the takeovers in Moscow and in other parts of the already disintegrated Empire took much longer and were more difficult and bloody. The armed continuation of the October revolution ended in 1921 with the termination of the Russian civil war. Having defeated their armed opponents in Russia (Yudenich, Denikin, Kolchak, Wrangel et. al.) the Bolsheviks succeeded in spreading the Soviet system on most of the former territory of the Russian Empire and in reintegrating into a huge multinational state Ukraine, Transcaucasia, Central Asia and the Far East. In this effort the Russian Bolsheviks were more successful than the elites of the two other multinational empires – the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman. They failed however in several other former Russian possessions which allowed for the restoration of Poland's independence and for the creation of new independent states in Finland, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. In 1919 attempts of revolutions inspired by the Russian October were crushed in Germany, Hungary and Slovakia. Several other communist revolts elsewhere in Europe (including in Yugoslavia in 1929) also failed. In the 1920s the Soviet system was expanded in Asia to two peripheral Chinese territories neighboring the Soviet Union – to Tuva and Mongolia. Tuva was later annexed by the Soviet Union while the People's Republic of Mongolia became formally an independent, later internationally recognized state and a member of Organization of the United Nations.

In the 1920s–1930s the ideas and slogans of the Russian revolution generated a considerable political echo in war – ravaged Europe. Its messages of peace, social justice, equality and of peoples' self-determination had attracted and motivated many leftists on all continents. On the other hand the Bolsheviks' victory indirectly contributed to internal splits in socialist and socialdemocratic parties which used to belong to the dissolved Second Socialist International. In many European countries communist parties sprung up out of their left wings.

In the 1920s–1930s the strongest communist parties in Europe outside the Soviet Union had developed in Germany, France and Spain and after the Second World War also in Italy. However none of them had been able on its own to stage a communist revolution or to gain state power through election. On the other side of the political spectrum the October revolution provoked strong anticommunist reactions in the rest of Europe and in Northern America. It affected a number of main stream political parties, the extreme right and the established churches, particularly the Roman Catholic Church. The Soviets of workers and Russian Bolshevism influenced the development of the German system of *Mitbestimmung* and the ideology of the German National Socialist Workers' Party (NSDAP). Moreover, the scare of communism contributed significantly to the growth of several varieties of European fascism, including Catholic clerofascism.

The main instrument for spreading world-wide the universal message of the Russian Revolution and communist ideology had been for about a quarter century the Third (Communist) International (Comintern). It was intended to be a centralized organization of the world-wide communist movement, a unified international party with national communist parties as "sections" led from the center in Moscow. Established in March 1919 at its first congress in Moscow Comintern functioned for more than two decades and

was officially dissolved in 1943. Its central bodies had confirmed the mandate, appointed the leadership or dissolved communist parties outside the Soviet Union, provided them with general political guidance and financial subsidies, decided on their strategy, provided to the communist who were persecuted elsewhere with political refuge and hospitality in the Soviet Union, new Soviet or forged foreign identity and documents, medical care, general and political education and ideological training. Comintern had maintained two universities, both located in Moscow – the Communist University of the National Minorities in the West (KUNMZ) and the "Communist University of the Toilers in the East" (KUTV). Comintern had also had a specialized publishing house producing books and brochures in numerous languages and a theoretical journal with a free world-wide distribution. Comintern had combined its promotion of communist ideology, mostly through printed media, with preparations for possible future communist takeovers in the "bourgeois" world.

Some foreign communists, among them future prospective leaders in their countries, were given also military, security and conspiratorial training provided by the Red Army and by the Soviet security services. Among the recipients were future prominent communist leaders, presidents, prime ministers, ministers and other high officials in Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. This list included the future Yugoslav communist leader Josip Broz –Tito. Comintern used also rowing emissars, advisers and controllers who were overseeing groups of countries and their communist parties. One of the best known among them was Mikhail Borodin who as Comintern representative operated in succession in the United States, Mexico, China, Scandinavia, Spain and Turkey. He and a number of other Russian lecturers played prominent roles in the establishment in 1924 and in the functioning of the Whampoa Military Academy in Guangzhou, Guangdong Province, China. Since the 1920s Comintern's educational, ideological, organizational and security training was provided in the Soviet Union to future leading communists from China, Vietnam and Korea. The future leader of Korean communists, first Prime minister and the later President of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea Kim Il-sung was educated and trained in Soviet military schools and by 1945 rose to the rank of a major in the Soviet Army.

The Soviet Bolsheviks (officially renamed into communists) considered and justified these activities (and the expense for USSR) as necessary for actively defending the first in history socialist state "of workers and peasants". In most countries outside the Soviet Union Comintern's activities were officially considered as politically subversive, even seditious and criminal (including in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia). An important role in Comintern's clandestine activities had been played by its internal security service and OMS (International Liaison Department). A considerable part of Comintern's political activities had been channeled through an extensive network of international "transmission" associations such as the Communist Youth International, Red Trade Union International, Peasant International, Red mutual assistance, a corresponding organization of women etc. Comintern's activities, including clandestine ones, had been supported by Soviet diplomatic and consular missions abroad.

The Second World War and its outcomes, had provided new opportunities for geographic spreading Soviet-like communist regimes. In 1939–1940 three Baltic republics and parts of Poland and Romania were occupied and annexed by USSR in accordance with the secret clauses of the Molotov – Ribbentrop pact. The defeat of the Axis in 1945 was followed by the imposition of Soviet-like systems in seven “people’s democracies” in Eastern Europe and Northern Korea. Moreover, the victorious communists in Yugoslavia and Albania established in 1945 their own versions of the Soviet system.

The spread of Soviet-like systems into Eastern Europe and Asia corresponded to two key strategic objectives of the Soviet leadership. These were (1) the declared goal of advancing “socialism” world-wide and (2) making the Soviet Union a world political and military superpower. Joseph Stalin utilized the attraction of the Russian revolution to advance and satisfy the Soviet Union’s great power ambitions. Achieving these two objectives had been costly and not always compatible. On a number of occasions they collided and then the latter always prevailed.

Following its official dissolution in 1943 a number of Comintern’s functions had continued in different, mostly bilateral forms in relations between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other communist parties. In 1947 an Information Bureau of Communist Parties (Informbureau) was established at a conference in Poland, mostly for guiding and disciplining East European communist parties. It was also joined by the two largest West European communist parties (the Italian and French). Originally the seat of the Bureau and the editorial office of its newspaper was in Belgrade. However in June 1948 the Yugoslav Communist Party was expelled from the Informbureau and its office was consequently relocated to Bucharest.

Outside the territory of the former Russian Empire Russian Bolshevism had most strongly influenced the destiny of two states in Asia and two in Europe. The Republic of Mongolia and the People’s Democratic Republic of Korea owe their existence as independent states directly to the Soviet Union. In the past it was also true of the German Democratic Republic (GDR). The ideological impact of Bolshevism was crucial for the rebirth in 1945 and forty five years later for the mostly violent demise of Yugoslavia as well as for the peaceful dissolution of GDR and of Czechoslovakia.

Banned in December 1920 the Communist Party of Yugoslavia (CPY) suffered greatly from police and judicial repression in the country and also elsewhere. In addition to the underground membership in the country its leadership and about a thousand adherents had as migrants or political refugees acted abroad – mostly in the Soviet Union, France, Austria and during the civil war also in Spain. Soviet organisational, logistic and financial support helped the greatly weakened and politically marginalized party to survive. In the late 1930s, with a new generation of young members and a new leadership, unlike the previous one operating in the country the Yugoslav communists abandoned their sectarianism and started cooperating with other anti-fascists. However under normal peacetime conditions, without the tremendous upheaval and huge social and political dislocation created by the Second World War the Yugoslav communists would have probably never gained state power through the ballot.

Financially self-sustaining without a Soviet subsidy since 1939, under the conditions of the Second World War and of foreign occupation as well as at a distance from Moscow the Yugoslav communists emancipated themselves from outside control. Their leadership had continued though reporting to Moscow by radio but adopted its political strategy and managed its own affairs independently. At several junctions its actions deviated from the Soviet positions and tactics in relations with the Western Allies. As a centralised and disciplined party without internal factions and with motivated adherents and supporters the Yugoslav communists, inspite their initially small membership proved to be the best organized force of armed resistance on the territory of the defunct Yugoslav monarchy. The line of resolute resistance adopted by the communists brought to the Yugoslav partisan movement, on patriotic grounds massively also non-communists. The Russian Bolsheviks’ organisational legacy, transmitted through Comintern, and the attraction of an egalitarian ideology helped the Yugoslav communists to end up on the winning side in the war. From 1943 the British and Americans recognized them as the most effective allied force in the Balkans. In autumn 1944 the Soviet Army liberated part of Yugoslavia’s territory but unlike elsewhere in occupied Europe (except in Albania) the Yugoslav partisans in the final stage of the Second World War succeeded in liberating most of the country. The war’s outcome allowed the communists to defeat, chase away or annihilate those internal adversaries who collaborated with the occupiers.

Imitating the Soviet system and adhering to Marxist-Leninist ideological precepts became a general rule in post-1945 Yugoslavia. The first constitution of the new Yugoslav state, adopted in 1946 was in good part a mere translation of the Soviet (“Stalin’s”) constitution of 1936. Very importantly the Yugoslav communists adopted the Soviet system of fake ethnofederalism with often artificial administrative lines separating federal units. In many respects the Yugoslav communists strived to be and indeed were more “revolutionary” orthodox and Stalinist than other European communist parties. The Yugoslav adaptation of the Russian Bolsheviks’ ideology replaced the pre-war ideological foundation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and became the chief adhesive element of the newly stitched together multinational state called the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia.

To the sharp conflict with Stalin in June 1948 and to the insulting expulsion from the Eastern European “camp of people’s democracies” the Yugoslav communists responded initially by even sharpened Marxian orthodoxy and Stalinism in internal political and economic life. Only from 1951 on the political shock produced by the conflict with Moscow led to gradual and partial liberalization in Yugoslavia and to distancing from the Soviet system. Its hallmarks had been workers’ self-management, semi-market economy, relatively open borders and non-alignment in international affairs. The Yugoslav communist leaders however, like the Soviets, still continued to erroneously believe that the “socialist revolution” resolved forever the national problem in their multinational state. In 1963 and 1974 under the pressure from below they made however concessions to centrifugal forces and allowed the transformation of the centralized quasi-federation into an incoherent and malfunctioning hybrid of a federal – confederal institution-

al structure and authoritarian one-party rule. With the waning attraction of an egalitarian communist ideology the “revisionist” deviations from the Soviet model proved to be insufficient to save the Yugoslav state in one piece. Not accidentally the modified imitation of the Soviet system in Yugoslavia went down the drain of history roughly simultaneously with its original form in the Soviet Union.

The dissolution of the Warsaw pact in 1991 marked the end of Soviet hegemony in good part of Eastern-Central and South-Eastern Europe. It was accompanied by the crumbling of European communist regimes and by the end of the “Cold War”. These dramatic developments allowed for important geopolitical transformation and realignment on the European continent. Four communist-ruled “realsocialist” states disappeared from the European map. Among them were three “socialist federations” (USSR, SFR Yugoslavia and ČSSR). Twenty four new European states existing today on the territories of the three defunct federations, among them seven republics on the territory of the former SFR of Yugoslavia, became independent due notably to the delayed political and ideological impact of the Russian October revolution.

In the 1920s–1930s the Russian October revolution and Comintern had significantly contributed to the growth of Chinese communism. The popularity of the Bolsheviks in semi-colonial China was enhanced by their anti-imperialist pronouncements and the declared intention to renounce Russia’s extraterritorial rights. In spring 1920 Grigori Voytinski, a Comintern emissary, helped to establish the Communist Party of China and drafted its manifesto which was adopted at the first party congress. In the 1920s–1930s future important communist functionaries Deng Xiaoping, Zhou Enlai and others had attended in Moscow ideological and organisational training at the Communist University of the Toilers in the East. The adopted Bolshevik organizational format, internal rules of a centralized and disciplined party as well as Comintern’s annual subsidy greatly helped the Chinese communists to survive persecution and eventually to come out victorious in guerrilla warfare against of Japanese occupiers and in the several decades-long civil war. The Whampoa Military Academy, Soviet advisors and instructors in China as well as military schools in the Soviet Union contributed to military education and training of some later famous generals of the Chinese People’s Liberation Army (PLA). In the final stage of the civil war the PLA strength was enhanced by captured stocks of arms of the Japanese Kwantung Army in Manchuria crushed by the Soviet Army in August 1945.

Having gained in 1949 state power on the mainland the communists had adopted and largely followed the Soviet model of state organisation and of economic and social development. There have been several notable exceptions. Mao Tse Tung disagreed with the Russian Bolsheviks’ concept of a “workers’ revolution” and opted instead for the strategy of a “peasants’ revolution”. The Chinese communists eschewed the Soviet model of ethnofederalism and granted only limited cultural autonomy to ethnic minorities. To strategically important peripheral provinces the communists organised mass transfers of the Han population. In addition they, unlike the Soviets allowed the continued existence and controlled legal functioning of eight “fellow”, by the Chinese standards small “patriotic” parties. After two disastrous experiments in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s with

Mao Tse Tung’s “Great Leap Forward” and “Cultural Revolution” the Chinese communist leadership under Deng Xiaoping abandoned Marxist economic dogmas. Moreover, unlike in the Soviet Union the Chinese leadership introduced and until 2018 maintained a system of regular mandatory rejuvenation of the top personnel in the state, based on criteria of proved competence, managerial ability and of personal achievements.

V. Lenin, the spiritual leader of the October takeover, strongly feared that Soviet Russia would not survive without a world socialist revolution [6, p. 309–313, 528, 622], L. Trotsky, its military leader claimed in his work “The Permanent Revolution” that a socialist revolution cannot be accomplished in a national framework [5, p. 131]. For more than three decades the prospect of a world revolution had looked unattainable. The future of world communism became brighter however by the 40th anniversary of the October revolution which was solemnly celebrated in November 1957 in Moscow. Conspicuously present at the event were the leaders of the territorially largest and of the most populous states on the globe (USSR and PR of China) as well as of a dozen “people’s democracies”. During the next two and a half decades the paracomunists gained state power on Cuba, in Kampuchea, South Vietnam, Laos, Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia, South Yemen, Afghanistan, Grenada and Nicaragua. All these achievements seemed to presage the communist future of mankind. However soon after the 70th anniversary Lenin’s premonition turned out to be correct.

Lenin and Trotsky were however wrong having assumed that the communist system could be defeated only if crushed militarily from outside by “bourgeois” imperialism. Instead the communist systems in the Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe imploded mostly for internal reasons. The Soviet system and the Eastern European “people’s democracies” were fatally affected by flawed economic strategies, inflexible authoritarian political systems and by the challenge of nationalism (which was presumably to disappear in communist societies). The Soviet Union collapsed also due to its leadership’s grossly excessive global superpower ambitions, to the ensuing economic exhaustion, the cancer of façade ethnofederalism and a conflict within the Russian political elite [10, p. 197–205]. In the last decade of the 20th century all communist – run or dominated “real socialist” systems in Eastern Germany, Central Eastern and South Eastern Europe, in Russia itself, in all other former republics of the Soviet Union (with a possible exception of Belarus) and in Mongolia experienced ostensibly liberal, mostly non-violent counter-revolutions. They ranged from multiparty parliamentary democracies to various kinds of autocracies and personal or family dictatorships behind the imitations of liberal constitutional facades. All these regimes deny any continuity with the heritage of the Russian revolution.

Lenin and Trotsky did not believe that if defeated in Russia Soviet-like systems would still survive elsewhere. Also in this respect they proved to be wrong. The most successful imitators of the Russian Bolsheviks turned out in Eastern Asia. Communist systems inspired directly or indirectly by the Russian revolution, partly copied from the Soviet model but developed indigenously were created “through the barrel of the gun” and have survived in Asia and Latin America. One of them, a radical totalitari-

an and militarized replica of the Soviet system in the People's Democratic Republic of Korea does not attract today the world's attention by the well-being of its population but by its successful development of nuclear weapons and long-range missiles. To the list of geographically more distant followers one should include the present systems in the Republics of Laos and of Cuba. An aberrant, brutal imitation of war Bolshevism by the "Khmer Rouge" existed for several years in Kampuchea, but was crushed militarily by the Vietnamese communists.

The economically and politically most successful "socialist" state – the People's Republic of China and to a lesser degree the Socialist Republic of Vietnam have developed and maintained several essential elements of the systems inspired by the Russian revolution: a ruling communist party, an official Marxist – Leninist ideology, mass rituals, red flags, five – pointed stars and other communist symbols. Having abandoned however Marxist economic dogmas the Chinese and Vietnamese communists combined the Soviet – like political features of their political systems with a considerably open and controlled market economy, a large share of private domestic and foreign capitalism and gross economic inequality. These deviations from the Soviet model released the energy of hundreds millions of Chinese. In three decades they made still communist China the second largest world economy and a great political and military power. The Chinese communists since the implementation of reforms inspired by Deng Xiaoping could be considered as followers of the Soviet "New Economic Policy" (NEP) in the 1920s which could be observed first hand by Deng Xiaoping, then a student of the Communist University in Moscow. This policy was however soon abandoned by the scared and dogmatic Soviet officialdom. In retrospect that turnabout and the ensuing suppression of private economic activities in the Soviet Union was one of the fatal errors committed by the Russian Bolsheviks.

The Russian October revolution was much more radical in its proclaimed goals and much more violent than the American revolution of 1775–1783. It also lacked the latter's main secessionist element. However when constructing the Soviet Union the Russian Bolsheviks copied some institutional features of American federalism. In a number of respects the Russian revolution could be more appropriately compared with the Great French revolution of 1789–1792. The storming of Bastille in Paris and of the Winter Palace in Petrograd became their symbols. Both revolutions occurred in the largest European states of that time and both deeply shook the existing social and political orders in Europe. The French revolution abolished feudalism in France and contributed to its gradual abolition in the rest of Europe. The Russian revolution swept away the remnants of feudalism in Russia. Both anticlerical revolutions, unlike the American revolution, degenerated soon into dictatorships. The liberating appeal of the two revolutions had been abused by the two dictators for conquests and domination in considerable parts of the European continent. The two dictators who came from minorities – Napoleon Bonaparte and Joseph Stalin thus betrayed the two revolutions' declared goals.

Both revolutions were eventually defeated in the countries of their origin (and in their satellites) but left deep impact on their societies. The ideas of the French revolution inspired for more than a century reformers and revolutionar-

ies in Europe and the Americas and were subsequently built into political and social orders of liberal democratic states on five continents. The French revolution also helped to decolonize Northern and Southern America while the French Jacobines influenced many radical leftists around the globe, including the Russian Bolsheviks.

The Russian October revolution failed in its chief declared strategic objective – to destroy and abolish world capitalism. Contrary to their original promise of "the complete abolition of the state", the Russian communists developed a huge bureaucratic machine. The scare of communism however helped to reform crude capitalist systems in the West in the direction of more human and democratic social states. The first communist state – the Soviet Union contributed fundamentally, with tremendous human losses to the military defeat of the German-Austrian Third Reich and to the Allies' victory in the Second World War. The Russian revolution had contributed to the decolonization in Asia and Africa and to the rebirth of China as a world power.

On the other hand, some features and symbols of the Russian revolution became discredited in many countries by authoritarian communist regimes. During the last three decades, in addition to over two dozens European, Transcaucasian and Central Asian states the communist parties lost the ruling positions in four Asian (Afghanistan, Kampuchea, Southern Yemen, Nepal), six African (Ethiopia, Somalia, Benin, Angola, Mozambique, Congo, Brazzaville) and in two states in the Americas (Grenada, Nicaragua).

However this discreditation has been geographically very unevenly spread. Communist parties rule today in four East Asian and in one Latin American states. Moreover, in Asia (India, Bangladesh, Nepal, Syria and Palestine), in Africa (South Africa) and in Latin America (Chile, Ecuador, Uruguay, Guyana and Venezuela) the communist parties have participated in ruling leftist coalitions. The Communist party of Japan has been represented in parliament with 14 deputies. Three small communist parties participate today in the ruling coalitions in Greece, Serbia and tiny San Marino while the non-ruling communist parties of note function in the Russian Federation, Czech Republic, Portugal, Spain, Italy, France and Cyprus. In European Parliament there are 15 deputies (out of 751) elected on the lists of seven European communist parties.¹

While the Communist International has been long defunct there are today two international associations of socialist and social democratic parties with growing and partly overlapping membership. These are the Socialist International with 151 member and associated parties and the Progressive Alliance with 140 participating democratic socialist parties. The former president of the Socialist International Antonio Guterres serves today as Secretary General of the United Nations. In Europe socialist and social democratic parties have played important roles, have been ruling parties or members of ruling coalitions in Germany, Great Britain, France, Netherlands, Belgium, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, Austria, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Norway, Iceland, Greece, Cyprus, Andorra well as in a number of Eastern and South Eastern European states where former communist parties were dissolved or reformed, reorganized and renamed into socialist or social democratic parties (Czech Republic, Slovakia, Romania, Bulgaria,

¹ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_communist_parties

Serbia, Macedonia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Albania, Croatia, Slovenia). In European Parliament there are at present 190 deputies – members of the second largest group “The Progressive Alliance of Socialists and Democrats”. The constitutions of the two most populous states on the Earth (China and India) as well as of a dozen other states officially define them as socialist ones. There are more than two hundred socialist parties in Asia, Africa, Australia and in both Americas, several dozen of them are or were in the past ruling parties or members of ruling coalitions. Among them were socialist parties in India, Israel, Japan, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Venezuela, Uruguay, Sri Lanka, South Africa et. al.¹ The negative side effects of globalization and the deepening divide between the rich and poor have stimulated a revival of socialist thought in many countries on all continents. All this indicates that around the world the ideas of democratic socialism are still alive and enjoy considerable public support.

Although some of its symbols and many monuments have remained a considerable discreditation of the October revolution in its country of origin is a fact. It explains why the Russian post-Soviet regime stopped celebrating and removed the 7th of November from the list of official holidays. The Americans and the French, on the other hand, joyfully celebrate every year respectfully the 4th and 14th of July as their main state events. The Russian October revolution became thus mainly an intellectual food for historians and other social scientists as well as a topic for writers, films and television producers and for other media.

In 1919 Petrograd lost its position as Russia's capital and in 1924 was renamed into Leningrad, in memory of the October revolution's spiritual leader Vladimir Ulyanov – Nikolay Lenin. This great city has remained however Russia's foremost cultural, intellectual and particularly from 2000 on also a very important political center. In 1991

the liberal counter-revolution restored to the former epicenter of one of the greatest events of the 20th century its original imperial name. Sankt Petersburg's important place in modern European history since it became Russia's capital under Peter the Great has remained unchallenged.

Literature

1. Сахаров А. История России с древнейших времен до наших дней / А. Н. Сахаров, А. Н. Баханов, В. А. Шестаков. – М. : Проспект, 2010.
2. Pipes R. The Russian Revolution / R. Pipes. – N. Y. : Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1990.
3. Lenin V. J. Država in revolucija in drugi spisi iz leta 1917 / V. J. Lenin. – Ljubljana : Studia Humanitatis, 2017.
4. Ленин В. И. Государство и революция / В. И. Ленин. – М. : Госиздат, 1961.
5. Trocki L. Permanentna revolucija / L. Trocki. – Rijeka : Otokar Keršovani, 1972.
6. Fischer L. The Life of Lenin / L. Fischer. – N. Y. : Harper & Row, 1964.
7. Deutscher I. Stalin / I. Deutscher. – N. Y. : Oxford Univ. Press, 1969.
8. Revel J.-F. Les origines intellectuelles et morales du socialisme / J.-F. Revel // La Grande Parade. – P. : Plon, 2000. – P. 109–124.
9. Revel J.-F. Le communisme au XXe siècle: une histoire sans signification? / J.-F. Revel // La Grande Parade. – P. : Plon, 2000. – P. 197–220.
10. Гайдар Е. Гибель империи / Е. Гайдар. – М. : Росспэн, 2006.
11. Pleterški J. Zgodovina Zveze Komunistov Jugoslavije / J. Pleterški [et al.] // Komunist. – Ljubljana : DZS, 1986.
12. Auty Ph. Tito. A Biography / Ph. Auty. L. : Longman, 1970.
13. Goldstein I. Tito / I. Goldstein, S. Goldstein. – Ljubljana : Modrijan, 2017.
14. Saje M. Zgodovina Kitajske / M. Saje. – Ljubljana : Slovenska Matica, 2015.
15. Short Ph. Mao: The Man Who Made China / Ph. Short. – L. : Tawris, 2017.
16. Pantsov A. Deng Xiaoping / A. Pantsov. – Oxford : Oxford Univ. Press, 2015.

P. Bülbüloğlu²

CULTURE AND DEVELOPMENT: THE CHALLENGES OF THE CONTEMPORARY PERIOD

The fundamental special feature of the contemporary historical process is globalization of various sides of social life. Globalization modifies traditional economic, communicative, political ties and relations in the society. This is a complex phenomenon brought about by the aggregate of objective and subjective factors, beyond unambiguous assessment. On the one hand, globalization opens fascinating horizons for scientific, technological, economic development, on the other hand, it leads to dangerous for the future of the humankind political, social, cultural metamorphoses. Understanding many aspects of globalization, its consequences supposes taking into account ethnic, confes-

sional, culturological, value and worldview factors, and that makes interaction of philosophical, scientific and religious approaches inevitable.

Culture and Globalization

It should be emphasized that even before globalization processes were activated in the second half of the 20th century, attention to the problems of cultural studies was considerably intensified. And that is not accidental. The culture's impact became evident in the nature of economy, legal, political systems of the society. It's evident now that there is no field of activities, there are no such social processes that originated, changed outside the culture's impact.

Culture is originally connected with humans and generated by humans. There is neither the society, nor humans without culture and outside culture. “Really, the man has become a cultural creature as he is now in the course of typical evolutionary formation. Processes of two types take part in human development, though they are fairly different in their rates but they most closely cooperate with each

¹ Wikipedia. Socialist parties, Socialist International, Progressive Alliance. List of Socialist parties in power

² Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Azerbaijan to the Russian Federation, Professor, Azerbaijan SSR National Artist. Composer, singer, actor. Minister of Culture of Azerbaijan (1988–2006). Author of the book “Cultural Policy in Azerbaijan” (2003, coauthorship) and other published works. He was awarded the Orders of Friendship and Honour of the Russian Federation, “Independence” and “Honour” of Azerbaijan, Honour of the Republic of Georgia and many others foreign awards.

other: slow evolutionary development and cultural development, which is many times quicker".¹

Each culture is a whole, spiritual and material phenomenon embodied in the tribal community of people, a certain ethnos. We should agree with cultural anthropologists that there are no better or worse cultures, they are various. The nation's own ideas, values, symbols, behavioral standards are formed in the process of nation's historical development. Even similar geographic conditions and conditions of material life do not lead to unification of spiritual life forms, variety does not disappear. Notwithstanding the fact that communities of people may live close to one another for many centuries, they preserve their specific features. This does not exclude common features, invariants in different cultures that determine a possibility of interaction, dialogue of cultures, their assessment from humanistic and environmental positions. Each nation has its distinctive ideas of life, behavioral standards, symbols depending on natural environment, ethnic special features. They changed to a certain extent in the process of historical development, for internal and external reasons, however, there was no full unification of spiritual life forms, the variety of cultures was mostly preserved.

In my opinion, we should beware of the "technological" treatment of culture as an aggregate of means of activities thanks to which some or the other human goals are realized. Sure, culture originates in the process of human activities, but it does not follow that any product of these activities is culture. The focus of human activities is of principal importance – creation or destruction, support of life or its annihilation. The humanistic focus of human activities in this case is of priority importance. In this respect, the definition of culture by academician D. S. Likhachov is of eternal importance. In his opinion, "culture is material and spiritual life environment created by humans", focused on "creation, preservation and reproduction of norms and values, *assisting elevation of humans and humanization of the society*".²

In this connection the attention is involuntarily paid to correlation of ideas of "culture" and "civilization". I agree with the point of view that civilization is the highest step in culture's development. Each society has its own culture, complex or simple, developed or undeveloped, but if culture became big, technologically rich and, for example, written language originated in it as well as cities, then such a culture really came close to the civilization level.

At the same time, the idea of "civilization" as Professor N. V. Motroshilova is justified to think, should reflect not only the level of scientific and technological process, the level of moving from primitive ways of management but also the extent of human freedom, human harmonious, moral and ethical development.³ It seems in this connection that humanistic messages can be fully revealed at the level of civilization development of culture.

However, how is it possible to explain that contemporary culture reaching the civilization level, not only preserves elements of evil, destruction and cruelty in it but can also return to the barbarism level? This is certified by periodical recurrences of Fascism, aggressive nationalism, ter-

rorist acts, human behavior during natural disasters, numerous individual and mass crimes against humanity in our times as well, in the 21st century.

Professor N. M. Mamedov⁴ explains some distortions of the humanistic essence of culture at its highest, civilization level. He singles out three aspects affecting inadequate development of culture. In his opinion, the first is related to human nature inherited from ancestors, natural instincts. The purpose of culture (socialization institutions) in this aspect is seen in "purifying" the archaic human nature, in particular, getting rid of "the aggressiveness instinct". Let's remember that already the thinkers of the New Times saw culture as the main means for correction of human natural vices and prevention of social cataclysms.

The second is related to limitation of theoretical bases of human transforming activities in every certain historical period. Hence special hopes on scientific knowledge, realization of noospherogenesis.

The third aspect is related to objective uncertainty in social and natural systems that is not eliminated in the process of cognition's development and can be relatively softened when forecasting the consequences of the taken decisions.

Generalization of Culture's Functions

Notwithstanding internal collisions of the cultural process itself, settlement of social and environmental contradictions is currently seen in the development of culture. Withdrawal from the traditional development concept, focused on economic growth was for the first time clearly outlined at the World Conference on Cultural Policies (Mexico City, 1982) held under the auspices of the United Nations. The well-being and prosperity of every individual were proclaimed the goal of true development. Culture was determined as the main backbone development factor, and improvement of individual's quality of life and personal merits were recognized as the final goal of development. The address to the states of the world was adopted at the Conference to guarantee such a strategy of national development when culture could become not just its inalienable part but its main foundation.

The generalized interpretation of culture was given in the Declaration approved at this Conference, it was more widely recognized in future. It is said in the Declaration that in order to coordinate various goals of the humankind, culture should be viewed in the widest sense as an aggregate of diverse spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features, characterizing the society or a social group. It should be acknowledged that besides arts and literature, culture also encompasses the way of life, the main human rights, the system of values, traditions and faith.

Such a presentation of culture excludes understanding development as the product of only technological and economic growth, characterizes culture as a uniting and creative force in the society.

The ideas of the Conference in Mexico City were developed 16 years later, in 1998 in Stockholm at the Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies for Development. It was emphasized then that cultural policies should not be autonomous, abstract activities but should become the determining factor for achievement of comprehensive

¹ Lorenz K. Aggression (the so-called evil). Moscow, 2008. P. 4.

² Likhachov D. S. Selected Works: Thoughts about Life, History, Culture. Moscow, 2006.

³ Motroshilova N. V. Civilization and Barbarism in the Period of Global Crises. Moscow, 2010. P. 131.

⁴ Mamedov N. M. The Human Nature and the Meaning of Culture // Culture of Sustainable Development: from Idea to Reality. Baku, 2013. P. 50.

social development. To put it differently, cultural policies were presented as an **important tool for social development's management by the state**, as an effective way for purposeful arrangement of the society.

However, there is still an unresolved issue of the extent of culture's manageability, as wide interpretation of culture in essence brings it down to the idea of the society and cultural policies to multi-level social management.

Contradictions of Cultural Globalizations

At the same time, the cultural process in the globalization environment started demonstrating its contradictory essence. On the one hand, unprecedented development of information technologies, communication means, penetration of common civilization universals into various social life structures started modifying and enriching national cultures. Globalization created unique opportunities for convergence of values, ideas, mindsets. On the other hand, there is a danger of national cultures' unification, their disappearance without a trace. Variety of cultures is considered the spiritual richness of the humankind and with good grounds for that, it should be supported in every possible way at various levels. The United Nations' concern with this state of affairs led to adoption of a number of documents, programs directed to preservation of cultural variety in the world. At the same time, special attention is paid to the fact that preservation of national cultures is related to the issue of human rights' observance. As national culture is the generalized embodiment of human rights in its spiritual world.

Mahatma Gandhi figuratively expressed the dialectics of the cultural process in his time: "I do not want my house to be walled in on all sides and my windows to be stuffed. I want the culture of all lands to be blown about my house as freely as possible. But I refuse to be blown off my feet by any".¹

Globalization and Multiculturalism

Preservation of the multi-faceted essence of world culture in the globalization environment becomes an urgent scientific-theoretical and social-political problem. In this connection, in my opinion, we should treat the policy of multiculturalism more attentively, we should eliminate the mist, artificially created in recent years by some West European statesmen around this extremely important civilization way for management of the dynamics of culture. Multiculturalism historically demonstrated its adequacy and effectiveness in multinational, multiconfessional countries. The consistently carried out policy of multiculturalism prevents conflicts on ethnic and cultural grounds, enriches socialization of individuals, creates tolerant spiritual atmosphere in the society, assists adequate perception of another culture. Humanistic principles of multiculturalism allow to raise above narrow nationalistic interests, dangerous manifestation of chauvinism and xenophobia.

Russia has a lot of experience in bringing ideas of multiculturalism into life. Multiculturalism is the basis of state policy in today's Azerbaijan. In 2008, the so-called "Baku Process" was launched on the initiative of the President of the Republic Ilham Aliyev, with the purpose to determine the long-term program in cultural de-

velopment, finding effective ways for inter-cultural and inter-civilization dialogue. World congresses in dialogue of cultures are regularly held as a part of the "Baku Process" with the support of the United Nations, and last year such a large-scaled event as "Alliance of Civilizations" was successfully held.

Scientific centers for research of the bases and ways for bringing multiculturalism into life have been set up in the Republic. The works by Azerbaijani scholars dedicated to the multiculturalism policy, its humanistic, social value, respectively the ideology of sustainable development are fairly well known in academic circles. As the Azerbaijani experience shows, the policy of multiculturalism strengthens trust in the society, strengthens social capital and that as a result is manifested in the development of economy, improvement of the standard of living and quality of people's life.

Establishment of Culture of Sustainable Development

As K. Marx appropriately said, if culture develops spontaneously and not directed conscientiously, it leaves a desert after itself. And an assumption that it is necessary to control the development of culture, realizing this or that cultural policy is in principle connected with that. As the minister of culture for many years (18 years) working in the most difficult transition period, I fully agree with this thesis.

The global concern with security of one's existence becomes a prerequisite for the new cultural synthesis. Currently, the humankind finds itself with the alternative: either to preserve the already established type of activities – and die in an environmental disaster, or change it cardinally and preserve nature for the life of the future generations. As the second variant is the only acceptable, the humankind will have to comprehend the new realities and basing on them transform not only the established, mostly destructive type of activities but also the whole system of values. That's how the sustainable development concept originated and was adopted in 1992 at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro as Agenda 21, the action plan for the 21st century for the humankind.

According to the sustainable development concept, the previous strategies, focused exclusively on the economic development, should be replaced by a strategy with the man in the center of it. The modern way of life, values formed in the period of industrial society, should be radically changed. That's the reason why it is necessary not only to use cultural traditions but also develop, promote the culture of sustainable development.²

The main indicator of sustainable development is the harmony between socioeconomic and environmental development. Consequently, the culture of sustainable development is a way of coordinated social and natural development, which provides for preservation of the fundamental indicators of the natural environment. If culture as a social phenomenon, "the creation of human hands" was always opposed to nature, the culture of sustainable development should become a new way for harmonious joining of the man and nature based on deeper understanding of its essence and reconciliation with it.

¹ Quoted by: Human Development Report 2004. P. 103.

² Mamedov N. M. The Phenomenon of Culture and Sustainable Development // *Universum: Bulletin of Herzen University*, St. Petersburg, 2013, № 3. P. 55.

This requires regular replenishment of knowledge about the laws governing the functioning of the surrounding natural environment, forms and methods of activities in rational and careful nature use.

As we comprehend the problems and prospects of the contemporary society's transfer to sustainable development, it becomes clear that such a transfer is possible in case of harmonious social relations, moral advancement of people, change of human features based on humanistic values and ideals.

A series of annual international conferences that took place in Baku under the auspices of UNESCO in 2011–2014 was dedicated to the issues of the culture's of sustainable development establishment. The next big step in this direction was the Congress organized by UNESCO "Culture: Key to Sustainable Development" that was held in the city of Guangzhou (China). The Guangzhou Declaration "Culture and Sustainable Development" was adopted as a result of the Congress. The Declaration contains

a call to make culture the nucleus of the sustainable development policy, and there are also ways to attain this goal offered. It should be acknowledged that the culture of sustainable development can be only formed based on purposeful activities. The education system determining development of the society, mass media, literature and arts can serve as the basis for a certain change and enrichment of culture.

Transfer to sustainable development is a very complex dialectical process, requiring efforts of all states, the whole humankind. This is the process called to unite people, consolidate the world community. All leaders of the United Nations member states acknowledged the urgency of this process of pressing concern. But we are once again convinced that there is a big distance between knowledge, understanding and specific actions. We can only hope that Homo sapiens will have time to become the Wise Man and take all possible efforts for development of the cultural component of being and further intelligent, safe and happy life on Earth.

**V. A. Chereshev¹,
V. N. Rastorguev²**

HOW TO SAVE THE FUTURE AND WHAT DIFFERENTIATES UTOPIA FROM STRATEGY?

"Isn't it an utopia – to preserve life on the globe? I don't think so. I believe that public opinion is capable to efficiently exert influence upon governments pushing them in the required direction. <...> Humans are responsible not only for their own survival. The issue is about saving the whole variety of life, which is the highest value. But the only living creature on the globe given the gift of the word is the Man. He has speech and consciousness – and he is the only hope of all life on Earth".

*D. S. Likhachov.
To Bring Up a Citizen of the World in Oneself*

It's difficult to preserve the heritage of the past, but it's even more difficult to preserve the future that we can lose because of risks, which are really lying beyond the bound, with which transformation of the technology-related civilization into the monocivilization is related. As a result of this unnoticeable evolution, the very possibility of preservation of cultural and lingual variety of the world is excluded from our being as well as the sentence is passed to the whole biodiversity of the world. Raising this issue is

¹ Chief Researcher at the Institute for Immunology and Physiology (the Urals Branch of the RAS), member of the Presidium of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Medicine), Professor. Author of a number of scientific discoveries and inventions, more than 700 scholarly publications, including 34 monographs, 14 books: "Immunophysiology", "Alpha Fetoprotein", "Immunologic and Genetic Factors of Reproduction Function Disturbance", "Biological Laws and Human Viability. Method of Multi-Functional Regeneration Biotherapy", "Physiological and Hygienic Concept of Speleoco and Co-Treatment", "Social and Demographic Safety of Russia", "Demographic Policy of the Country and Health of the Nation" and others; 2 manuals for studying combined radiation damages and clinical immunology; 6 textbooks; 11 manuals for higher educational establishments. President of the Russian Academic Society of Immunologists. Chief editor of the "Russian Journal of Immunology", "Bulletin of Ural Medical Academic Science", Bulletin of Ural Branch of RAS "Science. Society. Man", "Immunology of Urals". He is decorated with the Order of Friendship, the Order for Services to the Fatherland of the 3rd and 4th degree. He is a Laureate of the Government Award of the Russian Federation in science and technology and the award of the Government of the Russian Federation in the field of education. Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS.

seen by many people, including scholars, as just an alarmist method to obtain investments going into research. In the best case the very raising of the issue is looked upon as an obviously pessimistic but unlikely forecast that is allowed purely theoretically "for the fullness of the picture", though really there is no doubt in the scales of the approaching catastrophe, and the deficit of time required for working out the collective strategy, capable to minimize risks, is becoming acuter every passing year.

Why does it happen? One of the main reasons is a fairly explainable limitation of the researchers' position, as a rule they don't go beyond the limits of a narrow branch of knowledge, to say nothing of barriers between the humanitarian and natural branches of knowledge. Only a few rep-

² Professor of the Chair of Philosophy of Politics and Law at Lomonosov Moscow University, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Honorary Higher Education Lecturer of the Russian Federation. Class 3 State Advisor. Author of more than 400 scholarly publications, including 26 monographs and textbooks: The Nature of Self-Identification: Russian Culture, Slavonic World and Strategy of Continuing Education; The World's Wells: Russia's Environmental Doctrine: from Plans to Pilot Projects; Philosophy and Methodology of Political Planning; "The Civilizational Heritage of the Slavic World", "Smart Politics and the Culture of Planning" and some others. Deputy Chairman of the Scientific Council of the Russian Academy of Sciences for the study and preservation of cultural and natural heritage. V. N. Rastorguev is recipient of the UN Avicenna Award and Unity Award. He was awarded the Russian Federation Governmental Prize in science and technology.

representatives of the academic community have the strength to overcome them, they have the really encyclopedic range of interests and “well-known names” in world science, certifying that there is qualitatively new knowledge at the back of their encyclopedic learning but not common amateurishness. Amateurishness is dangerous not because people suffering from it spread fake knowledge, but because it devalues those evident truths that are usually interlaced into unreliable foundations and because of that are taken as false doctrines.

Happily, there are thinkers found sometimes among both humanists and natural scientists of such scales that allow them to be true teachers and prophets even “in their Motherland”. I’ll mention only two names of world-famous Russian scholars, who fully correspond to the role of prophets from science – they are D. S. Likhachov, who brought up his research to the level of the “ecology of culture” understanding, and N. N. Moiseyev with his world-famous foundation of the “nuclear winter” hypothesis. They are also drawn together by the fact that their vision of the problem noticeably and positively affected the general political culture and the vector for searching acceptable strategies for international cooperation. After they passed away, everyone feels that the degree of risk considerably increases when there are definitely not enough such weighty authorities in the academic community, capable to influence both the mass consciousness and the choice of political course.

When speaking about the civilization’s future, D. S. Likhachov directly pointed at its main “murderer”, the role of which is played, no matter how paradoxically it may sound, by the popular and fruitful idea of progress in its most primitive (and because of that the most popular) interpretation: “The idea of progress accompanies the history of the mankind over the visible period (not so long). Starting from the late 18th century, its meaning is decisive in most historical teachings and doctrines. It in its primitive forms views the past and the present as a victim sacrificed in the name of the future. But it turned out that in real life it started sacrificing the future in the name of the short present”.¹

N. N. Moiseyev came to a similar conclusion, though all his academic studies were based on a completely different picture (pictures) of the world. The project-oriented thinking evidently dominated in his creative work, and consequently in the idea of technical and technologic progress. But the new idea in his consciousness nearly always grew up to the scales of a big strategy, often global, with interbranch penetrations and philosophical generalizations typical for strategies’ synthesis. He was not afraid of big horizons when an idea grew up to really cosmic scales. Probably, because of that he felt very keenly about the theory of noosphere, according to which the mankind enters the era of the human mind’s omnipotence, acquiring the ability to create prerequisites itself, required for providing the co-evolution of nature and society, without which not only forward movement but also preservation of life are impossible.

The idea of noosphere was variously interpreted in the works of many thinkers – theologians, natural scientists and humanists. Many contemporary authors studying Likhachov’s legacy, refer his views to a kind of modifications of the noosphere doctrine, though it’s not exactly that as there is no and there never was a common doctrine,

but there are completely different though related concepts. At the same time, as it’s well-known, Likhachov tied his theory of conceptosphere with V. I. Vernadsky’s theory, and the “conceptosphere” term was introduced by him by analogy with such concepts as noosphere and biosphere. The noosphere concept became world-famous thanks to frankly utopian and, as Moiseyev emphasized, strictly illusionary teaching by Teilhard de Chardin about the fusion of nations into one whole, that the author of this concept thought it the omen of “the mankind’s fusion with Nature and God” and consequently establishment of noosphere as the final of the evolution and history.

V. I. Vernadsky filled this term with a completely different meaning, in the beginning of the century (in 1904) he said from the rostrum at the Moscow University that humans turned into the main geology-forming force on the globe. And a little bit later he said that humans would have to take the full responsibility upon themselves not only for the fates of the society but biosphere as a whole as well.

Moiseyev paid special attention to this topic and viewed this and other noosphere teachings as great utopias, differently directed and competing in many aspects (“finalist”, “alarmist” and “motivational”), in which nevertheless there is a grain of truth – acknowledgement of the Collective Intellect’s rights and responsibility. The idea of noosphere for Moiseyev was productive to the highest degree as it contained the highest imperative, which the mankind should accept for one reason – because there are no alternatives, for self-preservation in the face of the inevitable catastrophe.

He introduced the idea of the *ecological imperative* into the academic circulation to clarify his position, it was the main guarantee of a possibility of development without a global catastrophe, the probability of which should be minimized. In his opinion, the main difficulty of the modern times is that acknowledgement of an ecological imperative in the academic community and what is no less important, political community, is just a small step on the way of an imperative’s really becoming the absolute imperative – unconditional instruction for action. And establishment of new in essence organizational structures on global scales will be required for that.

It is necessary to say how far this idea is from being brought into life in our times? That’s the reason it is perceived by us as an absolute utopia. But the matter is that this utopia has no alternatives. According to Moiseyev, the issue is only if the radical change in the society’s arrangement takes place spontaneously, “when transfer is related to elimination of a considerable part of the mankind (and maybe death of the whole mankind) or realization of some optimal transfer STRATEGY developed by the Collective Intellect”.² At the same time, Moiseyev understood general knowledge and ability to use the technology of transfer, accumulation and use of information under the Collective Intellect – all that information system, including the decision-taking technology, which may only originate based on the general understanding of the goal. In his opinion, “establishment of the Collective Intellect is as natural process as the brain and individual intellect development”.³

Developing Moiseyev’s thought, it’s possible to say that the sustainable development concept can serve as the first

¹ Лихачев Д. С. Русская культура. М., 2000. С. 347.

² Моисеев Н. Н. Время определять национальные цели. М.: МНЭПУ, 1997.

³ Ibid. P. 136.

step on the way of turning the utopia into strategy. This worldview and mindset predetermined the wideness of Moiseyev academic interests. His legacy is still equally interesting for mathematicians, ecologists, representatives of engineering sciences and philosophers. Let's dwell on only one facet of his creative legacy – his globally spread sustainable development concept, which many people perceive as pure utopia and others as the only right strategy. But in order to come to this problem, it will be required to explain Moiseyev's attitude to utopias and strategies more clearly, to be more exact, to what we traditionally refer *either to utopias or strategies*. Usually we don't find any connections between these categories from the completely different at first sight worlds – the illusionary world and the real world. But when we start speaking about the project-oriented thinking and scientific provision for really big and socially important inter-branch projects, everything changes cardinally. And by the way, here we also see the similarity of his position and Likhachov's position (see the epigraph).

First, exactly the brave ideas that are perceived as pure utopias even in academic circles, especially if they encroach upon basic paradigms and traditional views, turn out to be the most productive for choosing strategies.

Second, no one knows which of the large-scaled projects aspiring to change the world is an utopia, and which has a real strategy in it: the number of factors is too big – both subjective and objective from which success or failure are finally composed.

Third, even a fairly successfully realized project is not a proof of its not being utopian. For example, one hundred years were required in order for the great and definitely not unsuccessful project for society building without exploitation and exploiters and also in a single country, that took place in defiance of everything and allowed in the shortest period of time to restore the state from ruins and break the spine of Nazi utopia, to be recognized... as a no less dangerous utopia than Fascism. By the way, bringing the Nazi regime down to utopia is not the wisest and far-sighted policy just for a simple reason that the brown plague that took millions of lives, was stopped only because of sacrifices and heroic deeds of our people, whose ideals we now call undoubtedly utopian... And we should not ignore the fact that this ideological plague can revive at the new spiral of history as there is no guarantee that the following generations will preserve the immunity to this plague. And those who recently proved that the Communist global project had no alternatives and could not have them, were the first to see only dangerous utopia in this more than successful social experiment...

Fourth, realization of such a geopolitical project as the European Union project was in essence is fairly instructive for understanding the transfer of utopia into reality. Count R. Coudenhove-Kalergi was its "general constructor", he started this project in the 1920s, in the previous century, when everyone thought it to be an absolute utopia, but he worded the principle of transforming utopia into strategy already at that time. He thought with fairly enough substantiation that the idea of Pan-Europe would be inevitably accused of its utopian character, though establishment of Pan-Europe, according to him, was not against any law of nature. On the contrary, "Pan-Europe is in accordance with the interests of the overwhelming majority of Europeans, and there is damage to the interests of an unimportant

minority. This small but very strong minority, that today decides the fates of Europe, would like to attach the utopia label to the idea of Pan-Europe. But this can be answered that every great historical event started as utopia and ended as reality".

Coudenhove-Kalergi gives the fact of the Communists' rule in Russia as an example, it seemed an utopia for all – up to the moment when their victory became a reality. And basing on that he comes to the conclusion about the inverse relation between politicians' abilities for fantasies and their abilities for planning. The more limited the fantastic world is, the wider the world of utopia seems and the narrower the boundaries of the possible. According to Coudenhove-Kalergi, "The world history has a richer fantasy than its puppets, its being a chain of alternating unexpected events and utopias brought into life. The idea's staying an utopia or becoming a reality depends as a rule on the number of its supporters and their energy. While thousands of people believe in the idea of Pan-Europe – it's an utopia, as soon as millions believe in it – it will become a political program, and only when one hundred million believe in it, it will become a reality".¹

But let's come back to Moiseyev's theory and his no less paradoxical vision of this problem but much weighted in a lot of aspects, taking into account the fact that a *successfully brought into life project can stay an utopia* as well. He demonstrated with a lot of examples how utopia changed into strategy and strategy changed into utopia. And this process cannot be considered a one-way process either. In his opinion, "any human activity, especially in the intellectual sphere, always starts from utopias". And he referred this governing law of the project-oriented thinking, first of all, to himself. In his book *The Civilization's Destiny. The Way of Mind* he speaks about his projects as utopias but of a special kind, singling out "*constructive utopias*", basing not on theoretician's logic but on Nature's logic, among all kinds of utopias.

According to Moiseyev, his own theory is also an utopia but referred to *constructive utopias*. Its principal difference is that describing it he did not try to say how the future world should be constructed and only about *what should not be done and without which it was impossible to do*. At the same time, it will be supported by the system of empirical generalizations or logical consequences of the whole pattern of the evolutionary process, the fragments of which make the history of the mankind".²

Moiseyev thought that any long-term forecasts and any construction patterns for the society of the future will always be groundless and utopian in this sense as the life itself would command how the world should be constructed in future centuries. "But still such utopias are required by people – they are a kind of catalyst for human thought and activities. The necessity of prognostic patterns using the scientific data will grow more and more with the growth of civilization's power and the role of the mind in the mankind's destinies – they are capable to foresee dangers", he emphasized.³

¹ Куденхове-Калерги Р. Н. Пан-Европа. М. : Вита Планетаре, 2006. С. 13.

² Моисеев Н. Н. Судьба цивилизации. Путь Разума. М. : МНЭПУ, 1998. С. 90.

³ Моисеев Н. Н. Избранные труды : в 2 т. М. : Тайдекс Ко, 2003. Т. 2. С. 143.

And now let's come back to Moiseyev's attitude to the sustainable development concept and respectively the sustainable development strategy. He wrote in one of his papers dedicated to this topic: "I am not striving to find a substitute for the sustainable development term or to offer another translation that could replace evidently not the best one Russian variant. We should just forget this trivial interpretation. But I think that it is absolutely necessary to give another meaning to the term: sustainable development is realization of human strategy. The mankind as a whole and each country individually will run across and overcome numerous crises, ups and downs. This is the way for continuous searches and not a sustainable development. And the more scientifically verified the strategy is, the less painful crises are".¹

In our opinion, there is only one link lacking in this reasoning. Today, there is even no draft classification for various phenomena of completely different genesis from scientific, political and media spheres of life, to which the fashionable "sustainable development concept" is applied. Such blurred understanding of the term is really an obstacle for us, in essence it leads to its devaluation, de-termination. The reason comes down to one methodological mistake, which is exaggeration of the role ascribed to academic circles in formation of the sustainable development concept. Really, this concept is accepted on completely different principles than scientific theories. They are approved not by scholars but politicians on the basis of respective procedures. The expert community is really engaged at some stages, it includes the "first-grade" experts – specialists providing conclusions, for example, about the worked out documents being in accordance with the norms of the acting national legislation and the international law, a possibility of provision with resources and finances, etc, and there are also representative of academic circles, the public, prominent figures in the field of culture taking part...

But as a rule, they are not participating in the most important stages of decision taking. And politicians as it is well-known proceed from other ideas, dictated by national, corporate, lobbistic and other interests, having no relation to science, the sense of party or group solidarity and finally strengthening of their own "sustainability" in the system. At the same time, it is sometimes required to sacrifice even the logic and the system of theoretical foundations for coordination of differently directed interests of the process participants. Actually this fact is the reason of indignation in academic circles that clearly see defects in foundation and logic and because of that they try to "correct the concept" offering their variants and are sincerely surprised that they are not heard.

This paradoxical situation brought Moiseyev to the radical conclusion that "the sustainable development concept is one of the most dangerous delusions of the modern times, especially in the way it is interpreted by politicians and economists". The reason of extraordinary risk is primitivism of political and economic interpretations, setting hopes on technocratic way of solving global problems. Really, the mankind will still have to overcome a long and thorny path full of planetary-scale tragedies. But "the society should be ready for that, and we don't have the right to replace the reality with simplified and dangerous illu-

sions. This path will be completely different from sustainable development".²

We don't intend to tell the history of this concept's establishment in the political sphere and its forerunners in the field of politics and science (and this is a long history), we'll just remind the basic landmarks of its development. The International Union for Conservation of Nature is singled out among other organizers of political discussions at international venues. In 1980, it offered the International Strategy for Conservation of Nature, where this concept was singled out, jointly with other international organizations. Because of that it's not surprising that from the very beginning *three main dimensions of the world's development: ecological, economic and social* were reviewed in this concept, with ecological problems having top priority.

All the main global problems, that were and still are the contents of political discourse, were viewed through this prism. There are limitations of population growth and poverty, maintaining the quality of life and protection of global ecosystems among them as well as conservation of strategic natural resources and minimization of the consequences of pollution of the environment, which are becoming threatening with globalization and economic growth as a background. The Overview by the World Commission on Environment and Development "Our Common Future" also known as the Brundtland Report has become an important landmark in the development of the political sustainable development concept and strengthening of the "economic dominant". The notion of sustainability was used in the Report as a synonym for the notion of "sustainable economic growth" as it exactly will allow to solve the poverty problem and the problem of pollution of the environment.

As we see, the sustainable development concept from the very beginning acquired the well-defined character, and that was searching for a compromise by the leading countries of the world, and that led to nearly each of them acquiring its own strategy and sustainable development program. The issue of a possibility to single out any scientific theory as the basis for the sustainable development strategy respectively went to the background.

Let's come to some intermediary conclusions from the above-said.

First, the basis of the sustainable development concept, surely if viewed in a maximally simplified way, is the *principle of three dimensions' equality* – economic, social and ecological. In this case, we are dealing not with the next global utopia but just a technology for global risks control that may be more or less effective as well as with a fairly developed ranking system for evaluation of various countries' achievements from the sustainable development positions.

Second, if the value of a scientific theory and research program is predetermined, first of all by its heuristic and epistemological potential, a political concept, doctrine and strategy have a completely different purpose. Here everything is determined by its ability or inability to optimize the achievement of political goals and regulate the political actors' behaviour at all "branches" and "floors" of power. And the architectonics of politics is fairly complex, and the sustainable development concept functions and is interpreted differently at each "floor" and level of power.

¹ Mouceev H. H. Ibid.

² Mouceev H. H. Ibid. P. 83.

The noticeable turn of the Russian politics to ecology is beginning to show recently, it took place to a large extent under the influence of the best-known scholars, and following the ecological imperative in politics turned out to be unexpected for many people. And coming back to the Ecological Doctrine of the Russian Federation confirms exactly such a turn. We won't speak in detail about the history of the Doctrine's creation and the way the project had to go from the idea's origination to the official approval of the document by the Government of the Russian Federation. We'll just mention the important for our report aspect of the topic: the sustainable development concept, fixed in respective international agreements and charters, is in the basis of the Ecological Doctrine. If you open the Doctrine, it is already said about that in the preamble.

The Russian Ecological Doctrine draft was approved at the meeting of the Government of the Russian Federation on August 27, 2002, i. e. several days before the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg (September, 2002). Thus, the first in Russian history experience in national strategic planning was successfully finished, the main stage of it took place not in offices of public officials, not isolated from the public opinion but in academic groups and nongovernmental organizations, attracting all people, who are not indifferent to the future of their native land, to the discussion. This seems especially important as the state ecological doctrine is nothing else but a kind of "sailing directions" for long-term sector planning for bodies of authority at all levels.

Thorough work at regional strategies is required to realize the Ecological Doctrine, first of all at the Russian Northern Strategy, as two thirds of Russia are northern territories. The Northern Socio-Ecological Congress was organized for this purpose, it was already held eleven times in Moscow, in many northern cities of Russia and Norway. The most important were the Fifth Congress in Syktyvkar, the results of the International Polar Year were summed up for the first time in Russia as a part of it, and the Eleventh Congress, where ten years of our work were summarized and new plans were outlined.¹ The multi-volume library of the Congress has been gradually formed.

The organizers of the Northern Socio-Ecological Congress coordinate their work with the RAS Academic Council for the Study and Protection of Natural and Cultural Heritage, set up by academician Ye. P. Chelysh together with a group of outstanding scholars, among whom Likhachov

played a special role.² The Russian Civilization Way is an extremely promising program initiated and carried out by this Council, the top priority there is inter-branch research of the cultural and natural synthesis being the basis of local civilizations' development. A special place among these principles is occupied by the principle of unity of cultural and natural factors in the process of world civilizations' establishment (cultural and historical types). This principle is important not only for understanding the special features of the Russian civilization way as of a country-civilization, its worldwide importance and relations with other civilization worlds, but also for research of the civilizational uniqueness of northern territories of Russia and other Arctic nations.

It's noteworthy that here we also come in contact with Likhachov's and Moiseyev's legacy, who viewed the Ecological imperative principle and the sustainable development concept as a part of the civilizational approach. Under civilization he understood "some community of people, characterized by a certain set of values (including both technologies and skills), the system of common prohibitions, similarity (but not identity) of spiritual worlds, etc.". At the same time, he keenly felt differences existing between various conceptual patterns, on the basis of which we distinguish monocivilizational theories based on unification of the global process, and theories describing local civilizations. According to Moiseyev, "any evolutionary process, including development of a civilization, is also accompanied by growth of variety of life arrangement forms, including 'civilizational varieties' – civilization never was and will never be united no matter the technological community uniting the mankind".³

His criticism of S. Huntington's theory of the clash of civilizations, with the conclusion about the role of civilization break-up borders in modern history, is especially interesting in this respect. However, Huntington's arguments do not seem convincing enough for Moiseyev as the reasons of the inevitable clash of civilizations are in much deeper horizons than it seems to the author: "One of the most important reasons for contemporary confrontations of civilizations are modernization processes and creation and spreading of some standards common for the globe, satisfying the requirements of the arising technological basis of civilization. But gradually these confrontations will transfer to the sphere of ecology".⁴

As we can see, N. N. Moiseyev's legacy is as multifaceted as the issues he raised.

¹ Preliminary result of the Northern Socio-Ecological Congress are presented in the book: *Северология: проблемное поле, методология и социально-экономические основы долгосрочного планирования*. Пушкино: Центр стратегической конъюнктуры, 2016.

² Co-Chairmen of the Council are academicians Ye. P. Chelyshev and V. A. Chereshev.

³ *Моисеев Н. Н. Избранные труды*. Т. 2. С. 92.

⁴ *Ibid.* P. 90.

M. Dell'Ambrogio¹

THE CONTOURS OF THE FUTURE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WORLD'S CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

Ladies and gentlemen,

Thank you for inviting me to the opening of your conference here in St. Petersburg. It is an honour for me to speak before such a distinguished audience.

Today you will be discussing a question that is particularly pressing these days: what does the future hold in the context of the world's current cultural development?

This question, of course, is not easy to answer.

It is particularly difficult because the term 'culture' is very broad one. It is a term with many facets.

When we speak of 'culture' in the traditional, narrow sense, then it is to a certain extent universal. Whether it is in the music of Bach, Tchaikovsky, Shostakovich, or in the literature of Molière, Dostoevsky and great contemporary achievements of the 21st century. We talk about art as a widely recognised and lasting works of genius.

Research and science are on a similar level to art. In their quest for new knowledge and verifiable truths, they are by their very nature safe, stable parameters. And just like art, science and research transcend borders and unite nations.

At the same time, ideological concepts and worldviews are another expression and concrete manifestation of 'culture'. Such concepts find their expression, for example, in sociology, in business administration, economics and above all in politics.

This ideological form of 'culture' is not stable; it changes with the times.

In principle, change is not a bad thing. However, I would venture the following thesis: With this form of 'culture', we do not steadily move forward. Instead, we take two steps forward and, unfortunately, one step back. Over and over again.

I see the decades after the end of the Cold War as two steps forward. In the sense of 'fraternity' in Friedrich Schiller's ode *'An die Freude'* (To Joy), a decisive common understanding developed. This understanding included peaceful interaction between countries and open borders for people, ideas and goods. It also led to democratic participation in shaping politics at the national level and to a social market economy which distributed prosperity widely.

It is not my intention to evaluate this time through rose-coloured glasses, but I feel that what is happening today is a step backwards. In the context of globalisation, the cards are being reshuffled in a wide range of areas.

It is almost frightening, for example, to see how scientific knowledge and scientific progress are called into question today. In fact, a fundamentally anti-scientific attitude is spreading – at least in certain social circles – especially in the so-called developed countries.

A field of tension has emerged between faith and evidence:

- Alternative medicine, New Age thinking and sectarianism instead of hard facts in the health sector;

- Climate change and its already emerging consequences are seen as the fake news of politically instrumentalised scientists;

- Increasingly complex statistical procedures and methods provide an even more complex variety of data. The scope for interpretation is correspondingly wide.

The international community is in a difficult situation. The commonalities of countries under the umbrella of the United Nations and its Millennium Goals (such as the 'globalisation of human rights') are increasingly taking a back seat to nation-state arguments. It is clear: in an increasingly globalised world, the nation state is straightforward. The nation state creates an identity that people find easier to relate. The concept of an international community is a lot more complicated. But how far can this constant competition between nation states take us? For those who win this competition, things may initially seem to be all very well. However, two things should be kept in mind: first, a victory can also be a Pyrrhic victory; second, world history teaches us that tensions between countries underpinned by nationalist tendencies are an extremely explosive expression of different 'cultures'.

I take the liberty of telling you all this as a representative of small, quadrilingual and neutral Switzerland. For us, dialogue was and is the irreplaceable instrument for success at national and international level.

Accordingly, we are proud of the fact that CERN was founded on Swiss territory in 1953. During the Cold War, it served as a neutral meeting place, completely independent of political adversity. And its achievements were not only scientific in nature. And it is precisely with all of this in mind that I express my hope that we will soon be able to take two steps forward again towards a common 'culture'. I am convinced that the Russian and in particular the St. Petersburg humanities and social sciences will make a significant contribution to this.

Here, in this city, several generations of people have had extraordinary experiences. These experiences predestine you to help reduce tensions and to actively participate in open dialogue, especially about common human values and a broad-based 'culture'. A certain degree of national pride must and should be permitted of course. But when pride turns into an expression of the Latin word *'superbia'*, it becomes, if not sin, then at least a danger.

In any case, I hope that the future will not bring us a world of small, competing islands, but rather a large, interconnected world with many different facets.

¹ Minister of Education and Research of Switzerland, Dr. Sc. (Law). Holder of a Doctorate in Law from the University of Zurich, held a number of public offices in the canton of Ticino from 1979 to 1999 after passing his bar exam: Judge, Chief of the Cantonal Police, Secretary-General for Education and Culture, Project Manager for the creation of the University of Lugano (USI) and Secretary-General of the USI. Director of the University of Applied Sciences of Southern Switzerland (SUPSI) in 2003. He has been

mayor of Giubiasco, a member of the Ticino cantonal parliament and Chairman of the Ticino electricity works. From 2008 to 2012, he was State Secretary for Education and Research in the Federal Department of Home Affairs.

B. Desgardins¹

THE FRAGILE AND THE RESILIENT

«The most obdurate wills are those most prone to break».

Creon to Antigone

In 2017, markets freed from a deflationary straightjacket overcame every setback. From the market peak on the 22nd January 2018, you could echo *Creon* (“*the most obdurate wills are those most prone to break*”) by reflecting that Donald Trump’s statements on international trade and the Middle East led markets to stumble. Investor optimism gave way to doubt, uncertainty, and even concern. Among the nagging questions are: uncertainty about free trade, concern over the situation in Syria, the forthcoming renewal of the nuclear agreement with Iran, and finally doubts about the longevity of the growth cycle. Grappling with untimely trade statements and aggressive geopolitical posturing, as well as with sometimes contradictory economic statistics, markets saw a resurgence of volatility and feared that Donald Trump might commit an irreparable error.

Far from wanting to ignore the risks, we should try to temper them by showing that a trade war is unlikely. The probability of escalation in the Middle East is moderate and the idea of economic slowdown is premature. Corporate earnings growth in 2018 remains promising, and concern about rising long-term interest rates is for very limited for now.

The Trade Concern: The China – US Trade Relationship

It is indisputable that China, behind its posturing in favour of free trade, distorts the competition rules through government subsidies, protects its market with finicky regulations, encourages the formation of large industrial groups in numerous sectors, and does not hesitate to bail out its companies in distress. The country thus mocks free-market orthodoxy. It is certain that the United States can complain about a \$370 billion bilateral trade deficit with China, because it buys \$500 billion worth of goods from them and sells just \$130 billion to them.

But tariffs cannot be the right answer. The US trade deficit is the result of a shortfall in savings, overconsumption, and a lack of competitiveness among its industrial companies. Raising taxes would not create more jobs in the United States, because the economy is close to full employment. Raising taxes would instead reduce the purchasing power of US consumers or encourage them to buy those goods elsewhere, and this would not bring down the overall US trade deficit. Raising taxes would reduce the competitiveness of US firms which rely on imports of cheap components – it is well known that 60% of US imports are components.

Historically, trade wars have brought no benefits: the notorious US Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 led indirectly to a 60% decline in US exports. The ECB estimates that in the event of a 10% tax on all products imported by Americans and reprisals on all products exported by Americans, US GDP growth, as of the first year, would be reduced

by 2.5 percentage points, i. e. it would fall to 0.5%, and global growth would shed 1 percentage point. At the end of the 1980s, the then-wealthy Japan, with its record trade surplus, barely reacted to US taxes, but that was because, politically, it was in a relationship of servility to the Americans. The situation with China bears no resemblance to that.

Following on from our note earlier this month, «Protectionist threats and risks for the markets», we will try to explain why in a standoff with China, the United States would not necessarily gain the upper hand. China has a massive capacity for reprisal. Fortunately, the consultation period on this issue will continue for two months and US companies can express their reservations up to the 22nd May. In a world becoming increasingly globalised, in which firms are intertwined, it would be difficult to break away from this process.

It is wrong to say that things have got worse. In 2008, the Chinese trade surplus, as a percentage of GDP, was 10%, while at the end of 2017 it was \$422 billion, or 3.4% of GDP. At the time the Chinese currency was undervalued, where now it is no longer so.

The best way to reduce the US trade deficit would be to reduce US consumption, but that would risk putting an end to the growth cycle, and the United States, by cutting taxes, has chosen the opposite route.

The four weapons available to the Chinese are, in decreasing order of probability of use.

The agricultural weapon. Although the US has a large trade deficit in manufacturing, it has a large surplus in agriculture. China’s threat to tax US soya beans would reduce US sales to China, which last year amounted to \$14 billion, and would delight the Brazilians and Argentines, who could thus dispose of their stocks for better prices. US farmers have until June to know whether they are going to plant soya beans or maize (corn), but Chinese reprisals would reduce their revenues, thereby affecting the prosperity of the Midwest states which traditionally vote Republican, and this would not be good for Donald Trump in the upcoming mid-term elections in November. According to the Peterson Institute, the curtailment of soya bean exports could cost up to 20% of jobs in some Missouri counties.

The industrial weapon. The United States plans to tax a whole series of products, but the Chinese can easily counter-attack and hurt US companies such as GM, who sell more cars in China than in the United States. Or Boeing, or Caterpillar. Better still, tech companies such as Qualcomm or Texas Instruments, who generate a large proportion of their revenues in China. Hence the current vulnerability of these companies on the stock market, and their rebound potential if a trade war does not break out.

The Treasuries weapon. The Chinese are the leading holders of US Treasuries, to the tune of around \$1,200 billion. A sell-off, or even a mere sell signal, could push US long-term yields above 3%, and hence make US debt more expensive and undermine the country’s growth. However, this weapon is a double-edged sword, because a Treasuries

¹ General Manager of Banque Eric Sturdza (Geneva, Switzerland). Author of a variety of scientific works, including “New International Economic Environment”, “Globalization Strategies”, “Phenomenon of the Swiss Banking System: Historical Facts and Current Trends” and other works on banking.

sell-off would reduce the value of China's foreign exchange reserves and result in an appreciation of the yuan, which is not necessarily what the Chinese authorities want.

The monetary weapon. The yuan is not convertible, so its exchange rate is set by the Chinese authorities, who could easily devalue their currency by an amount equivalent to the tax added to their goods, to neutralise its impact. This is a possibility in which we do not really see happening, and which the central bank governor, Yi Gang, seems to rule out. It would be a last-ditch weapon, because the Chinese are anxious to consolidate the image of a stable yuan and above all do not want to exacerbate capital outflows. Lastly, devaluing the yuan would require further purchases of US Treasury Bills, which the Chinese are not necessarily prepared to do.

To sum up, the trade war will probably remain largely verbal. The Chinese will make some concessions regarding the deregulation of financial services, the opening of their markets, equity investment thresholds for foreign groups in joint-ventures in China, patent protection and a reduction of the subsidies to certain state-owned enterprises, and Donald Trump will have something to boast about. As regards the NAFTA agreement, which is nearly 25 years old, and the US deficit of more than \$60 billion with Mexico, some adaptations in certain industries such as the automotive sector, should make it possible to extend the agreement.

Geopolitical Concerns over Syria and Iran

The worst is not always certain.
Calderon

After seven years of war, more than 350,000 dead and 10 million people displaced out of a population of 22 million, Syria is a scene of a conflict between the great powers, Russia, the United States, France and the United Kingdom. It is also the theatre of action for regional powers: Turkey against the Kurds, Iran, directly via the Pasdaran or indirectly via Hezbollah, not to mention small Islamist groups. With Assad's use of chemical weapons, the red line laid down by the Americans has been crossed. Trump, wanting to distinguish himself from Obama, who was considered overcautious in similar circumstances, has promised to intervene, but Putin has undertaken to respond. It is hard at this stage to discern which of the two will come to his senses.

The Iranian nuclear agreement signed under the Obama presidency in July 2015 provided for a freeze on nuclear development by the Iranians in return for a lifting of US sanctions, hence the prospect of increased foreign direct investment. Rohani expected \$50 billion per year. But nothing is going as planned. Firstly, Trump, wanting to destroy Obama's legacy and honour an election promise, would like to break this agreement. Secondly, the Iranian population, disappointed by the absence of economic improvement, the 30% fall in the value of the currency over the last six months, inflation still above 10% which is eroding their purchasing power, a high unemployment rate and costly military interventions abroad, is ultimately having doubts concerning the line adopted by the moderate Rohani. The situation is not new, but what has changed are the appointments of Mike Pompeo as secretary of state and John Bolton as national security adviser. Both are hardliners hostile to Iran. The former is a neo-conservative, close

to the Tea Party movement, while the latter famously spoke in favour of military strikes against Iran and North Korea.

Is it possible that, in Trump's mind, these appointments, intended to stoke fear prior to negotiations, will allow him to enter the arena in a position of strength? Or should we consider that John Bolton, the third head of this State Department in just over one year, will not be around for long? Should we deduce from these appointments that the agreement will be broken at the 90-day deadline, on the 12th May? Many fear this outcome, and markets would suffer the consequences, but it is by no means a done deal. The Iranians have not definitively abandoned uranium enrichment, and though they have agreed to reduce the number of centrifuges, that could change quickly. Tearing up the agreement before Trump's forthcoming meeting with the North Korean president on a similar issue would be clumsy, and would push Iran slightly closer to the Russian camp for military security and the Chinese camp for economic assistance. In return for a renewal of the agreement, Iran could agree to rein in the development of ballistic missiles.

Between global hostility to Russia and the regional conflict with Iran, it may be felt that the US Congress will, as it is entitled to do, force its viewpoint on Donald Trump and prefer to renew the agreement with Iran in order to avoid seeing Russia strengthen its presence in the region. John Bolton and Mike Pompeo are both advocates of a hard line against Russia, and they may possibly consider it preferable to step up economic sanctions, because they would hit Russia harder than military skirmishing. This year, Russian GDP growth will probably not exceed 1.7%, and lower interest rates would be problematic because the depreciation of the rouble would cause a resurgence of inflation, depleting foreign investments.

Regional activism. The debate has shifted from nuclear proliferation to the proliferation of ballistic missiles in the region. And on this point, the Saudis, the Americans and the Israelis share the same determination to check this penetration, to intercept the missiles sent by the Houthis and punish Syria for its use of chemical weapons. One positive point is the imminent elections in Iraq, which are expected to mark a distancing from Iran.

Concern about an Economic Slowdown is Exaggerated: Resilience

In the last two months, both the confidence indicators and manufacturing production indicators point to a growth dip in OECD countries and in China. Is this a signal that the peak of the cycle is behind us? Is it a temporary contraction, attributable mainly to harsh weather conditions in the northern hemisphere? We lean towards the second hypothesis, believing in the resilience of growth and an extension of the cycle, and are reassured by prospects of corporate earnings growth of between 8% in Europe and 10% in the United States this year. In other words, current hesitations on the stock markets should fade and give way to a slight rise in the markets.

In the United States, consumption and credit growth, manufacturing production indicators and investment growth, household confidence indicators and activity indicators all converge to suggest a contraction in growth in the first quarter. But the tax cuts are providing stimulus

just when the economy is moving closer to full employment. Setting aside the protectionist threat, the only possible fear would be a shock on long-term interest rates due to the combination of a restrictive monetary policy, i. e. three interest-rate hikes this year, and an expansionary fiscal policy which, according to estimates by Congress, will bring the deficit up to \$800 billion in 2018 and around \$1,000 billion in 2019. So far, nothing is anticipated by the market, because 10-year interest rates have not crossed the 3% mark and a further flattening of the 2-/10-year curve is expected.

In China, car sales were stable in January, rising only 2.4%, and industrial production rose only 6% year on year. And in March, the Caixin business indicator for medium-sized companies underscores a slowdown, as does the PMI indicator for industrial production.

In Europe, quieter economic activity was noticeable in the first quarter and the figures for industrial production in February were not great. However the appreciation of the Euro and bad weather conditions partly explain this. There is no reason to worry about a temporary slowdown, and if it were to continue, the ECB could extend quantitative easing beyond the 30th of September.

In Japan, a slowdown in consumption and a contraction in machinery orders were observed in the first quarter, and the Bank of Japan has pointed to a deteriorating business environment, probably as a consequence of the yen's appreciation, but a rebound in both consumption and investment is expected as of the second quarter.

Conclusion

Could we say, like *Baudelaire*: "*Soon, we shall plunge into the cold darkness / Farewell, vivid brightness of our short-lived summers*"? We don't think so. But what are stock markets going to do? Paradoxically, an upturn could come through the "fragile" rather than the "resilient" aspect. This will be possible if protectionism does not materialize and if the geopolitical crisis is contained. Conversely, resilient growth goes hand-in-hand with high expectations regarding corporate earnings, and the slightest disappointments will be punished.

From the trade viewpoint, rather than erect barriers, it would be better for the Americans to endeavour to open up

markets, and for the Europeans to reflect on the impact of the agreements that China, within the framework of the Silk Road, is negotiating with Eastern European countries. If a trade war is averted, then export-sensitive US cyclical stocks will regain favour with the markets.

From the geopolitical viewpoint, sanctioning Russia economically is less risky than allowing the situation to turn ugly in Syria. That pushes down the Russian stock market and the rouble, and therefore prevents the central bank from lowering its interest rates, discouraging foreign investment and holding back growth, which was previously expected to be 1.7% this year. For investors, two of the possible insurance policies against Middle East crises are buying gold and oil.

In this note, we have not gone back over the old refrain of a pickup in inflation, because there is still no convincing view of this scenario. In light of a situation of near-full employment in the United States, Germany, the United Kingdom and Japan, wage growth would make sense and would cause a rise in long-term interest rates which would be negative for markets. However as many of the jobs created are probably unstable, part-time or self-employed, this growth is proving slow to materialize. The impact of the rises in oil prices and in the prices of other commodities which began last year is starting to wear off. The latest figures published by China point to a fall in inflation, because the PPI (Producer Price Index) for March only increased by 3.1% year on year, well below from the 7.8% posted in February 2017, while core inflation slipped back to 2.1%. In the United States, core inflation in March was only 2.1% and wage growth was 2.6% or 3.3% depending on whether or not the figure is based on constant weekly working hours.

This document is neither an offer nor a solicitation to buy or subscribe to financial instruments. The information contained in this document comes from carefully selected public sources. Although all due diligence has been performed to ensure that this information is accurate at the time of its publication, no guarantee is given regarding its accuracy, exhaustiveness or reliability. Any opinion contained herein in the current context may be changed at any time without notice. Past performance is not necessarily a reliable guide to future performance.

KEY CONTRADICTIONS OF THE WORLD SYSTEM

Introduction

A note on **methodology**: our methodology is based on the dialectical method of inquiry on social analysis: the action, reaction and synthesis; or thesis, antithesis and synthesis. The idea is not new. It was proposed by Hegel and later developed by Joachim Fichte to the point of practical implementation in social inquiry. I would like to show the process, anti-process and the synthesis that may come out of the complex interaction between contradictory (political, social or economic) processes.

The second note is on the title of this paper, which is "Contradictions of the world system in the nearest future". It can probably trick you into thinking, that one can predict the future. I will attempted to show, that there are several processes, new to the kind of world order we know, which are related to the ways and mechanisms of development. One cannot claim that he knows the future or that he can predict the future. We have a much more humble task to show those contradictions that will probably create a new reality. We can see the contours of the future world order based on these contradictions.

The Five Contradictions

Hegemony VS Multipolarity

The first contradiction is a fundamental one. It's the "**hegemony versus multipolarity**" contradiction, which obviously causes the international system to change. The future world order will be somehow formed by the end of this struggle. On the one side of this struggle, there are the US and its allies, on the other side, there are the others. The hegemon, naturally, strives to maintain its hegemony. We are not giving a moral or ethical assessment to it. The hegemon always wants to keep the hegemony in order to secure better life conditions, clearer future and better stability for its citizens, so hegemon or hegemony cannot be called morally or ethically wrong. The problem is that keeping the hegemony is almost impossible in current world order, and therefore the hegemony has to engage in a contradiction with multipolarity, represented by the others. Clearly, the pair of "we versus others" will shape the next years of the world order.

By seeing this struggle it is not difficult to spot the contradiction of "the US + the European Union" (US hegemony with conditional support of EU) versus "Chinese economic challenges and Russian geo-security challenge". As you know, last year China's GDP reached the level of that of the US. It does not demonstrate the quality of life in Chi-

na or the US, but this definitely became the final warning signal to the US, that something is going on.

Another challenge to the US, this time in the area of security, comes from Russia. Syria has shown that the US allies do not have the security monopoly or the security umbrella monopoly in any part of the world. If the Russians can do it in Syria, they can probably do it in other parts of the world, too. This was a pretty strong signal, showing that the security monopoly is broken, and something has to be done about it from the perspective of the hegemon, as it will still be trying to maintain its power.

Because of this fundamental contradiction, the Chinese-US relations will be rather sour in the nearest future but maintained at the low level as both countries need each other. As for Russian-US relations, it is not about personal relations with Russia or its leader as well. It's about Russia's position in the world security structure. Therefore the relations between the US and Russia will also be sour for the years to come. The situation will not change, in the sense that Russia will subordinate or contain the hegemon, which is probably not going to happen in the next eight to ten years.

So what is the reaction of the hegemon to these processes? The hegemon is reacting in the form of inventing new tools, which have not been known yet, in order to maintain its hegemony. The US have come up with a network of agreements, negotiated for the last six to ten years, called "T-treaty trinity": the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP – 12 countries), TiSA – Trade in Services Agreement, and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP with EU). President Trump has been trying to block some of these projects, but in fact, the negotiations are going on. We even think, that Trump's administration is likely to make certain progress in these negotiation processes.

These US projects are all about capturing key positions, using institutional and normative framework, to maintain the hegemonic position of the US and the Europe. It is interesting, that if this happens, 2/3 of the global GDP will be under those agreements. It means that for the years to come a different type of hegemony, not military, not even economic, will create a new world order. The interesting fact is that in neither of those agreements China is presented. Russia is not included wither. In fact, BRICS countries are excluded from those agreements. It's a serious signal, showing the existence of "we versus others" contradiction, where those, who are not subordinated to "our rules", will be excluded from crucial normative and institutional frameworks, that will shape the future.

If you look at statistics, you will see an interesting picture of the world economy. There is a certain level of convergence, a type of visible economic convergence discussed in our book, between two systems: US-dominated system and US-not-dominated system. US and its allies try to maintain the hegemony and subordinate the process to their own benefits. Leaving aside moral or ethical assessments, this is a signal, that we are entering a period of deep structural economic contradictions, in which the process will create more, not only economic, but also political and social tensions.

¹ Director of the Center for Governance and Public Policy at Carleton University in Ottawa (Canada), Ph.D., Professor of Political Science. He is Editor-in-chief of a 19-volume series on Local and Regional Development in Poland (1986–1989) and editor (or co-editor) of 12 other books, the most recent of which are: "Mapping a New World Order: The Rest Beyond the West", "Social History of Post-Communist Russia", "Eurasian Integration: The View from Within", "22 Ideas To Fix the World", "Democracy versus Modernization: A Dilemma for Russia and for the World", "Russia: The Challenges of Transformation", "New Technologies in Public Administration as Reflected by the Canadian and Russian Experience". Honorary Doctor of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (2006), Honorary Doctor of the Russian Federation Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (2007). Member of the Valdai Discussion Club.

Obviously, this will be followed by different types of subordination, which is the media or information subordination. For instance, there are phenomenal changes in the US media, when the media is positioning itself not as a deliverer of information, but rather as a political broker between the systems. Media is not about the facts any longer; it is about the de-legitimization of the other side. The facts are no longer important, but the media is playing an active role in repositioning the structural struggle of the world. It creates the figures of “bad guys” and “good guys”, and no matter what the facts are, these are presented as such. The media is losing its objectivity, becoming a part of the hegemonic struggle, of the “hegemony versus multipolarity” contradiction.

Globalization VS Identity Politics

The second contradiction shaping our future is the “**Globalization (universalization) versus identity politics**” (autonomization of identities, which will lead later to the radicalization of identities) contradiction. One of the main characteristics of globalization is the universalization of norms, culture, behaviour, institutions, system of management and commodification of social relations. The main idea of globalization is to make the economic system going smoother, working better and more efficient, but universalization of behaviour and norms is obviously much simpler. To have one pattern instead of dealing with certain patterns, one solution instead of certain solutions is much simpler. Therefore, universalization is one of the key elements to the current stage of globalization.

At the same time, people do not like to lose their own identity, their own culture, customs, religion, history. Therefore, the reaction to universalization is the identity politics, emerging in different forms: religious aspects, serious gender aspects, ethnic aspect, and so on. One of Iranian leaders, Mohammad **Khatami**, started this process by saying, that we don't need universalization, we need dialogue among different civilizations. The dialogue of civilizations, initiated by Khatami, was then blocked by the hostilities between Iran and the United States.

Identity politics is not a new process, but we are entering a new phase of this process, in which the politics become dependent on identity. Politics react more and more to the identity struggle, class struggle, cultural struggle, many other forms of identity, and finally becomes based on identity groups. These identity groups are mushrooming, pressing on the state to deliver what they think is their own right. These are groups, political parties or social movements, that can be based on culture, religion, social class or caste, culture, dialect, disability, education, ethnicity, language, nationality, sex, gender identity, generation, occupation, profession, race, political party affiliation, sexual orientation, settlement, urban and rural habitation, and veteran status.

In other words, the new identity politics is emerging instead of the larger socially based interest groups, as groups are becoming narrower and narrower. Since the state cannot react to every identity group interests, some of these groups start radicalizing. They think: “If I cannot get what I want, I should be more vocal, more radical, because then the state will listen and then the state will react”.

A classical case is terrorism. “If I cannot achieve what I want by other means, I will use terror as the most radical

means of turning your attention to my problems”. Therefore, the next big struggle is that between identity politics and universalization, which will have consequences for the state policies and state behaviour: the weaker the state, the more it is prone to react to identity politics. The state is no longer reacting to social needs; the state is reacting to the needs of identity groups, which changes the whole dimension of state-to-citizen reaction.

This will obviously lead to more social protests, because the more radical the groups, the more visible they are. This can lead to misbalances between the state and interest groups. A classical case are pensioner identity groups globally, as result of which some states “are paying more attention to pensioners than to the children”. If you look at the EU statistics, you will see one interesting thing: right now, the social spending is lowering every year, with the exception of the pensioners. The children are getting less for health care, while the pensioners are getting more for health care every year in the EU. This is a dangerous notion, indeed.

Wealth versus Poverty

The third contradiction is the “**Wealth versus Poverty**” contradiction. Some basic facts from the World Bank show, that out of an estimated 7.4 billion people on earth, 1.1 billion people live below the poverty level, which is below \$1.25 a day; another 2.7 billion live on less than \$2 a day. This means, that about 40% of our planet lives beyond the poverty level. The point here is well shown in the book by French economist Thomas Piketty called “Capital in the Twenty-First Century”. His main point is that capital tends to reproduce itself. This is not a new idea, Marks was also talking about this. But Piketty is showing that there is a certain oligarchization of capital, which means, that inherited capital has the tendency to grow exponentially and at the expense of other social groups.

Piketty's book was followed by the Oxfam Poverty Report (2017), prepared for the conference in Davos. The report shows, that eight men own the same wealth as the 3.6 billion people, who make up the poorest half of humanity. This is shocking not in moral or ethical terms, but in terms of its possible consequences.

The consequences of this increasing inequality include the following:

1. The influence of democracy: usually we think that one vote corresponds to one person, but now it's increasingly clear, that this democratic theatre is changing into “one dollar = one vote”. We have witnessed two of the most expensive elections in the history of mankind. As Jonathan Nitzan and Shimshon Bichler showed in their book “Capital as power”, capital is becoming political power. They put a lot of economic evidence to show the direct link between capital and political power.

2. Tax avoidance: Superrich are avoiding taxes, because they are capable of keeping their profits in tax heavens. This is an important point, because paying taxes is vital to maintain social stability in countries, which then turn those taxes into social and security benefits. If you're not paying taxes, this means, that those aspects of the state protection will inevitably be diminished.

3. Global control over the labor market: as a consequence, we have a huge struggle to have minimum pay-

ment per hour in most countries, including North America. Statistics show that 300.000.000 people work without minimum payment guarantees. This is manipulation of wages on global scale, not only manipulation of politics.

To sum up, if there is a process of commodification of democracy, this will lead to the end of the myth of the liberal order. This is dangerous for those, who live in this myth of having some influence on the politics and the myth, that their vote means something. This myth is going to end, if we continue to have such huge inequalities, and the consequences of these inequalities will end up the full dimensional myth the western society is based on. In other words, alongside identity politics and hegemony struggle, we are losing trust in the system.

The State VS the Market

The fourth contradiction is an old one, between **the state and the market**. Economists and politicians hold a sinusoidal type of approach towards this key issue: how the state and the market are cooperating or not cooperating, and what are supposed to be the relations between them; whether the state should lead the development or the market should be responsible for the development. In other words, whether the state is supposed to be in charge of our well-being or the market should create conditions for our well-being.

This contradiction is sinusoidal, because some claim, following the Keynesian way, that the state should lead the market. The biggest projects of 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s and so on, like socialism, are based on this idea, and fascism is based on this idea of state leading the market, too. And then you have the 1970s and 1980s, when the neo-liberal economic order is starting to dominate, and therefore the market is to be the main stimulus for development or wealth. In fact, neither of these models worked. The crisis in 2007–2008 showed, that neither market nor the state alone can deliver what they are promising. Therefore, we lose the trust both in state and in market. This means we trust no one, not even banks that are now paying huge fines for manipulating the market during the crisis.

This leads to the point, that entrepreneurs themselves lose the trust in their own system. The solution for the future could be a dual parallel system of the state and the market, where the state plays the role of the corporate insurance company for the nascent productive forces, helping them in order to maintain their market position withstanding competition. This is not the same as the import substitution strategy, because the latter means that the state is helping the market indefinitely. What is going to happen is that the state will base on the corporative advantage of certain sections of the industry, helping them until they become the world leaders to compete. This is the case of China, Taiwan, Singapore, Malaysia, and South Korea. Therefore, there is no longer a debate between the market and the state. The debate is about how deep and in which way these should cooperate in order to maintain the market shared in the global scale and the national level.

The problem is, that if we would like the state to cooperate with the market, we need the state to be relatively strong, which is not the case. The states cannot withstand the pressure of globalization. They become weaker

and weaker. The wave of neo-liberalism led to the privatization of many state services. Then what is the role of the state in protecting our interests as citizens? Nothing, almost nothing. And if the state cannot protect the interests of its citizens, than the state apparatus is no longer needed. Why do we need political parties and parliaments, if they cannot produce politics? Politics means elaborating the choices that should be made by the power, and the power is for taking those choices and implementing them in the form of policies. If we don't have this, why do we need the system we have right now?

This debate between the market and the state is not only about economic forces. It's about the shape of the future of our political system. We are transforming into consumers. The last twenty years saw a phenomenal boom in capital forces. People were earning a lot of money, they had cheap commodities, and they started transforming into consumers. We are no longer needed for the market as citizens, because as citizens we would like to make our own choices, not imposed on us. The problem is, that these two processes are not compatible: the more we are consumers, the less we are citizens.

Power VS Politics

The fifth contradiction, which follows up the previous one, is "**power versus politics**". Power is currently in process of being separated from politics. Power is the ability to fix things, to deliver, to make things happen. Politics is the process of selecting choices for the power to implement. Politics is about whether we need a school or a swimming pool, whether we need more spending on army or schools or hospitals. And then those needs are transferred to the power via parliament process, and the power tries to implement them. So there is a link between politics and power: politics comes first, power comes later.

Now this system is clearly collapsing, because there is less and less power in the hands of the state. Because of privatization and globalization certain state prerogatives are located somewhere else. The money is located somewhere else, therefore the power is outside the national state. So the role of the state is changing, but then the state cannot cooperate with the market the way the market would expect it to do. Therefore, the market is more dependent on external forces, than on the forces located in the national state. As a result of these processes, the power and politics are separating almost to the point, that they are living two independent lives.

In practice this means, that politicians and state machines are living more autonomously than before. They create a shell in which they are somehow living their own small lives, which are very much detached from what we would like them to be doing. We call it "automatization of politics". When you ask a politician why he does something not wise or not rational, the answer is "because I can". The state is creating its own reality. The "autonomization of politics" may lead to interesting political consequences, as the worst conflicts will not depend on "national interests" but on the autonomous decisions of the leadership.

Conclusion

In an article, written with professor Kazarinova, for "Polis" journal, which is called "Fear as politics", we claim,

that these contradictions are scaring. They create fear in all of us, including the elites. The leadership is worried, as it doesn't know what is going to happen tomorrow. "Fear" is not a part of traditional politics, but now "fear" is becoming politics. Most of current policies are based not on rational calculations or our interests, they are based on fear. For instance, migration policies of Poland or Hungary have nothing rational in them, they are based on fear of migrants, not on rational behaviour, European solidarity or whatever, but purely on fear. There are many such example in budget, education, healthcare policies. They fear, that if they do not do something, there will be social

overreaction. Or they fear, that they are not in control, and they would like to impose a hard shell on the soft yolk.

Democratic and non-democratic states are becoming almost the same, they look the same, like an egg with a hard shell and a soft yolk inside. They are trying to present themselves as powerful and strong, but in fact, they are weak. Late professor Bauman was an internationally recognized sociologist, but I didn't agree with his idea of interregnum, something in between, when the old is dying but the new is not clear yet. My position is, that when the old is dying, the new is already there. So the contours of the future are known, the problem is, that we do not know the details.

L. L. Fituni¹

CONTEMPORARY CHALLENGES: SCIENCE AND CULTURE BETWEEN THE JUST WORLD ORDER AND THE "ICE WAR"²

This year, the Russian language and international vocabulary together with it were enriched by a new set phrase – the "Ice War". This word combination is used to denote the state in which political, economic, cultural and even sports relations find themselves in Europe and in a considerable part of the world as a whole. The father of this term is Ivica Dačić, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Serbia. It's well-known that his Motherland was the first country in Europe after World War II, the peaceful inhabitants of which, their houses, hospitals, factories, bridges and cultural properties were massively bombed from the air. The results are great loss of life and material damage, which turned a flourishing country on the Balkan peninsula into a poor soul standing by the doors of united Europe.

Establishment of the new European order in this part of the continent, that followed the aggression, dealt a deadly blow on the monuments of the South Slavic culture, language and science in the primary center of Serbian statehood and cultural identity of this nation.

In his time, Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov, who studied the influence of Bulgarian and Serbian written texts on Russian culture and literature of the 14th – 15th centuries, the so-called the second South Slavic influence, singled out "distinctiveness, expressiveness, adequate communication

of the essence of the expressed with words"³ as its special features. D. S. Likhachov wrote that the word "was the essence of phenomena. To name things meant to understand them"⁴.

I think that this characteristic given by the great Russian scientist engaged in cultural studies, can be applied to the "Ice War" term created by the head of Serbian diplomats, as to expressiveness and adequateness of description. Dačić is sure: "It's not a cold war anymore, it's an ice war, they even want to boycott the World Cup. From Serbia they require to speak on various issues – from incidents in the UK to the trade war with China. Further aggregation of relations between world forces and diplomats' recalls are expected"⁵.

What are the reasons of transfer from the Perestroika (restructuring) and post-Perestroika euphoria with typical for it dreams about the common European house, where we are guaranteed a spacious and comfortable apartment with high-quality European-style decoration, to tough confrontation in political, economic, social and cultural spheres? How did it happen that after a quarter of a century of discussions of the lack of reasons for a cold war as a result of overcoming global ideological conflicts of capitalism and communism by way of our country's refusal from the ideology of the latter, we found ourselves where we are today?

It's necessary to say that there are more similarities than differences between the Cold War and the Ice War. Both are the War of Essences. Opposition in the previous one, the Cold War, was built on the foundation of the "capitalism-socialism/communism" ideology. It was a military expression of the competition between the two systems. Currently, there is no competition of systems. There is even no competition at the nation-state level. There is no need for Russia in its current post-Soviet state to compete with the West. It's required for it to restore its economy, the population, improve its standard of living, restore the areas and sectors devastated by senseless reforms. These are the most important and most urgent tasks of its contemporary development. But the main thing is that Russia should preserve

¹ Deputy Director of the Institute for African Studies of the RAS, Head of the Center for Global and Strategic Studies of the Institute for African Studies of the RAS, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor. Author of more than 280 academic papers, including "Africa and National Interests of Russia" (coauthor), "Africa: Resource Wars in the 21st Century", "The Economy of Global Terrorism", "International Capital Flow in the Globalization Environment", "Financial Monitoring" (educational aid), "Shady Turnover and Capital Flight", "Is It Possible to Overcome Hunger? Main Problem of Emerging Countries", etc. Member of the Academic Council of the RAS for the Issues of Africa. Chief editor of the journal Proceedings of the Institute for African Studies and serial publications Global and Strategic Studies. Member of editorial boards of 6 journals (Asia and Africa Today, Journal of Financial Crime, Journal of Money Laundering Control, etc.). Deputy Chairman of the Expert Council at the Russian Humanitarian Scientific Foundation for Global Problems and International Relations. President of the Moscow Independent Document Center for Issues of Freedom, Democracy, and Lawfulness.

² The paper was prepared as a part of the Fundamental Research Program of the Presidium of the RAS for 2018 "22. Analysis and Forecast of New Global Challenges for Russia". Subprogram "Africa in New Global Realities: Challenges and Opportunities for Russia".

³ Лихачев Д. С. Некоторые задачи изучения второго южнославянского влияния в России. М., 1958. С. 24.

⁴ Ibid. P. 23.

⁵ <http://tass.ru/mezhdunarodnaya-panorama/5067865>

its cultural and civilization identity in order for all that to have a historical meaning, in order for Russia not to disappear.

The united West with the United States at the head destroyed its ideological opponent in the Cold War, i. e. the opponent that had its own global ideological project, aspiring to the role of an alternative cultural and moral core for a part of the mankind in the War of Essences.¹ After the victory, the West disintegrated the alternative ideological and cultural as well as resource space formed by its opponent, the West annexed a part of it immediately, and dealing with the other part, development of which required serious additional resources and efforts lacking at the moment the Cold War ended, was postponed to the future.

Now, this future has come. The "Ice War" for the today's West is nothing more than the "finishing off war" to murder the knocked down rival. But the fallen unexpectedly managed to get on his feet, focused and started dealing rather perceptible successive blows, fighting back. All efforts were engaged in order to save the reputation of the discouraged champion: blows below the belt, crooked referees, the united chorus of paid-for commentators and brawlers at the stands.

Surely, the things said should not be taken literally, a fight in the boxing ring, knockdown and the "Ice War" are metaphors. However, the essence-modeling possibilities of the latter should not be ignored. Individuals form new concepts of the reality in metaphoric nominations, basing on the set images already present in their conscience.²

The end of the Cold War was marked by a number of processes and upheavals, certifying fundamental changes taking place in the global system. It's well-known that wars don't just end by victory of one of the parties and signing a peace treaty on the victor's terms.³ As a result of world wars, victors determine the post-war world model, make the new world order legitimate via the renewed international legal regulation system, correct national laws of the losing side. They dictate the latter their rules of the game. In short, they use strategic fruits of their victory in war, including the right to seize and consume the loser's resources.

Systemic processes have become the determining features for world system development in the late 20th century and early 21st century: internationalization, globalization and integration. They transform it in the direction of overcoming internal separating membranes of state borders and ideally turning (it seems that it's still impossible to achieve in real world) it into the integrated one whole – giant economic macro-cell with the powerful nucleus of the center, surrounded by protoplasm of culturally and civilizationally alien to the center periphery, the role of which is to feed the nucleus, provide its further development and growth as well as protect from unfavorable effects of the environment and help healing internal pathologies.⁴

Various cultural and civilizational areas of the world started feeling the growing impact of desovereignization and other processes referred to the global governance category, after the end of the Cold War and the start of propagating the monopolar world order model. The global picture will be not only incomplete but also distorted if the ties between trends for constructing a stronger pyramid from elements of international and/or supranational governance of world economic processes, sectoral rules of the game and further cultural and civilization evolution are not taken into account.⁵

According to the prevailing in the West contemporary international relations theories, such governance supposes (at least at the declaration level) creation of organizational forms, mostly coming nearer to satisfaction of respective global social demands. But at the same time the governance theory supposes existence of objects and subjects of governance as well as clear goal-setting in the process. If there are no certain goals, tasks, and the tools to achieve both are not outlined, the need in governance does not appear. From the time of the end of the Cold War, the global governance agenda was determined by the countries aspiring to global leadership in the Cold War and bearers of "everything good against everything bad".

The established global rules of the game were invariably interpreted in their favor. The introduced agreements strengthened their economic, political, scientific and cultural domineering in the world. Various international anti-corruption, environmental, anti-doping, anti-money-laundering, anti-dumping and other measures and sanctions are systematically used very selectively. For example, the International Criminal Court (ICC) in The Hague in the course of its 15 years of operation officially brought 41 public suits, all of them against Africans, as results of investigations initiated by the Prosecutor.⁶ African leaders were outraged by such selective attitude of the supranational body of global governance and even dedicated a special summit of the African Union in October, 2013 to this issue. The heads of states and governments of the continent accused the ICC in biasness, calling it a tool of Western imperialism because they think that the attention of the Court to Africa is disproportional. Though the ICC has the global mandate, all nine national cases, investigated by the ICC before January, 2016, referred to African states. Until now, the Court punished exclusively leaders from weak states, ignoring crimes committed by richer and more powerful states. All imprisoned African political leaders turned out to be opponents of the West or lost its support by the end of their term in power. It should not be forgotten that all of them turned out to be the main corruptionists in their countries, besides being charged with war and political crimes. However, the Court at the same time leaves out accomplices and frequent initiators of corruption crimes – big Western business and politicians "developing" African resources.

The monopolar world model established after the Cold War started breaking down in the last decade under the impact of "new" global power centers. The power and influence redistribution process has been outlined on the globe.

¹ *Vladimirov A.* Report on the topic: "Hybrid Wars in the General Theory of War" at the "Hybrid Wars in the 21st Century". Military University of the Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation. January 28, 2015. Moscow. P. 2.

² *Хоречко У. В.* Метафора «войны» в научном историческом дискурсе (на материале «Полного курса лекций по русской истории» С. Ф. Платонова). URL: <https://moluch.ru/archive/31/3526>

³ *Владимиров А. И.* Основы общей теории войны : моногр. : в 2 ч. М., 2012. Ч. 1.

⁴ *Фитуни Л. Л., Абрамова И. О.* Закономерности формирования и смены моделей мирового экономического развития // *Мировая экономика и международные отношения*. 2012. № 7. С. 3–15.

⁵ *Фитуни Л. Л.* Смена моделей мирового развития и глобальное управление в цивилизационном измерении // *Восток. Афро-азиатские общества: история и современность*. 2013. № 4. С. 18–29.

⁶ See: ICC case information sheets for each defendant on the website <http://www.icc-cpi.int/iccdocs/PIDS/publications/...> For example, <http://www.icc-cpi.int/iccdocs/PIDS/publications/KenyattaEng.pdf> etc.

New poles of the forming polycentric international system have been brought forward. Certain countries, e. g. China, India, Brazil, Indonesia, Mexico and others acquired a non-typical for them before economic power and geopolitical importance. At the same time, the West, which won the Cold War, started slowly losing control, at least over some of the world economy governance levers, which until now were at its disposal unconditionally.

Surely, it's still early to say that "old" power centers are unambiguously deprived or will be deprived in future of their economic and geostrategic positions. As the history shows, the period of "economic decline" of any superpower was fairly long until now, except in cases of its crushing defeat at war and following it total looting. At the same time, it was never linear. And the descending powers themselves apply maximum efforts to stay afloat and make the rise of rivals more difficult if not prevent it.

The "Ice War" is one of such consolidated attempts. It has its special feature: though the victory in it is intended finally to provide a new amount of resources to preserve the domineering position of "old players" in the forming world order system, currently this task can be solved without a direct armed conflict with the opponent. Social and humanitarian technologies are becoming the main tools of the "Ice War" – including in culture, science and even arts, reformatting the cultural, historical and civilization matrix of the opposite side, bringing unacceptable damage to it at the same time. Humanitarian technologies are confirmed by new forms and kinds of struggle – psychological actions against the enemy population, operations with employment of social networks, political manipulations, disinformation, etc.¹

The "Ice War" is directed at suppression of the opponent's will, his subordination and turning into a tool to achieve one's own goals. Today, when a direct armed clash with an opponent of the same power is fraught with irreversible breakdown and critical damage for old players, the will suppression component becomes almost the main weapon of confrontation in the new type war. The task of opponent's will suppression is solved by consecutive wide-range increase of pressure on the opponent in all areas – economy, politics, culture, science and technology, sports.

The most important component on this way is psychological pressure not only from the outside but also from the inside. The people are taught to get used to the thought that generally accepted standards of justice, law, morals are not working in case of their country. Decisions may be taken without a court of law and without proof, property can be confiscated at will both from natural persons and a sovereign state, courts of law and arbitration courts use different legal approaches in similar cases, similar international precedents can be at will acknowledged either legitimate or illegitimate. All those separate acts of aggression in the context of the "Ice War" acquire an ominous meaning as a complex wide-range aggression with the purpose to break the will for resistance at first and dispose of the victim later.

As the recent past and the present show, the desired result is more easily achieved by way of winning the elites, whose well-being depends on their being regarded with favor by old players, over to their side. However, if they don't

manage to do that for some reasons, the social life chaoticization process is launched in the country. Political systems and rules existing in it are announced unfit and worthless, and not obligatory for observance. The consequences of that are generally known. We'll give just one example – Syria, though surely others come to mind at once as well.

The changed geopolitical environment and strengthening of Russia's positions in the world, Russian Federation's leadership in a number of defense technologies, convincingly demonstrated in the President's speeches, inclines the states opposing the Russian Federation and influential non-state players to forced advance at our country in the directions, where recently they managed to achieve critically important success by studying the Russian society and its undermining from the inside with a complex of managerial, political, economic, social and cultural technologies.

The increase of the humanitarian knowledge's (science's) role became evident already by the end of the previous century as the fundamental principle of the established confrontation, not inferior to but in long historical periods exceeding achievements in military technology and equipment in strategic importance. In recent decades, the West on the whole and its social science in particular mastered contemporary "hybrid" warfare technologies to be used in humanitarian space.

These threats grow at a big rate. There is significant lagging behind in many aspects in Russia because of underestimating humanitarian defense space and insufficient provision of our humanitarian home front.

Adequate counter-measures are vitally required for the future of the country. Deep fundamental developments, allowing to understand the mechanisms of world development, revealing the psychology of big masses of people and individuals present opportunities for their creative governance in the interests of well-being growth and development of the Motherland, and at the same time allow to successfully resist attempts to undermine and weaken the Russian society. This in essence is equivalent to the task of providing national security and defense potential of our country.

Such knowledge based on strictly scientific analysis, free from manipulations with the data depending on the state of affairs and rushing after unnecessary "scientometric indicators" in humanitarian sciences can in strategic perspective protect the society from the known today information and psychological war means, ideological sabotages, creation of dividing lines and chaos in the Russian society and managing it.

Underestimate of such threats, which are real, and inability to concentrate forces, formulate and adequately provide scientific and technological developments in the humanitarian field, allot the required resources and the required for that efforts, made the Soviet Union, which had giant technological possibilities and military parity with the West in the past, an easy victim of the latter. In the end they led to disintegration of the country.

A similar development model but on smaller scales though frequently with more tragic consequences was repeated in Yugoslavia, Iraq, Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Syria, Georgia, the Ukraine and a number of other countries. The systems of external target society (country) governance are perfected all the time.

The hybrid warfare is transferred into humanitarian space. This is assisted by the so-called social engineering,

¹ Абрамова И. О., Поликанов Д. В., Фитуни Л. Л. Интернет, трансформация обществ и сетевые войны // Российские стратегические исследования. М., 2002. С. 136–150.

a branch of science that has been developing in the West for several decades, and expanding technological opportunities of direct transborder impact on the target object, over the heads of national governments. Influence in global humanitarian space, protection and promotion of one's values are the obligatory conditions for joining and being among the powers aspiring to an independent role in the forming polycentric world.

It is possible to avoid the destructive impact and turn evident failures of the past backwards on some hybrid warfare fronts in humanitarian space, if the system of scientifically verified humanitarian knowledge, fundamental and applied social sciences giving keys for understanding development vectors and the society's demands are formed in advance as well as a set of certain means and mechanisms to efficiently affect their formation in the required direction and in due time.

At the same time, the sphere of culture is almost the main area to be protected and capable to provide victory in the "Ice War". Today, there is unprecedented attacks on the Russian spoken and written language. Scientists are made to publish their best works, first of all, in highly ranked foreign journals, i. e. in foreign languages. Thus, our academic literature is automatically devaluated by the efforts of narrow-minded officials, rushing after easily measured financial efficiency indicators.

It's important to provide adequate and timely financing as well as provide technologies for humanitarian research and development (foreign relations, economics, sociology, political science, history, language, culture, etc.), protecting the public space of Russian civilization and "Russian world" from threats both inside the country and beyond it. The primary task on that way is overcoming the widespread trends and approaches, proceeding from the idea as if any knowledge, initiative, publication, etc. from abroad are *ceteris paribus* "more valuable and significant" than similar domestic ones, and the value of Russian humanitarian research, in the opinion of Russian officials, is determined by acknowledgement of these achievements or approaches by some Western "experts".

The supremacy of English-speaking space in the academic circles leads to the fact that young scientists are focused on publications abroad from the beginning of their activities in science, and thus they are washed out of the Russian academic circles and in future they continue their academic careers abroad. This actually breaks the continuity of generations, helps "brain drain" from the Russian Federation and leads to real destruction of Russian science, which is a direct threat for national security of our country.

Russian culture as a concentrated expression of Russian identity is the main defense line in the "Ice War" bat-

tles. There is no Russia without it. It confirms the society's development level, its creative forces and opportunities for further growth. Studies of technological aspects of intercultural communications are the most important and urgent task. The managed acculturation, or to be more exact, cultural expansion should be put on the level of the most important foreign policy priorities.

I'll give an example of due, in my opinion, attitude to one's cultural riches and national language. It is said in the first item of the official working document of one British organization titled without unnecessary modesty "Britain's Place in the World: A Force for Good?" that the United Kingdom has been considered an irreplaceable global player with the great history of participation in world affairs since the ancient times. It has a wide range of priceless economic, military, diplomatic and cultural values, including the English language, which strengthens the role of the country in building the international system of post-war rules and as an active force when problems are solved all over the world. It's necessary to increase these values in order for them to serve as the basis for positive inclusion of the United Kingdom in world affairs.¹

There is a strict system built in this country for using "soft power" in its national interests. There is a special Committee on Soft Power and the UK's Influence in the Parliament (the House of Lords). By the way, sport in the Committee's documents is unconditionally referred to British soft power tools. As we can see, London is ready to toughly fight for them.

It seems to me that it is also urgently required for us to make support and creative use of the cultural component in academic and popular diplomacy more systemic. Working at the fundamentals of the state's cultural policy was finished more than three years ago, but some problems were revealed over that period, the roots of which are in basic approaches to the cultural development issues. As it is known, the President ordered in the end of the last year to develop a draft Federal Law "On Culture" by July 1, 2018. V. V. Putin said at the meeting of the Presidential Council for Culture and Art that prominent figures in the field of culture should directly participate in working out of the new law, which guarantees its efficiency. The President also thinks that the draft law should be widely discussed by the general public. He also ordered to make provisions for conducting a meeting of the State Council of Russia or the Presidium of the State Council of Russia in 2018 on the issues of preservation and development of traditional people's culture.²

It seems to me that the first and the second will be the most important steps for renewal and revival of academic and cultural policy in our far from simple times.

¹ Report "Britain's place in the world: a force for good?" Thursday 9 – Friday 10 November 2017 | WP1597. P. 1.

² <http://tass.ru/kultura/4931340>

S. Yu. Glazyev¹

THE CONTOURS OF THE RUSSIAN ECONOMY'S FUTURE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WORLD CRISIS

If the governing law for technological patterns' change is well-studied and recognized as a scientific discovery,² the hypothesis of global economic patterns' change requires explanation. The systemic cycles of accumulation discovered by G. Arrighi³ are based on the system of production relations and respective managerial institutions and interests of the ruling elite, setting socioeconomic and political relations.

It's supposed that the world economic development and related to it political changes take place by way of periodic change of global economic patterns, each of which is the system of interrelated international and national institutions that provide for expanded reproduction of the economy and determine the mechanism of global economic relations.

A global economic pattern is the system of interrelated international and national institutions that provide for expanded reproduction of the economy and determine the mechanism of global economic relations. The institutions of the leading country are of the highest importance, providing dominant influence on the international institutions that govern the global market and international trade, economic and financial relations.

Each global economic pattern has limits of its growth, determined by accumulation of internal conflicts as a part of reproduction of the institutions it includes. Such conflicts are deployed until the moment of destabilization of the system of international economic and political relations that have been solved so far by world wars. During such periods, the system of international relations is drastically destabilized, the old world order is destroyed, and a new world order is formed. The possibilities of socioeconomic development on the basis of the existing system of institutions and technologies are being exhausted. Countries that have been leading until then come across insurmountable difficulties in maintaining the previous rates of economic growth. Over-accumulation of the capital in production and technological complexes that are becoming obsolete, casts

their economy into depression, and the established system of the institutions complicates formation of new technological chains. They together with new institutions for production's organization cut a path for themselves in other countries that break through to become the leaders of economic development.

Former leaders are trying to retain their dominance on the global market by strengthening control over their geo-economic periphery, including by military and political enforcement methods. As a rule, this brings about big armed conflicts, in which the aging leader squanders resources without achieving the proper effect. A potential new leader, who is on the raising wave by that time, tries to wait and see in order to preserve his productive forces and attract the best minds escaping from the war, capitals and treasure of the fighting countries. The new leader builds up his capabilities and enters the international scene when fighting opponents are weakened enough, in order to appropriate the fruits of victory.

The basis of the today's global dominance of the United States is the combination of technological, economic, financial, military, information and political superiority. The technological leadership allows American corporations to appropriate the intellectual rent, financing research and development by it to outrun rivals on the maximally wide front of the scientific and technological progress. Keeping the advanced technologies monopoly, American companies provide advantages on global markets for themselves both in efficiency of production and offer of new products. The economic supremacy establishes the basis for the domineering position of American currency that is protected by military and political methods. The United States in their turn finance the deficit of their national budget, forming as a result of inflated defense expenditures, at the expense of appropriation of seigniorage from the emission of global currency.

However, currently the United States hegemony is undermined by unsolvable internal conflicts within the limits of the existing system of capital reproduction institutions. By now, the United States and their allies in G7 have already exhausted the opportunities of extracting resources from the post-soviet countries, in which their own corporate structures have been established and privatized the remainders of their production capacity. The financial war also exhausted itself, the war Washington wages against unprotected national financial systems, tied to the dollar, by way of forcing upon them the monetary macroeconomic policy with the help of the IMF, rating agencies, agents of influence, etc. dependent on it. There is already not enough capital inflow, artificially stimulated in such a way, into the American economy to service the federal government's avalanche-like increasing liabilities, expenses for which are approaching one third of the US GDP. The US financial system's reproduction has entered the blow-up regime – the exponential growth of their national debt and financial pyramids-derivatives certifies the approaching of its self-destruction.

At the same time, the People's Republic of China and India that preserved their economic sovereignty, do not

¹ Academician of the RAS, advisor to the President of the Russian Federation V. V. Putin on regional economic integration, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor. Research supervisor at the Interregional Institute of Economics and Law under the Eurasian Economic Community Interparliamentary Assembly. Author of more than 300 academic papers, including 32 monographs: "The Economic Theory of Technological Development", "The Theory of Long-Term Technological and Economic Development", "The Choice of the Future", "About the Strategy of Russian Economic Development", "Lessons of Another Russian Revolution: The Failure of Liberal Utopia and a Chance for 'Economic Miracle'", "Strategic Prerequisites for Modernization and Innovative Development of Russian Economy", "The 'Ukrainian Disaster': from American Aggression to World War", "The Economy of the Future? Does Russia Have a Chance?", "The Last World War. The United States Start and Lose", "Struggle for Leadership in the 21st Century. Russia-USA-China: Seven Variants of the Foreseeable Future", etc. Chairman of the Academic Council of the RAS for complex problems of Eurasian economic integration, modernization, competitiveness and sustainable development. He was awarded the Order of Friendship, medal "For Taking Part in Creating the Eurasian Economic Union" of the 1st class, the N. D. Kondratiev Gold Medal. Many-times winner of the Person of the Year National Award.

² Глазьев С. Ю. Теория долгосрочного технико-экономического развития. М.: ВлаДар, 1993.

³ Arrighi G. The long twentieth century: money, power and the origins of our times. L.: Verso, 1994.

open their financial systems, demonstrating stable growth in the crisis environment. The biggest countries in Latin America and South-East Asia follow their example, resisting absorption of their assets by foreign capital. China is quickly forming its international payment system by establishing bilateral foreign currency swaps. As the new technological pattern is established, the space for the US Federal Reserve System's maneuvers inevitably shrinks – the American economy has to bear the main weight of devaluation of capital, concentrated in excessive production facilities of the previous technological pattern, financial pyramids and liabilities of the countries in trouble. The gap between real assets and their virtual derivatives that was considered the main reason of the world financial crisis, has considerably increased since then. All that certifies that expansion limits have been reached and possibilities for economic development as a part of the current global economic pattern have been exhausted.

As in the previous periods when the age-old cycles changed, the leader losing influence resorts to enforced methods to maintain his dominance. Encountering over-accumulation of capital in financial pyramids and obsolete production facilities as well as loss of the markets, where they sold their products, and decrease of the dollar share in international transactions, the United States are trying to stay the leader by launching a world war to weaken both their rivals and partners. Establishing control over Russia combined with domineering in Europe, Middle Asia and Middle East gives the United States the strategic advantage over the rising China in control over the main sources of hydrocarbons and other critically important natural resources. Control over Europe, Russia, Japan and Korea also provides domineering in creation of new knowledge and development of innovative technologies.

According to the hypothesis of global economic patterns' change, the United States cannot win the provoked by them world war. The era of American hegemony in the world is coming to the end. The system of institutions that set the American accumulation cycle going, does not provide forward movement of production forces any more. The modern development of production forces requires new production relations and global economic institutions, which could allow providing sustainable development and repulsion of threats to the planet, including ecological and cosmic. These challenges to the existence of the mankind remain without an answer in the environment of liberal globalization, built according to the interests of transnational, mostly English and American corporations.

The rise of China entails reformation of the global economic order and international relations. Revival of planning of socioeconomic development and state regulation of the main indicators of capital's reproduction, active industrial policy, control over trans-border capital flows and limitations for currency – all that may turn from the prohibited by Washington financial organizations "menu" into generally accepted tools of international economic relations. A number of scholars are already speaking about the Beijing consensus as a counterweight for the Washington consensus, as the first one is much more attractive for emerging countries in which most people live. It is based on non-discrimination principles, mutual respect of sovereignty and national interests of cooperating states, orienting them not to servicing international capital but advancement of peo-

ple's well-being. At the same time, a new regime may originate to protect rights to intellectual property and transfer of technologies, it's probable that new standards will be approved for foreign trade in energy and resources, new rules of international migration will be approved, new agreements may be signed on limitation of harmful emissions, etc. The Chinese approach to international politics (refusal from interference into internal affairs, from armed intervention, trade embargoes) provides a real alternative for emerging countries to build mutually advantageous relations enjoying equal rights with other states.¹ China principally rejects use of force as well as imposing sanctions in foreign policy. China always emphasizes expansion of economic and cultural cooperation even in its relations with Taiwan, while Taiwan authorities oppose that.²

Japan, Singapore and South Korea are engaged in formation of the nucleus of the new global economic order together with China. Notwithstanding considerable differences from the People's Republic of China in political organization and mechanisms for economy regulation, there are a lot of sustainable, cooperative ties formed between them, mutual trade and investments grow quickly.

Both neighboring countries – Russia, India, Vietnam, Malaysia, Indonesia as well as Brazil, Venezuela, Cuba and other states in Latin America come up to the forming "nucleus" of the new global economic pattern. The attraction of African countries to it strengthens. The total economic power of these states is already comparable with the countries from the "nucleus" of the American accumulation cycle.

It's possible to determine the following scenarios for development of Russia depending on internal and external factors in the triangle with the United States and China. If in case of the latter it's possible to suppose that the current system of new global economic pattern's institutions will be preserved, and the new global economic system's center will continue formation in the foreseeable future, there are two variants for both Russia and the USA.

The US politics may stay mostly unchanged, and Trump will go on along the previous line, keeping to global domineering, continuing the hybrid warfare against Russia and constraining China. Or he will switch to the common sense policy, acknowledging the realities of the multipolar world and inevitability of transfer to a new global economic pattern. The second way will require cardinal renewal of American ruling elite and looks unlikely.

The variants for Russia differ depending on the home economic policy. In the first case, it stays unchanged. This will mean growing technological falling back of Russian economy, its degradation, decrease of competitiveness and final loss of ability for independent development. The second variant supposes switching to the outrunning development policy on the basis of new technological and global economic patterns. It supposes sovereign monetary and crediting policy and mixed strategy of economy development: accelerated increase of investments; dynamic catching up in the spheres with relatively small technological "lagging behind"; catching up development basing on import of modern technologies in the areas of hopeless lagging behind.

¹ Ramo J. The Beijing Consensus. L. : The Foreign Policy Centre, 2004.

² The talk of V. Popov and P. Dutkiewicz. 22 Ideas for the World Arrangement (talking to outstanding scientists). M. : Изд-во Моск. ун-та, 2014. P. 470–471.

Let's review the following variants.

1. Status quo. Each of the three countries continues the current policy. For Russia that will mean growing falling behind both the new and the old centers of the global economic system. It will lead to weakening of military and technological power, comparative worsening of the standard of living and reduction of social support for the authorities. The weakening of the latter will provoke increase of the United States' aggression against Russia that will include intensification of military provocations on the part of the neo-Fascist regime in the Ukraine controlled by the United States, escalation of terrorist activities in the Caucasus and the Volga Region, destabilization of social and political situation in the capital cities of the Eurasian Economic Union (EAEU). At the same time, the People's Republic of China will increase its influence in the economy of Russia and the EAEU. Chinese investments en masse as a part of bringing the Silk Road Economic Belt (SREB) doctrine into life will adapt them to requirements of the Chinese economy's development. The EAEU will hardly stand the test within the framework of this scenario and break up under the pressure from opposite directions by the United States and China, with weakening Russia. The Eurasian integration will also be tested for strength between the old and the new global economic centers. Russian economy will become a set of poorly tied with each other enclaves, serving various segments of the global market, which creates prerequisites for destabilization of the political situation and transfer to the next variant of development of events.

2. American colonization. Domination of pro-American forces in home policy restores in Russia in the environment of increasing socioeconomic difficulties. Concessions are made under the pressure brought upon Russia by the West in order to lift sanctions, and that entails intensification of American aggression up to establishment of a puppet regime in Russia. Nuclear disarmament of Russia and its following disintegration are effected by this puppet regime. Russia loses its sovereignty, the EAEU ceases to exist, Middle Asia becomes the area where China dominates.

3. Chinese periphery. Russia's strategic partnership with China is filled with real contents in the environment of the growing falling back and worsening economic situation in Russia. Joint programs for interlinking of the EAEU and the SREB are brought into life thanks to Chinese financing. Chinese investments en masse are directed to development of Russian fuel and energy, agribusiness and transport complexes, which are reoriented to the demands of the Chinese market. The military-industrial complex is developed according to the goals of external protection of the Collective Security Treaty Organization and the Shanghai Cooperation Organization. The remains of the civil high-tech industry's potential are absorbed by joint Chinese-Russian ventures. Russia preserves political sovereignty and equal military and political partnership with China, while its economy becomes a Chinese "periphery".

4. Isolation and intervention. This is the worst variant for Russia, in case of which China joins anti-Russian sanctions. In this case, Russia finds itself in total isolation, losing both foreign currency reserves and foreign markets. If the current economic policy is maintained, this entails catastrophic worsening of the standard of living and destabilization of social and political situation. There is a big probability of the EAEU disintegration. Social and political destabi-

lization in Russia provokes external aggression that may take the form of the country's division into areas of influence between the old and the new global economic centers.

5. Isolation and mobilization. The still existing in Russia research and production, military and technological, intellectual and spiritual potentials as well as natural resources allow surviving and independently developing based on formation of the mobilization variant of integral global economic pattern in case of global anti-Russian front. It supposes complete de-offshorization of economy, transfer of the most part of foreign currency reserves into gold, introduction of currency control and limitations for trans-border operations with capital, obligatory sale of all receipts in foreign currencies. It will also require review of the privatization results, introduction of progressive taxation of incomes and property, resource rent in favor of the state, without which it will be impossible to achieve restoration of justice required for mobilization of public conscience. The monetary and crediting policy should be subjected to the modernization goals and production growth. State corporations, banks, ministries and departments should operate according to strategic and indicative plans and be responsible for their fulfillment. However, the today's ruling elite is principally incapable to do all that. Practically full replacement of it will be required – both in administrative authorities and in business.

6. Russian-Chinese strategic partnership becomes real when new global economic pattern's institutions are formed in Russia and there is a transfer to the outrunning development strategy. Common development plans are worked out, big joint investment projects are brought into life, the interlinking of the EAEU and the SREB is filled with real contents. Big Eurasian partnership is established. Russian high-tech products are sold on the Chinese market. Russia joins the "nucleus" of the new growth center of global economy. In case of this variant, the growth rates of Russian economy achieve the maximum figures – up to 10% growth of annual GDP and 20% growth of investments. An expanded anti-war coalition is established, in which Russia, China and preferably India participate. In this case, it's also supposed that the Russian ruling elite will be considerably renewed.

7. The United States, Russia and China partnership. An unlikely at the moment scenario with lifting anti-Russian sanctions and establishment of friendly relations based on acknowledgement of joint liability for keeping peace and inevitability of transfer to a new global economic pattern. The criterion of this variant's reality is cessation of American occupation of the Ukraine and anti-Russian aggression. This is the most comfortable for Russia but unstable scenario, the efficiency of which will depend on the carried out economic policy. In case it remains unchanged, events may leave this track and take scenario 4.

At the same time, variants 4 and 2 are impossible while V. V. Putin is the President of Russia. They may become actual only as a result of a "color" revolution or coup d'état.

Proceeding from the definition of politics as the art of the possible, the preferential for us is movement according to variant 6. It practically does not depend on the United States influence, allows protection of ourselves from threats coming from them by cooperation with China as well as achieve the maximally high rates of economic growth. In case this variant is realized, there are prerequisites for bringing the seventh, the most favorable scenario, into life.

An. A. Gromyko¹ (1932–2017), Al. A. Gromyko²

THE FOOTHOLDS OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORDER

In what direction is the world going now, at what point of international relations and world politics do we find ourselves, why do many of us feel uneasy or alarmed?

Confrontation dominates in relations between the great powers, and growing rivalry at best. More and more hot-heads hype up the topic of such confrontation's inevitability. It's required to keep the coolness of judgments in this environment. One of them is that even after all reductions of armaments by Russia and the United States in recent decades, their military power as, by the way, the power of other nuclear-weapon states is so great, that it would be irresponsible to the highest degree and even a crime to think that the mankind can survive World War III.

The world community lives and acts in the environment of persistent seeking, even chase after world order concepts, many of which originate on the diplomacy's and social sciences' horizon and then are quickly forgotten. This search is inseparably connected with the change of the power balance in the world politics, which in its turn is a whole set of important factors. Many of them are often forgotten. For example, about the strength of law, about the role played in the world politics by the United Nations and the UN Charter, no matter what.

The UN Charter is a small book when you hold it in your hands. But what about its importance? If you want it, the UN Charter is the child of May 9, 1945. It is an inalienable part of the Victory Day, defeat of Fascism, of

the Army, which was considered invincible before clashing with the Soviet Army.

Currently, the world lives in the grip of two forces: international relations are threatened with chaos, which threatens all of us; the second force is the growing interdependence of all on all. Chaos is growing "somewhere there", in the Near and Middle East, in North-East Asia, on the big expanses of Africa, but the whole Europe shudders, risks for Russia are increasing. The Old World feels giant pressure because of the inflow of refugees, terrorist acts against Europeans and sometimes arranged by Europeans, become more frequent and bloodier.

The nation-state institute serves a foothold besides sufficient armaments and peaceful settlement of disputes, inadmissibility of the use of mass destruction weapons. The world politics is still made mostly by states, though it's beyond question that new players joined big politics in the 20th century besides them, first of all, transnational corporations and big non-governmental organizations. However, the process of many states' disintegration goes on in parallel, sometimes pushed by external "well-wishers". But surely not always. A wide-spread reason is inability to efficiently handle freedom acquired in the second half of the 20th century and manage with the legacy of the colonial past, overcome problems gotten as a result of disintegration of the Ottoman Empires and European empires.

As for the outside pressure with the goal to reformat these or those states, deprive them of a part of sovereignty or fully subjugate, the people of the countries, which are experimented on, start resisting this process as an answer. This phenomenon requires special attention. For example, announcement that a number of states are social outcasts can be a method of such disintegration, after which, in essence, it's possible to do everything you wish with them. Radicalization of the society is a response to intrusion from the outside, extremist and terrorist organizations come to the foreground. The example of Libya is demonstrative. It's possible to destroy a state, but destroyers have not thought up anything except restoration of the same state instead of it. Even where there is no efficient and viable state in practice as in cases of Kosovo, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Abkhazia or South Ossetia, the great powers prefer to call their de factor protectorates states again.

Another example of a nation-state's strong resistance to the policy of its desovereignization is the modern history of the European Union. The idea to delegate a part of sovereign authorities to supranational structures has its convincing reasons, first of all, understanding that it's required in today's world to unite efforts for solution of transregional and global problems. But after the supranational bodies of authority are established, they as any bureaucracy start not only reproducing themselves but strive for expanding their authorities. The "uprising" of Euro-skeptics in one of the leading EU member – the UK – and the following Brexit became the result of this governing. Those who think it to be an accidental phenomenon are mistaken. There are no accidents on these scales in history. It's possible to arrange

¹ Soviet and Russian diplomat and scientist, specialist in American studies, African studies, and foreign relations. Dr. Sc. (History), Cand. Sc. (Law), Professor. First secretary, counsellor of the USSR embassy in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (1961–1965). Minister counsellor of the USSR embassy in the USA (1973), minister counsellor of the USSR embassy in the German Democratic Republic (1974). Director of the Institute of Africa of the USSR Academy of Sciences (1976–1991). Corresponding member of the USSR AS (1981). Head of the Politics Evaluation Center, Senior Research Associate of the Institute of Africa of the RAS (2003–2010). Since September 2010, Professor of the Faculty of Global Politics, Lomonosov Moscow State University, author of an advanced course on history and work of the United Nations Organization in modern times. Ambassador Plenipotentiary and Extraordinary, Class 1. Awarded with the Order of October Revolution, Order of People's Friendship. Laureate of Russian State Prize (1980), Vatslav Vorovsky Prize (1985). Member of the Creative Union of the Artists of Russia.

² Director of the RAS Institute of Europe, corresponding member of the RAS, Chairman of the Coordination Council of Professors of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Political Studies), Professor of the RAS. Author of more than 150 scientific publications, including monographs: "Political Reformism in Great Britain", "Modernization of the Party System of Great Britain", "Images of Russia and Britain: Reality and Prejudices", "Building Good Neighbourliness. Russia in the Territory of Europe" (co-author), "Ten Years of Negotiations Better than One Day of War. Memories of Andrei Andreyevich Gromyko" (author and redactor), "Memories of Nikolai Shmelev" (editor and redactor), "21st century Europe. New challenges and risks" (editor and redactor), etc. Chief Editor of "Modern Europe" journal. Chairman of the Council of Experts of the Institute of Linguistic Civilizations and Migratory Processes of the Russkiy Mir Foundation. President of the Association of European Studies of Russia, member of the bureau of the Department of Global Problems and International Relations of the RAS, member of the Scientific Council of the Security Council of the Russian Federation and the Scientific Council of the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs. Head of the Department of theory and history of international relations, Institute of International Relations and World History, Lobachevsky Nizhny Novgorod State University. Honorary Doctor of The Paisii Hilendarski University of Plovdiv (Bulgaria) and Voronezh State University. Laureate of the Prize of the National Science Support Foundation (2004, 2006).

a “melting pot”, which is certified by the history of many empires and countries, but only within the framework of federations, quasi-federations and multinational states. But it turned out too much even for the EU to arrange a “melting pot” from the already existing and mostly old states.

After the terrorist attack on the twin towers of the World Trade Center in New York, an extremely harmful slogan “you’re either with us, or against us”¹ again won in the world politics, i. e. the slogan that is in no way in conformity with the force of law based on the UN Charter. Even such a loyal to the United States organization as the EU encountered a nearly blatant dictate, including Washington striving to use its national laws extraterritorially to promote American business interests on the international scene.² This example serves another one, in this case negative proof of the fact that nation-states go on calling the tune in the world politics. And those, who seek to create new subjects of international relations based on refusal from the nation-state concept, can’t oppose that effectively.

Socioeconomic factors are not frequently discussed now. But terrorism is impossible to destroy not only because it is often terrorism of individuals or small groups of extremists, origination of which it’s difficult to follow. The problem is that terrorism is fed by the constant information about well-being of ones and sufferings of others.

Where does such fanatical devotion come from, such ineradicable wish to fight as a member of terrorist organizations? It’s impossible to buy everyone, isn’t it? Yes, there are a lot of mercenaries, professional fighters loving the business. But there are no less of those among the fighters who grew up in poverty, who long ago lost all hope to achieve anything in a normal way, uneducated people but in a rage because of injustice in the world, including those revenging deaths of relatives and people close to them as a result of actions of various international military coalitions. It’s not possible to justify the acts of terrorists but it’s necessary to understand their motives, otherwise it’s impossible to really fight this phenomenon.

Hence the “new populism” phenomenon, including Euro-skepticism – the direct consequence of the unexpected phenomenon for the welfare state. Unexpected because from the point of view of neoliberal economic theory and practice of the period of Thatcherism and Reagonomics, it still seemed not long ago that magic recipes for solution of the problems of economic crises, inflation and unemployment had been found.³ But then it turned out that the neoliberal globalization model requires replacement. In some aspects it helped development of global markets in the 1980–90s in the interests of big masses of the population in post-industrial countries and in a number of emerging countries, including China, but by the second half of the 2000s it exhausted its performance potential, became an obstacle for substantiating the world becoming polycentric with a respective, more just economic basis. The world financial and economic crisis of 2007 – 2009, its consequences became a striking evidence for that.

The next foothold. We’ve been celebrating the great Victory Day on May 9 year after year. But only experts remember two other dates: June 26, 1945 – the date when

the Charter of the United Nations Organization was signed, and October 24 – when the Charter came into force (the United Nations Day since 1947). This is the formation, the start of the new world order with the UN and contemporary international law as the nucleus. With the benefit of a hindsight at our times, we are again convinced that the war was won surely first of all to liberate our country and other states from Nazism but to no less extent for establishment of new rules for global co-existence based on the force of law, embodied in the UN Charter.

It was no easier in some aspects to establish the UN by peaceful means than defeat the enemy with arms. Thank God, there were no military victims in this political and diplomatic battle. But this victory of the common sense and wisdom of the winners, undoubtedly, saved the world, first of all Europe from new uncountable misfortunes and tragedies. Andrey Gromyko, the head of the USSR delegation in Dumbarton Oaks and later in San Francisco after Vyacheslav Molotov left for Moscow (Molotov headed the Soviet delegation from April 25 to May 8), did a lot for that.

Comprehension of the post-war history raises an extremely important issue of sovereignty and independence. It’s clear that there can be no independent foreign policy without sovereignty. Because of that subjugation of the foreign policy to interests of someone else leads to sovereignty’s blurring, gradual actual subjugation of one state by the other. Such states can say as it was usually done that they take decisions guided by their free choice and responsibilities of allies, but really there is exactly subjugation at the back of it.

Surely, sovereignty does not mean autarchy, on the contrary, the most active foreign policy and interaction with the widest circle of international relations subjects are required for its assertion. But the state should clearly understand where its national interests end and the interests of the others start. At least, such a behaviour is typical of the great powers that have no reasons to pay for providing their security by cessation of a part of their sovereignty in favour of the “big brother”.

The footholds of not just order but law and order are surely the principles on which the United Nations Organization is based. Everything can be changed, any norm can be improved, but the principles achieved through sufferings of the mankind in the course of World War II and in its epicenter – the Eastern front in Europe – should be left as they are. But if you start shattering these principles, doubt them to accommodate some here-and-now profits or chasing the former greatness, or you start using the UN to settle geopolitical accounts with other members of the Security Council, only dismantlement of the international security system can be the outcome of such a policy. And that happened in the recent quarter of the century at the rates unseen even in the Cold War period. And that was notwithstanding a sincere, though naïve wish of Russia in the 1990s to inline in the West’s channel, and then notwithstanding its striving in the beginning of the last decade to establish mutually advantageous partnership with the United States and their allies.

The world politics balances between the rule of law and the rule of force. Fragile relation of tough military force and force of compromise, diplomacy characterizes the state of the world politics and international relations. And we should acknowledge that diplomacy and “soft power”

¹ Literally: “You’re either with us, or you’re on the side of the terrorists”, see, e. g.: <https://iz.ru/news/252080>

² <http://tass.ru/ekonomika/4770649>

³ *Boote R. The Death of Inflation: Surviving and Thriving in the Zero Era. L. : Nicholas Brealey Publishing ; New Ed edition, 1997.*

are currently on the defensive. Relations of the East and the West go on downhill and no serious breakthroughs are seen in the foreseeable future.

China is also meant under the East, and not only Russia. Today, the confrontation of Washington and Beijing is not as strong as in case of Moscow. But actually the American military strategy as well as the economic strategy are directed at long-term confrontation exactly with the Middle Kingdom. Recently, the attention of the whole world was mainly drawn to the conflict of the United States and Russia. But for serious analysis of American behaviour we should not forget that the main opponent for the United States ideologically is communist China, the state with the one-party system and one fifth of the world GDP and not Russia that switched to capitalist rails long ago and the economy of which is incomparably smaller. We'll mention that the defense budget of China (more than US\$ 150 billion in 2017) already exceeds the Russian defense budget several times and it appears that the gap between them will increase.

The inability of the great powers to return political trust to their relations seems unallowable luxury with really global for the mankind problems of utmost importance and threats as the background. It can't be said that the state of affairs is absolutely hopeless – let's remember the Lavrov – Kerry diplomatic channel. But how many times their agreements, first of all related to the state of affairs in Syria, were torpedoed by other American departments? The previous United States administration in the end of its term did everything possible to send Russian-American relations to a dead-end, having no scruples about any mean methods – let's remember mass expulsion of Russian diplomats from Washington just before the new 2017 year.

"The Skripal case" became the new chapter in anti-Russian sentiments in the West, accusations of Russia in this

case reached the scales of absurdity and trampling upon diplomatic norms unseen even in the Cold War. The UK after the USA plunged in the very depth of anti-Russian hysteria on its own free will. They are trying to drag as many states as possible after them into this whirlpool, appealing to Euro-Atlantic solidarity. As if solidarity means blind pursue of any absurdities and political mystifications.

* * *

One can hear often: "Well, why do you, Russians, blame the West for everything?" This argument is wide off the mark. Western politicians are not blamed in Russia for everything but they are blamed because one should not act like a bull in a china shop on the international scene. One should not accuse Russia with an occasion and without a pretext. One should not turn another big power into a punching bag because of the internal political war in the United States or the desperate situation and T. May in the UK. The status of other great powers is acknowledged in Russia, they are considered important partners in solution of many global problems. If Western partners think that Russia is wrong in something, this is not a reason for blackening it. Russia does not act in this way.

Moscow comprehends both the potential of the country and limitations of its opportunities. Russia acts much more carefully, prudently and verifying its steps on the international scene than those eager to start a new cold war against it.

What are we seeking to prevent and what are we seeking to achieve in the today's environment? World War III should be prevented, and a balanced and stable global regulation system should be achieved. Is it possible to solve these tasks in the environment when the idea of a "new Cold War" is escalated? The question is rhetorical.

A. A. Guseynov¹

THE NOTION OF CULTURE IN THE MEANING OF MARX'S ELEVENTH FEUERBACH THESIS

The topic of the Likhachov Scientific Conference 2018 "The Contours of the Future in the Context of the World's Cultural Development" can be interpreted in two ways: on the one hand as a look into the future through the prism of culture; and on the other – as a glance on the culture through the prism of the future. In this essay I will focus more on the second aspect, starting from the understanding of the future in the philosophy of Karl Marx in the way it is expressed in his "Feuerbach Theses".

1. The eleventh Feuerbach Thesis by Karl Marx goes: "Die Philosophen haben die Welt nur verschieden interpre-

tirt, es kommt darauf an sie zu verändern". (The philosophers had only explained the world in different terms, and the thing is, we need to change it.)² It is as closely associated with the name of Marx and has become as much of a saying in itself as "Workers of the World, Unite!" (both of these, I might add, are etched on Marx's granite tombstone). This thesis is more than just a vivid expression, although it might be quite a statement; it represents a fundamental formula that contains the first principle of Marxist philosophy. In the meanings of a traditional vocabulary, against which this thesis is actually directed, the essence of what is being expressed could be called the "doctrine of being", the metaphysics of Marxism. The central message of this doctrine, as summarized in the eleventh thesis, was formulated at the very beginning of the same text (in the first thesis). It consists in viewing the "subject", "reality", "sensuality" not in the form of an "object", as would be the case in materialism, and not as an abstraction generated by the sub-

¹ Principal Adviser for Academic Affairs of the Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, full member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor. Author of over 500 scientific publications, including books: "The social nature of morality", "The Golden Rule of morality", "Great moralists", "Language and conscience", "Philosophy, morality, politics", "Ancient Ethics", "Negative ethics", "The great prophets and thinkers. Moral teachings from Moses to the present day". Managing editor of the year book "Ethical Thought", the journal "Social Science" (in English), the member of the editorial boards of the journals "Philosophical Sciences", "Problems of Philosophy". Vice-president of the Russian Philosophical Society. Laureate of the State Award of the Russian Federation in the field of science and technology. Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS.

² Маркс К. Тезисы о Фейербахе // Маркс К., Энгельс Ф. Соч. 2-е изд. М.: Госполитиздат, 1955. С. 4.

ject itself, as would be with idealism, but as “human sensory activity”, “practice”.¹ In this doctrine Marx considers the world of things as a form of human sensory activity, and the human sensory activity as a form of substantive work.

Being is therefore viewed not as the world which is external in relation to man and equal to itself but as human practice. That is to say, the practice not in the abstract sense, not as an idea or a philosophical premise but as pure practice: substantive work of the people in the form which it actually takes in history. And, when Marx juxtaposes the explanation of the world to changing it, he does not, in all actuality, deny or discredit this explanation or question it. He only suggests not to vest it with a self-sufficient meaning, but to consider it as a moment in reality, that philosophy claims to explain. He means, in fact, that one should not stop at the level of explaining the phenomenon. For example, in his *German Ideology*, Kant is criticized for having considered goodwill alone as sufficient; even when such goodwill does not bear fruit, and having moved the exercise of this good will, the harmony between the said will and the needs and desires of individuals, into the other-worldly experience,² that is, not for the idea of goodwill, and not even because it is viewed as the opposite to needs and desires of individuals, but because it is not inscribed in the real-life historical context. The fact that consciousness is secondary to being does not mean that being came before consciousness, which is only revealed second (such an interpretation is admissible as a methodological tool in the framework of materialistic epistemology). In fact, consciousness is immanent in being, and cannot be understood apart from it, just as the very existence does not exist and cannot be adequately understood outside the consciousness generated by it. It is this inclusion of consciousness in being as its secondary, but, nevertheless, unchanging product, by virtue of which both become the two aspects of living and cooperative individuals, that generalization in the category of practice is obtained.

The practice as a philosophical notion has two particular features that set certain parameters for understanding of culture. This understanding removes the abstract juxtaposition of being and consciousness, which serve as mutually connected, albeit not equal, parts of publicly organized practical activities. It therefore follows, that, firstly, public practice covers the whole of the world, in all its holistic representation. As part of the public being, consciousness is not seen as separate to being; it is immersed in being, is immanent to being, and the philosopher who is cognizant of the being, is incorporated into it as a thinking body. Secondly, the issue of what is being conceived (or thought of), of what the being is, is directly related to those who conceive (or think) of things.

2. Culture in its most general form is defined through its correlation (comparison) with nature – as that which is not nature is different from it and forms its own, artificial world. Here is a vivid example: almost all the concepts that characterize human beings and their existence have analogs in nature: as we describe natural life in any of its aspects, we talk about the concepts of beauty, morality, thinking, language, social setups, architecture, power relations, etc. But when we talk of nature we never mention culture: this

notion has been reserved for human beings and their activities, and it is called upon to differentiate between the natural and the man-made. Culture represents the second, non-natural, nature of the human being. This statement as any tautologous argument possesses an intuitive kind of clarity. Problems, theoretical difficulties and disagreements start when we seek to clarify the essence of the cultural, this second nature of the human being, and relate it to his or her original nature.

The difference between culture and nature is not visual, sensual, or objective; we cannot separate one set of things from another and say that some belong to nature and others to the world of culture. Further, we cannot draw a visible boundary between the natural world of nature and the artificial world of culture. The fact is, culture exists, and it is always presented through the substance of nature; in all its manifestations it is presented in a material, sensual, bodily manner. As Marx and Engels wrote, “the spirit is initially cursed to be “burdened” with issues of matter... in the form of the language”.³ The substance of nature as it changes in the process of cultural processing, does not change its natural form; and even if it does, it follows own natural laws in the process. Antiphon the sophist had provided quite a vivid example of that: if you put olive stalks in the ground, he said, olive trees will grow, and if you plant a bench made of olive in the ground, then an olive tree might grow again, if anything grows at all, but do not expect to grow a new bench. The culture does not change nature in its internal necessity, it just gives it a new meaning, incorporates it into a different, precisely human, system of relationships and goals. Human beings cannot change the nature of a tree, they can only use the tree for their own purposes, turn it into a bench, so that they could sit on it and talk; into a pipe, so that they could play it, into the butt of a rifle so that they could fight with it, etc. In short, culture does not exist outside nature, with the latter being a real empirical (live and dead world) that follows its own laws and causation.

But does nature exist outside of culture? In our sober contemplation of this world we never doubt that it had existed before there were any humans of culture, and it will obviously continue when (or if) humans should disappear. The question is: does it exist outside culture only since the human beings appeared and created culture; is it somewhere in the vicinity of culture but no longer in its realm? In other words, is the nature just one part of culture, or is nature fully incorporated into the cultural space? Again, it is obvious that nature, when viewed across its entire range of breadth and depth, is full of uncharted secrets, the places that no humans had been before; such secrets and places are considerably more numerous than what we are aware of, but even they are not primordial, they are also facts of culture, for they are marked within culture – accordingly – as spaces of unexplored secrets that no humans had gone before. Moreover the human mind has conceived on nature as something endless and eternal, and we find joy in it. We like that we do not know much more than what we do know; the paradox of cognition says that as your knowledge grows, the space of what you do not know expands. Human beings master nature in the form of culture. First and foremost, this is done through language: there is no direct link, human beings enter into nature as natural (physical) beings, and this serves only a starting point, from where the human

¹ Маркс К. *Op. cit.* P. 1.

² Маркс К., Энгельс Ф. *Немецкая идеология* // Маркс К., Энгельс Ф. Соч. 2-е изд. М.: Гос. изд-во полит. лит., 1955. С. 182.

³ Маркс К., Энгельс Ф. *Немецкая идеология*. С. 29.

beings proceed to naming cultural events, assigning them meanings. Further, the human being perceives nature sympathetically, in the context of his or her own conscious activities, insofar as it is included in this activity, through its goals and values, through social relations that frame and cement it. In this sense, the attitude of a human being to nature is fundamentally subjective, it is expressed in that it imposes its own imprint on it, turns it into an ideal form of being, elevates it to the level of truth, evaluates, normalizes, brightens it, or mythologizes, deifies, dehumanizes it, etc.

Human beings are different from other living beings: the power of human life is not in the body, but in his or her conscious soul. The body is, as the Stoics believed, only a vessel, and the real body of a human being as a carrier of life is all of nature transformed into forms of culture. In this sense culture is equivalent to signs and symbols of the public form that all nature (matter) acquires in the process of human activities. In this sense, there is no nature outside culture; I should add “for humans”, although saying “no nature outside culture” is the same as “no nature outside culture for human beings”, if we should recognize that the objective character of nature is a cultural fact in itself. The understanding of nature in the light of Marxian philosophy, which differs from all previous philosophies in that it is a philosophy of historical materialism, is defined very precisely by György Lukács, who characterizes nature as a “social category”. “The way in which the relationship between nature and man is arranged, the understanding of ways in which man encounters nature, in brief, what defines the form and content of nature, its scope and objectivity, is always a result of social construction”.¹ The images of nature are historically conditioned, secondary in relation to culture, which is proven by the fact of their very diversity – descriptive (from chaos to the totality of eternal laws) and value-oriented (from fierce opposition to the state of moral tranquillity). The unity of nature and culture is especially visible when it comes to comparing the natural conditions of labour and labour itself in all its manifestations through history. The natural conditions of labour, such as soil fertility, influence the growth of production; but that does not lead, in turn, to the reverse dependency, and does not mean that more favourable conditions would necessarily lead to growth of production. They only define the natural boundary beyond which surplus product generation is possible; “this natural boundary is forced back as the industry progresses”.²

Therefore, the being that we understand as the being of humans, as a form of activity, practice, presupposes unity, merger between nature and culture: the nature is objectified, sensuous content of culture, and culture is the human form of nature’s being. We can even say that culture is nature itself at the highest stage of its evolutionary development. As human beings evolved, their being acquired a public form, and was hence defined only as such,³ and nature merged

with culture and transferred into it. Nature, which was conceived of as the opposite to culture, its mere prerequisite, is now incorporated into the cultural process so completely and concretely that it has become obvious: it is already a prerequisite for culture as its result.

3. The unity of nature and culture is proven not only by the grand successes of the human race, making humans sovereign masters of the planet Earth and opening them a gateway to space, something they had wanted to do since times immemorial. It is even more clearly and convincingly manifested in their negative dependence on each other, expressed in the fact that human beings, involved in destructive forms of their cultural activity exerts such a destructive effect on nature that it produces an inverse effect and destroys the human beings and their culture in return. Gary Bardin’s recent cartoon, entitled “Listening to Beethoven” may appear simple and straightforward, yet in actuality it is quite deep, and in many ways possesses layers of meaning. The cartoon, the contains no dialogue, shows vegetation breaking through the neatly laid stone slabs. As the first sprouts appear, they are immediately destroyed by three robots whose only function is to weed out the grass. The vegetation, however, reappears, and the process repeats many times. Then the robots lay asphalt on top of the plates to make sure there are no seams; vegetation, nevertheless, still appears, now larger and stronger than before. In response, robots upgrade themselves and destroy the vegetation with greater productivity. But the plants become larger each time, and so do the machines. In the end we see powerful trees break through the stones and the asphalt, and destroy the robots. All this is accompanied by Beethoven’s energetic music. The soundtrack completes with his “Ode to Joy”. Even we talk here about the triumph of life, then it is about the triumph asserting itself in the struggle with blind violence of the soulless world of technology.

The modern humanitarian consciousness is increasingly prone to viewing the destructive influence of human beings on nature as rooted in the falsely interpreted idea of domination, when this very domination is understood as an instrument of using nature to serve the goals of improving the life of human beings and the society. As we ponder the idea of the opposition between culture and nature as the dominance of the former over the latter, we must consider the fact that culture itself is divided into spiritual and material components, which partly correlates to the ancient practice of dividing all good things into things good for the body and material things.

The material culture encompasses the world of man-made things and processes designed to improve human welfare, our level of comfort of and meet the demands of our permanently growing needs, boosted by the growth of productive power. The world we live in is peculiar since while it is being created by people, it also exists independently, in accordance with its own laws, as if it were a natural ele-

existence, Marx provides to his materialism a look that corresponds to the new worldview of Copernicus. The place of human beings in space is not just a natural fact; it includes the changing understandings of this position, and is determined by the way in which human beings view the space and the world around them. Overall, it should be noted that historical materialism concerns not just the society in the narrow sense of the word, that is, in contrast to the doctrine of nature, it is a new form of philosophical materialism, which differs from all of its previous forms in that it treats matter not as a “thing-in-itself”, but as a “thing for itself”, which is what it becomes in social practice.

¹ Лукач Д. Изменение функций исторического материализма // История и классовое сознание. Хвостизм и диалектика. Тезисы Блюма (фрагменты) / пер. с нем. С. П. Поцелуева. М. : Русский фонд содействия образованию и науке, 2017. С. 314.

² Маркс К. Капитал. Т. 1 // Маркс К., Энгельс Ф. Соч. 2-е изд. М. : Гос. изд-во полит. лит., 1960. Т. 23. С. 523.

³ Bertran Russell notes that Marx’s view is limited to our planet, and to the human being on the planet; he sees this as peculiarity and shortcoming, since after Copernicus it became clear that human beings have no significance at the level of the universe (Рассел Б. История западной философии. М. : Академ. проект, 2009. С. 516). Indeed, being concentrated on social

ment (we do not need many examples or proofs here, it will suffice to mention market economy and modern megalopolises). It is not only emancipated from living individuals – those who create it, but opposes them as a powerful alien force. The material culture approaches nature in the utilitarian fashion, seeking to make nature serve the human beings as special creations of nature.

When it comes to spiritual culture, unlike its material counterpart, humans partake of it not as own natural beings but as representatives of nature as a whole; he or she acts not as a natural entity but as a public, historical entity with its own mind, and it is in those cultural dimensions that he or she views their true nature. Obviously, the spiritual culture exists in natural materials as well; it exists in sounds, colours, things, etc., but its special nature (unlike that of the material culture) consists in that in this case the attitude to nature is not utilitarian or pragmatic but unbiased and symbolic. Moreover, the products of spiritual culture do not lead their own separate lives beyond the ties to real individuals who created these products or those who are able to comprehend and perceive it. (This can also be applied to the material culture, whose products – so far, at least, – do not lead their own independent lives; but nevertheless the difference along this criterion is present, and the material culture is more independent of the people who create and use it than the spiritual culture).

Material and spiritual cultures are interrelated and connected in a way that makes the former prevalent over the latter. But precisely for this reason the state of material culture, above all, its state which is defined by the current mode of production, the contradictions arising therein and the destructive means arising therefrom lead to broadening of horizons of the spiritual culture and to criticizing its own foundations. In this sense the spiritual culture is not only the expression, continuation, apology of the current material culture and the criticism imposed on it, which is the defining moment of its historical self-denial. In this sense the historical culture with its symbolic forms of making sense of nature, and the non-utilitarian attitude to it is more adequate than the material culture. It expresses the principal provision, according to which culture is commensurable to nature (world) as a whole.

4. Understanding of being as a type of activity means that the relationship between the human being and the world is equivalent to the relationship between the human being and culture. This means that human beings deal with the world to the extent to which they are involved in its activities, to the extent to which the world defines the content of their activities, i. e. the world of human beings, the culture. In this sense the world is not what surrounds the human being but things he or she deals with, the content of his or her activities. The human being is a part of the world to the extent to which the world is a part of him or her; according to the categorical definition of this feature of human existence by Bakhtin, there is no alibi in being; it is absent from the notion to the extent that humans cannot leave the world without making the act of living a form of active interaction with the world. Culture is the world that is a part of human activity, its content, its objectified meaning. Culture is as diverse in all its forms and manifestations as the world with which the human being has to deal. However, the content of his or her activities is just one, objectified side of his or her actions; the other side refers to the sub-

jective beginning, the actor him– or herself, represented as a concrete living individual.

This relationship between the subject and the object, the consciousness and existence acquires a totally different configuration when it is viewed not abstractly, not along a certain obvious prerequisite of polar maxims but when this juxtaposition is viewed through the lens of the real process of human activities, as its inalienable components. In the latter case the most important problem is that of their unity within the act of culture-creating human activities. The key issue here becomes to define the foundation of this unity, to choose the pole (aspect) of the common set of activities that is defining in nature.

The culture if viewed through the lens of content-rich publicly significant results is not only an objectified but truly objective world; objective in the sense that it provides a logical structure where the internal logic is faceless (depersonalized). Even in such clearly defined forms of culture as philosophy or literature, to say nothing of such large-scale anonymous types of activities as maintaining households or joining in social events, there exist laws (indeed, laws!) of development. In this sense the humanities are not different from natural sciences. Such is the culture in its results, in its content-laden outcomes. But in its genesis, in the concrete types of activity it is always personal, subjective. There is always a living, unique and only individual at the source of it. Any activity is at all times a very concrete, personally expressed type of activity, which could not happen without the person who is carrying out this type of activity. Naturally, a certain Johnson who is doing something could be replaced by a certain Jackson; but this fact does not cancel the assertion that what Johnson did he or she alone could do; and if Jackson replaced him or her, it would be then his or her contribution, which would otherwise not occur.

Each separately defined sphere of activity presupposes existence of certain individuals with the qualities necessary for performing this kind of work (knowledge, competencies, moral standards, etc.) and shapes them. Any meaningful activity needs and requires individuals who are functionally prepared to implement it. An actor, in the functional sense, is involved in the content of some activity: the military sector requires military men and women, engineering needs engineers, crimes need criminals. This is such a direct correlation that corresponding functions can be (and are already being) transferred to robots. The functional capability of an actor is based on his or her activities and defines its role, but it never follows that the role must be played by a live individual; if it is a live individual, it should be the individual that plays the role. The role that a particular individual will play in the open space is decided by him– or herself alone; by choosing the role, he or she, being rooted in reality, actually chooses him– or herself. The very cognizant nature of human existence shows that it is the individual in action who defines whether a certain act is going to take place or not. It is the individual who decides on the course of action and contributes to the genesis of culture in its every form.

There is a common opinion that there are no irreplaceable people that executors will be found for any action, good or despicable. But it is also true that the interchange is necessary every time that the actor is always at the source of any action. For the gun to fire, someone must

press the trigger. Leo Tolstoy had thought that the cancellation of the capital punishment must begin with the executioner who will refuse to continue with this practice of pseudo-legal madness. His argument was as simple as it was undisputable.

Should there be no people to play the social role of the executioner; capital punishment would not be possible at all. Tolstoy could not be suspected of being a naive simpleton; he knew that there were many people willing to become executioners and that they would compete fiercely for this well-paying job. He knew also that the aspiration to overcome violence, including the most disgusting form of violence – that authorized and executed by the state – should begin with the lengthy process of changing the conditions of daily life. He knew that it was not only a lengthy process but also a process with no future; he realized that there would always be reasons for violence, and those who thought otherwise would be deceiving themselves. If we were to finish Tolstoy's argument, we'd find that the solution would lie in changing the moral outlook of the human being. Only when humans would refuse to engage in violence due to moral reasons, implementing this dream into reality would become possible.

The most adequate understanding of culture is understanding it as a form of human activity. Not only in the general sense, which presupposes that nothing in culture is done without people but also in the most precise sense that every action has its name, that someone is responsible for it, and that there is a concrete living individual behind it.

5. Human beings act consciously and they are responsible for their actions not as nature's creatures but as members of the society. "The human essence, – Marx writes, – is not something abstract, inherent to one individual. It is indeed a compilation of all societal relationships.¹ The human essence understood in this way is viewed as external to liv-

ing individuals, as objectified forms of culture. It acquires flesh and concreteness as it comes to life in conscious activities of human beings, separate individuals and their associations. Marx had revealed the vicious circle of interdependence of change in humans and changes in circumstances, which was characteristic of the old school of materialism: to change people, circumstances need to be changed, but to change circumstances; people need to be changed, because circumstances also change people and the educator himself must be educated. The way out, according to Marx, is to make sure that human change and the change of circumstance is done concurrently as part of activities aimed at revolutionary changes in the society.

Individuals merge with their essence, and establish themselves as personalities or social types in the process of their own activities, in which there is always a certain end point, when an autonomous decision on the subsequent action is made by the actor. Therefore we can say – literally, not figuratively – that an individual is the sovereign actor. Therefore, an adequate approach to the human being within the unity of his or her essence and existence, as well as an approach to culture as a set of meanings and facts lies in getting rid of false dilemmas: whether it is the human being who serves the society or vice versa, whether the human being defines culture or vice versa. On the contrary, humans must be viewed as parts of culture, and an active approach must be taken to eliminate the discrepancy between the two, with the plan of creating an association, in which "free development of each person is a condition for development of all".² I would think that Marx had had this idea about changing the world in mind, when in his Theses on Feuerbach he talked about viewing the reality subjectively, as practice, and the real deal lies in that the world must not only be explained but changed as well.

M. S. Gusman³

THE ROLE OF MASS MEDIA IN SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS

The tense situation in the world, witnessed in recent years, is regularly at risk to develop into serious international conflicts.

The threat of international terrorism, territorial disputes and numerous local clashes destabilize the world community, slow down its development and hinder harmonious co-existence of nations.

When reviewing the processes of international conflicts' formation, it's required to take into account intensive glo-

balization and informatization processes taking place in the world.

Global informatization is a logical consequence of information revolution, marked by appearance of electronic computer and personal computer and the following creation of computer and telecommunication networks.

Wide-spreading of the Internet allowed, on the one hand, to get first-hand information about events in the world, on the other hand, to take part in their discussion, sometimes providing an opportunity to directly influence the course of events.

The current state of integration processes in mass media as well as methods of information transmission and the level of technology and equipment allow to speak about such a phenomenon as global information space.

It has a transborder character and starts prevailing over all fields of activities of individuals, the society and the state, acting as an important geopolitical tool.

A number of media market players can in the environment of struggle for influence in global media space refer

¹ Маркс К. Тезисы о Фейербахе. С. 3.

² Маркс К., Энгельс Ф. Манифест коммунистической партии // Маркс К., Энгельс Ф. Соч. 2-е изд. М.: Гос. изд-во полит. лит., 1955. Т. 4. С. 447.

³ First Deputy Director General of TASS Russian News Agency, Professor, Merited Man of Culture of the Russian Federation, TV and radio presenter. The author of TV series "The Formula of Power" (more than 350 exclusive interviews with world leaders since 2000). The author of books, scripts for TV films and programs. Vice-President of the World Congress of news agencies, the Representative of Russia in the International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC). Laureate of State Prize of the Russian Federation and Moscow Government Journalist Prize. He was awarded with the orders "For Merit to the Fatherland" (4th class), Order of Friendship, Order of Honor.

to intentional distortion of facts with the goal to maximize profits or monopolize the industry.

At the same time, thorough analysis of the current situation can be replaced with superficial calculations and presentations, without sufficient proof and substantiation, and that in the end often leads to formation of the picture of events known to be false and aggravation of tension in the society.

Thus various mass media become participants of information and psychological conflicts and even manipulations of consciousness. Fake news, which became more frequent, and information warfare are an open threat to the world community.

"Invention", "fake", "disinformation", "propaganda" and "stove-piping", i. e. leaked faked provocative information that is also called "alternative facts", have become the main problem of today's society. These phenomena have an impact on the interests of media community, they are spoken about from the highest rostrums of international organizations, they seriously affect the home and foreign policy of whole states. They are becoming tools of geopolitical influence and can lead to international conflicts.

In March, 2017, the Joint Declaration of Freedom of Expression, "Fake News", Disinformation and Propaganda was adopted in Vienna. Diplomats are asking the UN Secretariat to start working out international strategy for fighting against fake news and disinformation, which can be compared to a virus epidemic in the degree of damage.

The problem has gone so far that even the top state official – the United States President Donald Trump – accused American mass media in "faking" and took an unprecedented measure – he prohibited officials from his Administration to have contacts with CNN reporters.

The general public's trust to mass media has been undermined as well. The skill to find information was important in the past, now it is the skill to filter it and to comprehend it critically.

In 2017, opinion polls conducted by Russian research group ZIRCON demonstrated disappointing trends. If in 2009, when the question "Where will you apply to specify or check the information" was asked, 20% of respondents named newspapers and magazines and 23% named the Internet, in 2015 the trust to mass media decreased more than twice. Only 8% of respondents will refer to printed media and 48% will surf the Internet.

Today, we hear the statement that "journalists are soldiers of information warfare" more and more often.

One not precisely worded message can become a catalyst for an international conflict in the information age, and thus information warfare can go beyond the limits of media into the real world.

The reasons of the events taking place are seen by many people in abrupt reduction of professional standards in mass media. Unfortunately, it's often difficult not to agree with that. Production of fake news, which are lies in essence but "packed" in a beautiful propagandist wrapper, brings bigger and bigger profit. There are journalist's moral and ethical values placed on one side of the scales and high incomes on the other.

Cyber attacks bring a lot of damage to mass media reputation as well. Thus, one of *The New York Times* accounts on Twitter was hacked in 2017. Unknown malefactors managed to place false information about a missile attack Russia as if intended to launch against the United States.

This example shows that fake news can seriously destabilize the world community by way of immediate spreading all over the Web.

We can state that stability of global information space is one of the guarantees to maintain stability in the world community. Today, professionalism and ethics of mass media, ability to get and adequately analyze data are becoming the key links in maintaining the fragile world balance.

Traditional media and journalists have to solve the issue: how to resist the fake news epidemic? How not to let information warfare grow into armed conflicts in the real world?

It's required to work out a practical definition of "fake", efficiently working from the legal and law enforcement point of view. How many false facts should be in a message? 10%, 30% or 50% of the published information?

Besides, it's required to precisely define and divide the notions of "fact" and "opinion".

The search systems and social networks, state authorities and business structures are introducing fact checking systems besides mass media.

It's necessary to pay more attention and develop more actively the principles and standards of ethical journalism. Only an individual's personal choice and observance of ethical principles allow to draw the line between truth and lie, between the professions of "journalist" and "propagandist".

Mechanisms preventing penetration of extremist and terrorist ideologies into information space, should be fixed legally on the international level, and it's required from the countries to unify standards for that.

It's required from mass media to apply efforts to form the positive agenda, provide extensive coverage for global humanitarian and cultural initiatives, international exchange and regular meeting of the leaders of world powers in order to strengthen mutual understanding between nations.

According to the generally accepted opinion, the urgent problems of the world community – from diplomatic misunderstandings to armed conflicts – should be solved by dialogue of the parties, in which there is a place for both acknowledgement of individual special features of this and that country, and solidarity in respect of the principles of the international law.

Liquidation of white spots on the map of mutual understanding is possible in case the participants of dialogue (be it regions, states or cultures) have reliable and trustworthy information about each other and unbiased judgments.

Successfully carried out integration processes are also a guarantee of stability in information space.

International cooperation within the framework of mass media associations helps that to a no small extent.

Their goal is improvement of quality of the produced by the parties content and increase of modernization processes' efficiency as well as strengthening of understanding between countries, representatives of which are parties to the alliance.

There is no doubt that annual events dedicated to discussion of the urgent issues of the world information community stimulate sharing experience and cooperation of news resources, allowing to outline the further ways of development and reveal the emerging threats.

Let's not forget that meeting of professionals, forming the news picture of the world and expertly evaluating the changing global reality, are themselves the true example of inter-civilization dialogue.

G. A. Hajiyeu¹

ABOUT THE ARGUMENT “THE WORLD IS TIRED OF PEACE” – THE OPTIMISTIC POINT OF VIEW

“The world is tired of peace” is the statement by Professor V. D. Zorkin, reminding us of the title of the great novel by Leo Tolstoy, who, by the way, met Proudhon in 1861 and published his book *War and Peace* in 1864. The French thinker’s paradoxical ideas served as an impetus for Tolstoy’s historiosophic reflections. And if war in case of Proudhon is an antinomy, Tolstoy’s peace is not the state opposite to war, but the World² with a capital letter, which means the most important ontological category. And a very modest soldier Platon Karatayev lives in this World, according to Tolstoy, Karatsev’s greatness consists of his perception of himself as exclusively a part of the whole, the nation, without the tiniest claims to autonomy and individualization. Surely, this is an archetype in Jung’s style, a characteristic of the nation in the person of one representative, from whom it is required to learn aesthetics, truth. And these are already not the conclusions to which Pierre Bezukhov comes.

Coming back to Proudhon: the phenomenon of war is explained by him as two functions of the mankind, which alternate in history as vigil and sleep alternate in individual’s life. And when war is something common and even productive! Proudhon’s idea of war is, first of all, the idea of power, which is one of the principles of movement and life. Power gives birth to antagonism, and this is already one of the universal laws of the World (understood not as the state opposite to war, but as an ontological category). Antagonism, struggle of opposites is one of 12 Kant’s categories. Justice also appears in this straightening spiral of discourse about power as manifestation of practical mind and the highest ability of the soul; the balance existing in nature demonstrates itself in justice. So, war is antagonism, but it exactly helps origination of the international law and the idea of European balance in foreign policy that appeared a little bit later. Carl Schmitt wrote that the idea of balancing was the achievement of absolute rationalism of the Age of Enlightenment that generated numerous isomorphic images. Starting from the 16th century, various kinds of balances have been ruling in all fields of the mankind’s spiritual life: trade balance in national economy, attraction of balance and repulsion in space, and even Malebranche’s balance of passions and J. Moser’s balanced diet. War is a continuation of antagonism, its culmination. However, cessation of antagonism may lead to “universal hierarchy”, which will mean “uni-

versal enslavement”. Because of that Proudhon comes to the conclusion that the political system of the mankind “is in the general balance of states, mutually limiting each other”. This balance is peace.

It seems that the feeling that the World is tired of peace reflects a pessimistic point of view. What is the optimistic point of view in this case?

Joseph Brodsky presented the Declaration of Optimism in his famous speech in December, 1988 addressed to the graduates of the University of Michigan. He suggested in the Declaration to “try to respect life not only for its amenities but for its hardships, too. They are a part of the game, and what’s good about a hardship is that it is not a deception. Whenever you are in trouble, in some scrape, on the verge of despair or in despair, remember: that’s life speaking to you in the only language it knows well”.

You only have to know how to understand the language of life, which is very metaphoric. The metaphor of deep paradigm changes in scientific ideas is a part of a mountain collapsing and baring the structure of a part of the Earth crust! The state of affairs when “the world is tired of peace” bares the illusiveness of many scientific reflections. Actually, scientific knowledge has a feature of permanence as well, and this is the permanence of illusiveness. For example, the happy for the mankind thirty years of the 20th century after the end of World War II generated such a scientific illusion as the welfare state. Thomas Piketty proved in his book *Capital in the Twenty-First Century* that there is much more injustice and inequality in owning capital now than in the 20th century. People in Russia feel the injustice of property stratification after decades of relative property equality. And this creates a strong demand for a certain model of politics.

The idea of universal human rights turned out to be one of the most dangerous for the world illusions. At the time of George Walker Bush’s Presidency a conviction appeared that “our”, i. e. American values, ideas of universal human rights are the only right ones, because of that they should be accepted by all other nations of the world. Jurgen Habermas rightly noticed that the way the American government acts leads up to the thought that the international law as the environment to solve inter-state conflicts, realize human right is already of no importance for the United States. This world power already openly declares these goals as the contents of its own policy, which no longer appeals to the international law but addresses its own aesthetic values, to a big extent founded on an individual’s autonomy and individualization.

I did not remind about the archetype of Platon Karatayev’s image accidentally, it helps to understand that the amount of piety to individualization existing in the West is not the same in all cultures. Together with the phrases about morals in international relations, the Bush’s government sent *ad akta* (to the archives) the Kant’s project created 220 years ago for regulation of international relations by law, which may only appear on the basis of agreements, on the constitutional basis.

¹ Judge of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation, Dr. Sc. (Law), Professor, Honored Lawyer of the Russian Federation. Author of more than 270 scientific publications, including monographs and textbooks: “Protection of the Basic Economic Rights and Freedoms of Entrepreneurs Abroad and in the Russian Federation: An Attempt at Comparative Analysis”, “Entrepreneur, Taxpayer, State: Legal Positions of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation”, “Constitutional Principles of Market Economy”, “Constitutional Economics”, “Ontology of Law (A Critical Study of the Legal Concept of Reality)”, “The Russian Judicial Power: Modern State and Prospects” (co-author), “Law and Economics (Methodology)”, etc. Member of the Editorial Boards of 12 scientific journals. Member of the Russian Presidential Council for the Improvement of Civil Legislation. Awarded the Certificate of Honor of the President of the Russian Federation. Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS.

² The words ‘peace’ and ‘world’ are homophones in the Russian language – translator’s note.

M. Harputlu¹

THE EFFECTS OF THE WAR IN SYRIA TO THE TURKEY'S SOCIAL AND LABOUR RELATIONS AND SECURITY

From prehistoric time to the now there has always been competition between states, communities, groups of people, between all interest groups, all sectors of societies, between all economic and social organizations also between individuals. Nowadays this competitions are far more ruthless, atrocious irregular and deadly. Because of this competitions, clashes and war millions of people have to move from their home and country.

The Syrian clash and conflict has produced the most compelling humanitarian challenge of the this century. At the March 2011 millions of Syrians have been forced to leave their homes. The conflict has initially generated a huge wave of internal migration within Syria mostly toward Hatay, Kilis, Gaziantep Sanliurfa the Turkish provinces at the Syrian borders. When the conflict began to devastate in late 2011, the internal migration wave has changed nature and transformed into a wave of refugees flowing into the Turkey.

The initial presence of Syrian refugees on Turkish territory, which was considered temporary at the beginning of the crisis, has now become a permanent one. The permanent nature of the situation is now affecting the psychology and reactions of both the host and incoming communities. The Government of Turkey currently hosts 227.000 refugees in 25 camps, with ongoing costs associated with health, education, food security and social and other services offered. Despite enormous efforts from the government, local authorities and generosity from host communities 3 334 000 Syrian refugees that live outside of camps in urban and rural areas are often unaccounted for, and are surviving under very challenging circumstances. Access to information, registration and to public services, including education and healthcare, is acutely limited [1].

Refugees in The Camps

The Turkish Disaster Response Agency has been the lead agency in coordinating the government's efforts to respond to the refugee inflow. Although it was originally established in order to deal with disasters, such as earthquakes, the agency restructured itself in the immediate aftermath of the arrival of the first Syrian refugees and reorganized its local units in order to deal with the growing humanitarian disaster in Turkey's southern border. As an extremely well organized and dynamic organization, with the full financial and political support of the government, The Turkish Disaster Response Agency has ensured that the needs of the refugees have been met by utilizing the capabilities of various government agencies and ministries. The Turkish Disaster Response Agency also assumed the task of building refu-

gee camps, the conditions of which are above and beyond the international standards set by the United Nations [3].

Security Problems Caused By Syrian Refugees

While the camps are well managed and all humanitarian needs are resourced, the non-camp refugee population continues to experience significant problems that need to be solved.

At first, when Syrian refugees began streaming over the Turkish border in 2011, the Turkish government granted them a special protected status but no work permits. Many thought the regime of Syria would fall quickly another domino in the Arab Spring and that Syrian refugees would be able to cross back over the border and return home swiftly.

With the Syrian war now in its seventh year, Turkey has opened a path to Syrians for official employment. But few have taken it. One of the government's motives in trying to regularize Syrians is that Turks have been worried about having their wages undercut. There was a public concern that Turkish people would be unemployed because of the Syrians being employed with lower wages.

Fearing a political backlash, Turkey started a program in January 2016 to increase work permits for refugees. The government also now requires companies to give Syrians the same pay and benefits as Turks. But the rollout has been slow. Because of this policy many Turkish workers lose their job and some times this situations cause to rise tension between Turkish workers and Syrians.

Integrating Syrians is political, too. They tend to be more religious and conservative than many Turks. In the future if the Turkish Government does not take necessary measurements and precautions they may be more radicalized.

Syrian people are registering for Turkish ID cards and health care, and signing up their children for public schools all services they get for free as refugees. Turkey's social services are overloaded with Syrian refugees. This year, a series of clashes between Turks and Syrians could be a sign that for some Turks, patience is running out.

Turkey is facing a growing problem over the presence of the refugees. There is a kind of tension growing in Turkey and there's already debate, like in other Western countries, that they are taking our jobs, they are getting privileges such as, Syrian students can go directly to university, they get health and social needs freely etc.

The birth rate between Syrians is very high because of that it become difficult to deal with this problem. If they stay longer in Turkey it would be difficult for Turkey born Syrians to turn back their country.

Many refugees have mental health problems, disabilities, among those especially in children, but Turkey seems to not have the capacity to identify and support these individuals in terms of mental health wellbeing. There is a need for a higher number of psychologists, social workers, counsellors and other mental health professionals working in the field as well as child and adolescent psychiatrists.

¹ Governor of Alanya (Turkey), Dr. Sc. (Political Studies). Was an intern in the field of public administration in the United Kingdom (1990–1991). In 2003, he received a master's degree from the Institute for European Studies at the University of Exeter (UK); in 2005 – Master's degree in the Institute of Social Sciences of the University of Dokuz Eylül. Assistant to the Governor of Izmir (2012–2017). Member of the Association of Governors of Turkey, the Commission for the definition of strategies for rural development, the State Planning Organization, the Commission for the preparation of the development plan.

This will effects Turkish peoples health security. The international community has to be aware of this and assist Turkey's efforts to provide adequate mental health care to Syrian refugees [1].

References

1. *Alpaslan A. H.* The issue of Syrian refugees in Turkey / A. H. Alpaslan. – Afyonkarahisar : Afyon Kocatepe University, 2016.

2. *Balkan B.* Immigration and prices : quasi-experimental evidence from Syrian refugees in Turkey / B. Balkan, S. Tumen // *Journal of Population Economics*. – 2016. – № 29 (3). – P. 657–686.

3. *McClelland M.* How to Build a Perfect Refugee Camp / M. McClelland // *The New York Times Magazine*. – 2014. – Febr. 13. – URL: http://www.nytimes.com/2014/02/16/magazine/how-to-build-a-perfect-refugee-camp.html?_r=0

4. The issue of Syrian refugees in Turkey. – URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/305319037_The_issue_of_Syrian_refugees_in_Turkey [accessed: 21.04.2018].

V. Ingimundarson¹

ARCTIC GOVERNANCE IN AN AGE OF GEOPOLITICAL ANXIETY

The geopolitics of the Arctic has, historically, been characterized by an underlying tension between state aspirations and multilateral interests. Early plans for Arctic imperial conquest, scientific exploration, and economic exploitation were not motivated by modern notions of sovereignty. But they, nevertheless, became tied up with territorial desires, state-building ideas, and expansionist goals. Indeed, the control of territory provided the basis for Arctic claims, no matter how imprecise or distant they were from contemporary understanding of international law. While the current state-centric attitudes toward the Arctic have changed from seeing it primarily in terms of the remote and exotic to that of an increasingly open and conquerable space, the dialectic between individual and collective claims is still what characterizes Arctic discourses.

The legitimacy of the existing framework for sovereign aspirations and inter-governmental cooperation in the Arctic stems from the UN Law of the Sea Convention (UNCLOS)—and the most credible regional inter-governmental forum, the Arctic Council made up of the eight Arctic states, the indigenous Permanent Participants, and the Observer states and organizations. Yet, the existence of other political mechanisms, notably, the forum of the five Arctic littoral states that make territorial claims in the Arctic Ocean, underscores that the regional complex is a multifaceted structure based on various types of hierarchies and power disparities between stakeholders.

In this paper, I explore the interplay between geopolitics and governance in the Arctic. The emphasis is on how Arctic states, acting alone or in tandem, have legitimized hierarchical governing structures, defined the rules of access for non-Arctic states, classified the rights of indigenous peoples, and established a regulatory framework, with varying degrees of acceptance, for multilateral territorial regimes. The purpose is to map out the Arctic governance system, with the aim of identifying areas of Arctic colla-

boration and friction. I argue that the prospects of a change in the legal basis of Arctic governance are minimal because of a vested interest in the status quo. The resistance of powerful Arctic states, such as the United States and Russia, to the broadening of the Arctic Council's original objectives of environmental protection and sustainable development to include political functions reflects their refusal to subordinate sovereign interests to binding institutional cooperation. In the interest of a mutual willingness to maintain regional stability, the Arctic states have continued to promote inter-governmental collaboration, using a depoliticized language. It does not, however, mask spill-over effects, including a sanction regime, stemming from the Ukrainian crisis. Thus, instead of resorting to metaphors of “peaceful Arctic family relations” or a Cold-War style “friend/foe” dichotomy, the current condition is rather marked by geopolitical ambiguity, where multilateralism is used to advance state-centric agendas. Yet, there is an informal understanding among the Great Powers that the Arctic should not be treated as a geopolitical conflict zone.

Scholars such as Klaus Dodds and others have sought to define contemporary Arctic geopolitics as an uneasy interaction between liberal institutionalism, with its emphasis on interstate cooperation, and neo-realism, with its preoccupation with states and national security interests. On the one hand, the re-opening of the Arctic from the military confines of the Cold War was interpreted during the 1990s as an opportunity to establish a new political cooperative order. On the other, the Arctic was seen in terms of a resurgence of neo-realism in the 21st century as geopolitical actors allegedly scrambled to reterritorialize an opening Arctic space in pursuit of national goals and resource competition.² A case can be made for such a dualist reading. The immediate post-Cold War period witnessed a period of collaboration in the Arctic, culminating in the establishment of the Arctic Council, with its non-military agenda.

Subsequently, a spate of media accounts on the “Scramble for the Arctic” and the potential for Great Power rivalry—which were buttressed by realist scholarly interventions following the Russian North Pole flag-planting in 2007—momentarily disturbed this narrative. It was, however, quickly dwarfed by a revival of government and scholarly discourses on neo-liberal cooperation schemes—as captured, rhetorically, in the Norwegian catchphrase “High North, Low Tension”. Far more importantly, it was given

¹ Professor of Contemporary History at the University of Iceland (Reykjavík), a Chair of the Board of the EDDA Center of Excellence, Associate Fellow at the Royal United Services Institute in London, Ph.D. Author of more than 50 scientific publications, including the following monographs “The Rebellious Ally: Iceland, the United States, and the Politics of Empire. 1945–2006”, “Geopolitics of Arctic Natural Resources”, “Topography of Globalization: Politics, Culture, Language” (ed.), “Cold War Cultures: Perspectives on Eastern and Western European Societies”, “Arctic Security in the Age of Climate Change”, “NATO: The First Fifty Years”, “Iceland's Financial Crisis: The Politics of Blame, Protest and Reconstruction” (co-auth), etc. He has been a peer reviewer for many scientific journals, including “Cold War History”, “Journal of Slavic Military Research”, “the Polar Journal”. He is the recipient of a Literary Award of the J. Sigurdsson Fund and an award for research on NATO.

² Have you heard the one about the disappearing ice? Recasting Arctic Geopolitics / J. Dittmer [et al.] // *Political Geography*. 2011. Vol. 30. P. 202–214.

geopolitical weight by the effects of the 2008 Ilulissat Declaration of the five Arctic littoral states (Russia, the United States, Canada, Denmark on behalf of Greenland, and Norway), with their commitment to peaceful settlement of international disputes and a firm commitment to the United Nations Law of the Sea Convention.¹ The tension between the West and Russia over the Ukrainian civil war, then threatened to tilt the balance, again, toward the conflictual. The imposition of Western economic sanctions on Russia and the boycott of specific Arctic meetings resulted in Russia's countermeasures, including a refusal to approve the European Commission observership in the Arctic Council.²

Yet, despite such friction, no breakdown in communication has occurred between Russia and its other Arctic partners. There has also been an effort to separate the region from other geopolitical conflicts. There is no willingness to change the multilateral Arctic structures in place or of refraining from abiding by mutually accepted norms in state-to-state relations. And while there is currently no military collaboration going on between NATO states and Russia—with the Russia-NATO Council remaining dysfunctional—the two sides still work together in the field of civil security, maritime safety and Search and Rescue in the Arctic.

To be sure, until the election of Donald Trump, Russia and the United States were heading in opposite directions in terms of Arctic strategic priorities: The Obama Administration was bent on conservation, culminating in the joint U. S. – Canadian decision to bar drilling in most off-shore Arctic areas; Russia, on the other hand, had been prioritizing exploitation, whether with respect to oil and gas or to the commercial use of the northern sea route. Under Trump, U. S. policy has already been reversed in favor of exploration, but the economic feasibility of drilling will depend on factors, such as oil prices and competition from other more accessible areas. As energy supply rivals, there is no convergence of U. S. – Russian economic interests in the Arctic. But the sharp anti-environmental turn in U. S. policy has disappointed several other Arctic states, which have counted as U. S. traditional allies.

Indeed, since the UN Law of the Sea Convention has no enforcement mechanisms, its functioning hinges on such intergovernmental collaboration. In the Arctic, the five littoral states have sought to assume a privileged governing role through an informal Arctic Five venue. From the start, it was subjected to criticisms by the three other Arctic states, Iceland, Finland, and Sweden, and by the representatives of the indigenous peoples for being an exclusivist club. It was argued that the forum would weaken the Arctic Council and represented an attempt to control the Arctic region despite its commitment to UNCLOS. The unilateral 2015 "Declaration concerning the prevention of unregulated high seas fishing in the central Arctic Ocean" left no doubt about the stakeholding aspirations of the Arctic Five.³ But to enhance the legitimacy of the proposition to put in place a regulatory framework to prevent future industrial fishing operations in the Arctic Ocean Commons, the Arctic Five invited, for the first time, five other stakeholders—that is, the European Union, Iceland, China, South Korea, and Ja-

pan—to hammer out an agreement on a conservation regime in the Arctic Ocean, which was signed in 2017.

Dire predictions of the Arctic Council's irrelevance, especially after the 2008 Ilulissat meeting, quickly gave way to a discourse on its elevated position and integrative role. Yet, despite agreements on Search and Rescue and on oil-spill prevention, the Council has not changed from a decision-shaping body into a decision-making one. States, such as the United States and Russia, are not really interested in expanding Arctic governance. They have agreed to allow the Arctic Council to prepare a 10–15 year plan for its future work and needs instead of the two-year agenda developed by those states chairing the Arctic Council.⁴ Yet, the Council's Secretariat has no real influence or a voice.⁵

It is known that powerful states—such as China, Japan, and South Korea—are not happy with their exclusion from any input into Arctic Council meetings. They feel that their involvement should go beyond their contributions to the activities of the Arctic Council Working Groups. For this reason, it does not have to come as a surprise that these states despite their divergent foreign policies have recently formed an inter-governmental forum to promote their interests on Arctic issues, in general, and within the Arctic Council, in particular. These Asian states have invested heavily in the Arctic based on its future potential; apart from building ice-breakers, they are pursuing economic investment opportunities in Arctic gas, oil, and infrastructure projects, some with the aim of diversifying their energy resources and exploiting shorter transport routes.⁶

These challenges to Arctic governance only underscore the Arctic Council's limitations as a non-decision-making body, with no say over environmental measures to fight climate change, the exploitation of resources, the opening of up sea routes, regional military security, territorial disputes or the protection of the rights of indigenous peoples. In the past, there have been calls for the strengthening of the Arctic Council's soft-law governance structure by turning it into an international organization with a treaty mandate. In addition, many favor the convocation of an Arctic summit – with the participation of the heads of Arctic Council states and heads of the permanent participants as well as the Observers and for an annual, rather than a bi-annual, Arctic Council ministerial meeting.⁷ Both ideas would give the Arctic Council more international weight and generate a greater normative pull when it comes to regulating behavior of Arctic and non-Arctic states and organizations.⁸ The counter-argument to structural changes is that it may be an advantage that the Arctic governance system does not take the form of a comprehensive, legally-binding agreement because of its ability to adapt to new contingencies or changing circumstances. Some scholars, such as Oran R. Young, oppose the idea of turning the Arctic Council into an intergovernmental organization, arguing that it might sideline some of the council's most innovative

¹ See, for example, "The Ilulissat Declaration" issued by Arctic states at the Arctic Ocean Conference in Ilulissat, Greenland, 27–29 May 2008. URL: http://www.oceanlaw.org/downloads/arctic/Ilulissat_Declaration.pdf

² Interviews with Arctic Council officials. 18 October 2016.

³ Interviews with Arctic officials. 21 January 2017.

⁴ Interview with an Arctic official. 25 January 2017.

⁵ Interviews with Arctic officials. 20 January 2017.

⁶ Guy E., Lassare F. Commercial shipping in the Arctic: new perspectives, challenges and regulations // *Polar Record*. 2016. Vol. 52 (264). P. 302.

⁷ See, for example, Standing Committee of the Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region (SCPARR). Conference Statement, "Arctic Governance in an Evolving Arctic Region" (final draft). September 5–7. URL: <http://www.articparl.org/files/conference-statement%20C-final-draft1-2.pdf>

⁸ Interview with an Arctic official. 25 January 2017.

features, such as the distinctive role accorded to the Permanent Participants.¹

This is not a particularly strong argument; it does not answer the question of why the role of the indigenous peoples cannot be retained or expanded under a more formal mechanism, even if it were negotiated by states. Moreover, if individual states want to grant indigenous peoples more power of representation, they can do so through the enactment of domestic laws. The Inuit Circumpolar Council and other indigenous organizations are among those that have made the case for shared sovereignty on the basis of the rights of indigenous peoples for self-determination, which are rooted in international law. It is true that the concept of self-determination has after the era of de-colonization in the 1950s and 1960s been increasingly shunned by the so-called “international community” out of fear of secession movements.² But it does not devalue the concept in international law.

In a post-colonial age, with increased global interest and activities in the Arctic, it is impossible to exclude the indigenous peoples from Arctic decision-making. A case in point is Greenland, which enjoys autonomy in domestic affairs. Financial dependence on Denmark has prevented Greenland from making use of its right to break away from the Danish Kingdom. But the issue of independence is on the political agenda, even if no time-table exists for achieving that goal. In the absence of its own military forces, an independent Greenland could opt for maintaining close ties with Denmark.³ But an alternative secession scenario could open up foreign policy identity experiments by the Greenlanders, who are very interested in securing foreign investments for natural resource exploitation, for example, by cultivating historical ties with the United States or even China. Such a development, in turn, could affect geopolitical constellations in the Arctic region on the whole, since Greenland would become a key Arctic actor in its own right.

Another constraining factor is the taboo on discussing military security within the Arctic Council, which dates back to its establishment in the mid-1990s. Increased militarization is certainly taking place in the Arctic, with most of the Arctic states, expanding their military presence there and staging military exercises. Increased military interest in the North Atlantic has been accompanied by a Cold War focus, with concepts like “deterrence”, “the GIUK gap”, and “maritime supremacy” being re-visited and recycled. There has been a call within the NATO to restore its military posture in the North Atlantic. But the discursive slant about a maritime contest in the Northern Atlantic and the portrayal of its remilitarization as a matter of urgency can be misleading. A sharp political-geographic distinction is still being made between the North Atlantic, which is seen as a potential conflict area, and the Arctic, which presumably is to remain a peaceful region. Such an artificial divide does not obscure the fact that military activities are taking place in

the Arctic as well as the North Atlantic. It reveals, nonetheless, a political commitment by both the West and Russia to a stable Arctic, even if the development of what Karl Deutsch dubbed a “security community” is highly unlikely in the Arctic because of the absence of shared political identities and values.⁴

While the UN Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf can determine the size of the continental shelf, it has no power to resolve disputes among Arctic states. After issuing recommendations, it will most likely be up to the Arctic Five to negotiate with one another the setting of maritime boundaries and rival claims. They have an incentive to do so in a peaceful manner, but conflicts, for example, in the form of effects of crises in other regions cannot be ruled out. It is unlikely, however, that in the foreseeable future a discord over natural resources among Arctic states will be the main source of contention because they are mostly located within the EEZ of Arctic states. The most lucrative area with disputed boundaries in the Beaufort Sea is between the United States and Canada. The U. S. – Canada relationship is probably the best example of a “security community”, making the militarization of the conflict unthinkable. Fishery disputes created by migration of fish stocks as a result of climate change could turn into nasty confrontation, but rarely into full-scale military conflicts. The same applies to territorial disputes: while there are legal differences over sea routes, it is not foreseeable that they will lead to something more serious. The different ownership claims between Denmark and Canada, on the one hand, and Russia, on the hand, over the Lomonosov ridge is mitigated by the fact that the area is not believed to possess rich natural resources. Finally, if the United States and the European Union disagree on Canada’s and Russia’s legal interpretations of their respective control of the Northwestern and Northern Sea routes, they are not likely to challenge them formally.

This is not to say that the prospects of access to natural resources cannot lead to potential geopolitical trouble. A case in point is Spitsbergen. A Christopher R. Rossi has argued, Svalbard’s extended geographical area not only raises fundamental questions about regional management; it is also a prime example of a “territorial temptation” in the Arctic.⁵ The 1920 Spitsbergen Treaty subjected Norway’s assumption of sovereignty over the archipelago to a number of qualifications regarding the equitable rights of other treaty signatories. Further, the treaty does not cover the continental shelf, which was at that time an unknown concept in international law. The Norwegian view has been that limits on sovereign rights must be stated unambiguously in the Treaty to affect Norway’s sovereignty. The 40 plus countries that have signed the Spitsbergen Treaty accept Norway’s right to govern Spitsbergen and its territorial waters on the account of its sovereign rights. But several states, including Russia and Britain, refuse to accept Norwegian claims that the treaty does not apply to ar-

¹ Oran R. Young. *Governing the Antipodes: International Cooperation in Antarctica and the Arctic* // *Polar Record*. 2016. Vol. 52. Iss. 2. P. 236.

² Abulof U. *We the people? The strange demise of self-determination* // *European Journal of International Relations*. 2016. Vol. 22. Iss. 3. P. 536–565.

³ Ackrén M., Jakobsen U. *Greenland as a Self-Governing Sub-National Territory in International Relations: Past, Current and Future Perspectives* // *Polar Record*. 2016. Vol. 51. Iss. 4. P. 404–412; Sejersen F. *Rethinking Greenland and the Arctic in the era of climate change*. New northern horizons. L. ; N. Y. : Routledge, 2015.

⁴ *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area* / eds. K. Deutsch [et al.]. Princeton : Princeton University Press, 1957; Adler E., Barnett M. *A framework for the study of security communities* // *Security Communities* / eds. E. Adler, M. Barnett. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1998. P. 29–65.

⁵ Rossi C. R. *A Unique International Problem: The Svalbard Treaty, Equal Enjoyment, and Terra Nullius: Lessons of Territorial Temptation from History* // *Washington University Global Studies Law Review*. 2015. Vol. 15. Iss. 1 (16). P. 93.

areas outside Spitsbergen's territorial waters or that Norway's own continental shelf extends to the archipelago. This could spell trouble for future governance and regional stability, if the signatories that reject the Norwegian legal position decide to contest it formally.¹

To conclude: One should be wary of subscribing either to oversimplified conflictual binaries or to inflated cooperation discourses in a region where geopolitical ambiguities exist, where spill-over effects of other global events are mixed and where attempts at depoliticization have been countered by competitive political practices. At bottom, it is a question of traditional power politics: who governs a site, polices its border, and controls mobility in terms of admis-

sion and exclusion. At the same time, the complex governing arrangements in the Arctic do not exclude autonomous countries, indigenous peoples' organizations, and environmental NGOs that have legitimate regional or transregional interests that often differ from those of sovereign states. This multilayered Arctic governance system, with its overlapping contractual relationships, including formal and informal ones, is not immune from instability. *This lesson should not be forgotten in a time of international tensions and Great Power proxy wars in areas outside the Arctic. It should also serve the purpose of working against militarized ideologies of the past to promote political goals in the present.*

G. B. Kleiner²

"CONSENT OF DISSENTERS": THE ROLE OF CULTURE IN PROVIDING SUSTAINABILITY OF THE GEOPOLITICAL SYSTEM

The transfer from the bipolar structure of the political world map to a more complex and sustainable configuration can be viewed as the main trend in the social dynamics of the 21st century.³ We're reviewing the issues of the new geopolitical world structure's formation from the point of view of the system socioeconomic theory (SET)⁴ in this paper and come to the conclusion that

the configuration of international relations should be based on the so-called "systemic landscape" of the world, i. e. the complex of countries and relations between them as relatively independent socioeconomic as well as administrative and political systems.

The suggested approach allows to take into account such immanent and important for the geopolitical analysis systemic special features of countries as feeling the limitlessness/infiniteness of the country's territory (space) or life cycle by its population; the country's being "charged" with energy required for protection and development of its territory, prolongation of the period of its vital activities. Replenishment of respective space, time and energy resources deficit is carried out by countries in the process of their exchange within the framework of interaction between countries. In this context, international trade, exchange of cultural values and international aggression can be reviewed as attempts to achieve an interstate balance in the field of space, time and energy resources. We demonstrate that the nucleus of the configuration, providing potential sustainability of interstate relations, is a four-element complex of the countries representing four sectors of the global space. Such a role could be played by Russia (environmental sector); China (process sector), the USA (project sector); the European Union (object sector).

This configuration's sustainability is based on arrangement of special relations between the parties, providing the flow of basic resources required for vital activities from the countries that have enough of them to the countries with respective resources deficit.

Taking into account the basic special features, typical for each of the said countries – parties to the nucleus, will provide sustainability of this configuration, even in case of principal disagreements between the parties on these or that socioeconomic or political issues. At the same time, exchange of cultural values and cultural development trends plays the role of the factor blurring out interstate contradic-

¹ On the legal aspects of the Spitsbergen question, see: Rossi C. R. Op. cit. P. 93–136; Churchill R., Ulfstein G. The Disputed Maritime Zones around Svalbard in Myron H. Nordquist // Changes in the Arctic Environmental and the Law of the Sea / eds. T. H. Heidar, J. N. Moore. Leiden : Martinus Nijhoff, 2010. P. 551–593; Anderson D. H. The Status Under International Law of the Maritime Areas Around Svalbard // Ocean Development & International Law. 2009. Vol. 40. P. 373–384; Ulfstein G. The Svalbard Treaty: from terra nullius to Norwegian sovereignty. Oslo : Scandinavian University Press, 1995; Fleischer C. A. Svalbardtraktaten. En utredning også nye styreformers på Svalbard vurderes. Oslo : C. A. Fleischer, 1997.

² Deputy Director of the Central Economics and Mathematics Institute of the RAS, Chair of the System Analysis in Economics at the University of Finance under the Government of the Russian Federation, scientific adviser of the Faculty of Economics and Management of the Dubna University, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor. Author of more than 700 academic papers, including monographs: "Collective Forms of Economic Management in Today's Economy" (coauthor), "The Economy's Systemic Balance" (coauthor), "The Strategy of Enterprise", "The Knowledge Micro-Economy" (coauthor), "Economics. Modeling. Mathematics", "The Evolution of Institutional Systems"; articles: "Economic Dependencies: Principles and Methods of Constructions" (coauthor), "The System Coordination in Economics: To the Establishment of the General Coordination Theory", "The Evolution of the Leading Paradigms in Modern Economic Science", "State–Region–Sector–Enterprise: the Framework of the Systemic Russian Economy's Sustainability", "What Kind of Economy Russia Requires: Analysis Based on System Modeling" and others. Chief editor of the *Economic Science of Modern Russia* magazine, Chairman of the Academic Council of the Social Sciences Department of the RAS "Problems of Complex Development of Industrial Enterprises". He was awarded the first and second-class medals of the Order of Merit for the Motherland.

³ Attali J. Demain, qui gouvernera le monde? P. : Fayard, 2011; Перская В. В., Эскиндаров М. А. Интеграция в условиях многополярности. М. : Экономика, 2016; Волконский В. А. XXI век. Многополярный мир. Тренды и задачи истории. М. : Книжный мир, 2017 (сер. «Коллекция Изборского клуба»); Запесоцкий А. С. Культура: взгляд из России. СПб. : СПбГУП; М. : Наука, 2014.

⁴ Kleiner Г. Б. Устойчивость российской экономики в зеркале системной экономической теории : часть 2 // Вопросы экономики. 2016. № 1. С. 117–138; Он же. Устойчивость российской экономики в зеркале системной экономической теории : часть 1 // Вопросы экономики. 2015. № 12. С. 107–123; Он же. Системные сдвиги и опорные точки

мирового развития // Глобальный мир: системные сдвиги, вызовы и контуры будущего : XVII Междуна. Лихачевские науч. чтения, 18–20 мая 2017 г. СПб. : СПбГУП, 2017. С. 102–105.

tions originating because the countries satisfy their territorial or other geopolitical claims and interests.

1. The Global World's Systemic Landscape

The systemic landscape of global geopolitics is made from two components: 1) the aggregate of independent countries (or sustainable consolidated communities of countries, e. g. the European Union; below we'll also call the European Union a country to simplify the presentation), viewed as autonomous socioeconomic as well as administrative and political systems; 2) the complex of sustainable ties between these systems.

According to the system socioeconomic theory concept, the key role among numerous characteristics, differentiating some countries-systems from the others, is played by two groups of features. The first group characterizes the spatial and temporal localization of the system. At the same time, the physical size of the controlled territory and the adopted in this country horizon of the strategic vision of the future are not as important as the feeling of limitedness/infiniteness of the territory (spatial borders) and clear prospects for the country's future development for a long period of time (temporal borders) in the public conscience of this country's population. The second group describes possibilities of effective use of available for this system space and time resources by it.

Thus, each country can be characterized from the point of view of owning space and time resources (we'll call them existential as today a country can exist as a subject of the global geopolitics only in case of a fixed to it space and acknowledged by other countries prospects for continuation of its vital activities) and potential abilities to use the said resources (we'll call such resources energy resources as they, like physical energy, determine possibilities of carrying out activities in mastering the space and time habitat). Note that when understanding the existential resources as binary (space and time), the energy resources or abilities can also be interpreted as binary: *intensity* resources required for effective use of space, and *activity* resources required for effective use of time. Consequently, various kinds of socioeconomic, political, cultural, scientific, educational and other interactions of countries, including various kinds of aggression, can be interpreted as exchange (transfer, takeover, etc.) by existential and energy resources.

The global world's systemic landscape appears before us from this perspective as an aggregate of countries – systems endowed with space, time and energy resources, while the acts of interaction between countries can be viewed as a kind of spatial, temporal or energetic transaction.

2. Systemic Typology of Countries – Parties to the World Community

According to the systemic socioeconomic theory, the basic typology of socioeconomic systems is based on singling out four principally different types of systems, depending on configuration of existential resources.

Object type systems, the vital activities of which are perceptibly affected by existing well-known spatial borders of the system, and not affected perceptibly by temporal limitations (or they are non-existent). Such systems are characterized by continued development of the forward or cyclic type. These systems generate spatial variety and temporal

stabilization in the area of their influence. The problems, which such a system has to deal with, are solved by organizational solutions (organizational approach).

Environmental type systems, where the borders of available space and time don't perceptibly affect the system's functioning, or don't exist at all. Such systems increase entropy and decrease organizational variety of space-time. The arising problems are solved by absorption of problematic situations by the practically unlimited internal space of the system. The system functions in space and time without jumps and jerks, as a rule, cyclically.

Process type systems, where there are temporal limitations and they have a perceptible effect, while spatial limitations don't have a perceptible effect or don't exist. Such systems increase the homogeneity of space but introduce variety into periods following one after the other. Such systems develop discretely, and strategic problems are as a rule solved by some change of social development stages.

Project type systems are perceptibly affected by limitations of the system's functioning space and the length of the life cycle. Such systems develop practically within the framework of specified limitations, and their functioning leads to increase of variety in the area of the system's activities. The arising problems are solved by initiation and implementation of new projects.

From the point of view of this construction's application to the problems of global geopolitics, it's important to emphasize that the presented systemic typology also determines approaches to formation of the reviewed systems' politics, focused on solution of significant development problems. The following is singled out here:

- Organizational approach in case of which an organization is entrusted to solve problems – a system under centralized management, acting in accordance with the continuity principle on the time scale;
- Environmental approach in case of which the solution of problems is distributed in space and time, it is decentralized and sometimes put off for an indefinite period;
- Process approach in case of which development problems are solved by launching mechanisms, automatically leading to overcoming the arising problems;
- Project approach in case of which a clear sequence of actions with an unambiguous ultimate target, time-limits and criteria for its achievement, is planned and realized to solve a problem.

Definite referral of certain countries – parties to the world community to this or that class of systems required collection and processing of considerable amounts of data regarding the impact of spatial and temporal limitation – on public conscience of various social groups in the country as well as conditions and results of working out the policy of this country. In order to simplify the solution, we'll use one of characteristics, differentiating countries' belonging to object, environmental, process or project type.

The analysis of politics of certain countries based on this typologization of approaches allows to determine to which type this or that country is referred. Let's use this method to determine the type of several leading players on the global geopolitical arena.

The most outstanding representatives of the four classes of systems among the most authoritative members of world community are: the European Union – organizational approach; Russia – environmental approach; the People's Re-

public of China – process approach; the USA – project approach. These four countries form the nucleus of the contemporary world order framework. Exactly these countries should be entrusted with the mission to maintain the world community's sustainability. In this context, relations between them, smoothing out arising contradictions, acquire especial importance. Let's review the issue of typology of ties between systems applied to interaction between countries to analyze opportunities in this field – the second component of the global world's systemic landscape description.

3. Typology of Systemic Ties between Countries

As it was established above, each system is characterized by an amount of existential (space and time) and energy (intensity and activity) resources. The processes of these resources transfer from one country to another make the contents of relations between systems. To put it definitely, the following kinds (channels) of ties between two systems are possible:

- Spatial connection (one system's affecting the volume and configuration of space, controlled by the other);
- Temporal connection (one system's affecting the length of the other's life cycle);
- Intensity connection (one system's affecting the efficiency of use of the other's space);
- Activity connection (one system's affecting the efficiency of use of the other's time).

Distribution of these types of ties per all systems is determined by special features of systems of each type, included in the reviewed aggregate as well as three common principles.

1. *The equality principle*. Each system has all four kinds of resources (space, time, intensity, activity), and it is the donor in case of two of them and recipient in case of the others.

2. *"One addressee" principle*. Each system transfers this kind of resource to only one system.

3. *Cohesion principle*. The aggregate of researched systems can't disintegrate into two or more non-connected aggregates.

When these principles are realized, the world community's systemic landscape, as it can be shown¹, makes a two-dimensional grid with partly overlapping four-element complexes of countries, referred to different types. Such complexes – tetrads – are relatively sustainable and can maintain stability of the whole world community. In our case the key tetrad is a ring-like structure "European Union – Russia – China – USA – European Union", in which the European Union represents the object system class, Russia – environmental, China – process, USA – project.

4. Consent of Dissenters: Cultural Ties

As it was established above, the relations between the countries of the "key quartet" are divided into two groups. The first is related to transfer of existential resources, the second to transfer of energy resources. The analysis of the history of inter-relations allows to affirm that relations of the first type, connected with distribution of territories, lead to numerous contradictions, conflicts, including diplomatic and with using armed forces. Relations of the second type, on the contrary, help rapprochement of interests, smoothing out institutional differences, harmonization of development trends. There are two kinds of mechanical energy differentiated in physics: potential energy, connected with interaction of objects, and kinetic energy, connected with movement of objects. The energy of socioeconomic as well as administrative and political systems is also made from two components in a similar way: intensity, directed to mastering space (an analogue of potential energy) and activity focused on mastering time, development (an analogue of kinetic energy). Transfer of cultural values, including exchange of works of art, technologies, achievements of science, is in the basis of interstate exchange of the energy of intensity. The exchange of the forming trends and courses of culture, technologies, science and education development is in the basis of interstate exchange of the energy of activity. In strategic perspective, the growth of volumes of such exchanges restrains states (at least states included in the world community nucleus) from expanding and deepening contradictions arising in economic, environmental and territorial relations. The interstate balance of existential and energy resources distribution should be maintained both by efforts of states-parties to the key configuration and supranational bodies and organizations.

The four-polar world, the structure of which was outlined above, opposes the unipolar, bipolar and multipolar or polycentric world. The world order built on the basis of the established systemic geopolitical landscape, taking into account the role of cultural interactions, puts in order and adjusts relations between countries and allows to reduce a little both costs of "frictions" between certain countries and risks of uncontrolled expansion of the "area of dissent", recently taking over lion shares of countries – parties to the world community. The carried out analysis shows that development of national cultures, intensification of interstate exchange of cultural achievements and development of culture's trends is not "one of" but actually the only factor to provide sustainable and safe functioning of the world community.

¹ Клейнер Г. Б. Ресурсная теория системной организации экономики // Российский журнал менеджмента. 2011. Т. 9, № 3. С. 3–28.

CHINESE ECONOMY AT THE ERA OF GLOBALIZATION

**The Growing Importance of Asia
in the Global Economy**

China is as much as and, yet, merely the Middle Kingdom. While it may not be the Middle Kingdom of the whole world, then at least of Asia, where the importance of better developed economies and increasingly educated societies is on the rise. Therefore, the question is not whether China alone, but Asia with China at the forefront, is moving to take dominion over the world. Some people think that this is the case, and, even if it is not a deliberate intention of the elites ruling therein, such is the logic of the historical process. Following this interpretation, there are only 90–100 years left before the end of the Western dominance and the takeover of this position by the East. It is supposed to happen at beginning of the 22nd century [10].

The growing strength of Asia is much more than China. The volume of production and size of the population are rapidly increasing. The continent has almost 4 billion 500 million inhabitants in total; that is about 60 percent of the world population and about 55 percent outside the Middle East, often treated separately for geopolitical reasons.² This large population produces 47.3 percent of the gross world product, GWP – slightly more than Europe and North America combined. From a slightly different perspective, it is as many as eight percentage points more than the United States and the European Union combined. In the future, both the share of Asian population and production will continue to grow due to both the natural increase and economic growth rate being higher than the global figures. It would be pertinent to realise that once – in actual fact throughout all the centuries of the previous millennium, until around 1820 with its powerful onset of the Western World industrial revolution – Asia kept turning out over 60 percent of the global production. In 1950, it was less than 20 percent, but two generations were enough to make this index more than double.

China itself two hundred years ago – before the industrial revolution gained momentum; first in England and soon after in Western Europe, and before the Middle Kingdom turned its back on the world and kept itself strictly to itself – China turned out almost a third of the world pro-

duction. Five or six generations of disastrous domestic policy and the unfavourable external circumstances, including the British and Japanese colonial practices, were enough to go dramatically down this scale to below 5 percent half a century ago. No wonder, then, that some authors write about China's return to the international arena because it has already been there (Cholaj 2011).

And now a digression. My perennial efforts to avoid tautology in the form of the term “globalised world” do not seem very productive. It is so often that both in everyday language and in scientific literature this mistake is repeated! The world is global by definition, as is the globe, hence the world cannot become global (or worldwide) and the globe cannot globalise because they have always been such. What undergoes globalisation is economy, trade, capital flows, technology transfer and also workforce, albeit, with significant constraints resulting from cultural, social and political reasons, and outside the *strictly* economic sphere – also magnificent things like culture, and nasty things like terrorism. Globalisation is a historical and spontaneous process of liberalisation and integration following in its footsteps, turning hitherto largely isolated in their functioning national economies and local commodity markets into one, great, mutually interconnected and intertwined worldwide market of capital, goods and workforce (Kolodko 2002a and 2002b). Globalization also has its microeconomic aspect related to the networking of production and exchange by incorporating into the process of production and distribution companies from many countries, still treated as national economies, although the management process is carried out increasingly on a supranational scale (Szymański 2004 and 2011).

The Asian continent is highly diverse – culturally, politically and economically – especially if it is treated literally; in geographical terms and stretched from Turkey and Israel in the west to Japan and Russian Siberia along with Kamchatka and Chukotka in the Far East. Apart from the Asian part of Russia, which is not usually included in the Asian calculations, its four main parts are China and Japan and two regional integration groups – ASEAN in Southeast Asia³ in which none of the economies predominates, and SAARC in South Asia⁴, which is dominated by India which is a regional population (1.28 billion inhabitants), economic (7.4 percent of world production based on purchasing power parity, PSN) and military (military expenditure 2.5 percent of GDP) superpower.

Of the twelve countries with more than one hundred million inhabitants, as many as seven: China, India, Indonesia (261 million), Pakistan (206), Bangladesh (159), Ja-

¹ Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of Poland (1994–1997, 2002–2003), Director of the Research Institute at the Kozminski University (Warsaw), foreign member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor. Author of 50 books and over 400 articles published in 26 languages, selected works: “Neither Washington, nor Beijing Consensus, but the New Pragmatism”, “Towards a Better future: Integration Perspectives”, “World in Motion”, “Globalization, Transformation, Crisis – What's Next?”, “From Shock to Therapy. Political Economy of Post-Socialist Transformations”, “Whither the World: The Political Economy of the Future” and others. Member of the European Academy of Arts, Sciences and Humanities Research. Honorary Doctor of 10 foreign universities.

² The population of the Middle East is estimated at around 450 million, if we include in this part of the world also African Egypt with 97 million inhabitants (geographically Asian Sinai has around 1.4 million inhabitants) and Cyprus with only 1.2 million people. Without these two countries, the Middle East – geographically located in Asia in its entirety, apart from the small, 23 764 square kilometres European fragment of Turkey – it is home to about 350 million people. This is the total number of the inhabitants of Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Iraq, Iran, Israel, Yemen, Jordan, Qatar, Kuwait, Lebanon, Oman, Palestine, Syria, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates.

³ The member countries of ASEAN, Association of Southeast Asian Nations are: Brunei, Philippines, Indonesia, Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Singapore, Thailand and Vietnam. This grouping is inhabited by about 650 million people (8.7 percent of all mankind) and produces around 10.5 global gross product (counting per purchasing power parity, PPP).

⁴ SAARC member countries, South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (*South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation*) contains: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Nepal, Maldives, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. These countries are inhabited by about one billion 770 million people (almost 24 percent of all mankind), who produce about 13.7 percent of the world's gross product (counting per PPP).

pan (126) and the Philippines (105) are located in Asia.¹ We omit here the Eurasian Russia, which is inhabited by 146 million people, of which only a quarter lives in its Asian part. Soon, still during this decade, another country will join them – Vietnam (97 million inhabitants in 2018). It is worth adding that in this group of countries the population is decreasing only in Japan; there are fewer and fewer inhabitants every year, and at the same time they are getting older. The median is as much as 47.3 years, which means that half of the population is above this age. However, the societies of India are young (median 27.9 years) as is Bangladesh (26.7). These are very important comparisons, because aging societies are deprived of the so-called demographic dividend, which affects the supply of labour to the labour market. For this reason, *ceteris paribus*, one can expect in the future a faster rate of economic growth in India than in China.

Of the twenty economies producing more than one percent of the world production, nine – China, India, Japan, Indonesia, Turkey, South Korea, Saudi Arabia, Iran and Thailand – are located in Asia. Therefore, reflecting on the future role of Asia – its demographic potential and culture, political significance, and above all, economic influences – it must be borne in mind that it is almost the largest region of the world in every respect.

Is it actually so that things have already gone so bad (in the West) and so good (in the East) that Americans have to resort to wicked protectionist practices to save their own skin? Or maybe the Chinese indeed are plotting and using globalisation to bring the world under their heel? Is the era of Asia's domination indeed under way with the Euro-Atlantic civilisation relegated to a secondary position? Do we already need to learn Chinese first and then English?

New Silk Road

There is no doubt that both the absolute position of China – the economic one and, consequently, as is the case with a great country, the political and military one – and their influence on what is happening in the world, are growing [7]. It will remain this way in the foreseeable future because this process cannot be stopped, let alone reversed by peaceful methods – other ones are out of question. All others must acknowledge this, regardless of their own interests and biases. And certainly, China will not turn away from the world and will not shut itself down in destructive autarky, as it once did.

The size of the country has its advantages, but it is also a curse. Norway or New Zealand, Canada or Australia, Chile or Malaysia, Tunisia or Bulgaria do not have to lose sleep over power, because they are in no danger of becoming one. They are to sustain or create well-being for their citizens and that will suffice. In contrast, China, like the US and Russia, and to a lesser extent also India and Japan or France and Great Britain, as well as Brazil and Nigeria regionally, must demonstrate greatness both economically, politically and militarily. Only countries like Singapore or Costa Rica can afford a pacifistic orientation but by no means China or the USA.

¹ Other countries with a population exceeding 100 million are, in the order of population size, the USA (327 million), Brazil (208), Ethiopia (196), Nigeria (191), Russia (146) and Mexico (125). Soon, this group of non-Asian countries with similarly numerous population will be joined by Egypt.

What needs to be done is take a leap into the future and seek reconciliation with others in addition to finding the right place in the ever-shifting world. It should be somewhat easier nowadays since some processes are running in opposite directions than before. On the one hand, China is constantly attracting the production capacities of Western corporations, transferring on that occasion their hi-tech, while placing more and more of its production abroad, this time already having modern manufacturing techniques at its disposal. On the other hand, direct investments from richer countries still go to China, but also to other economies, not only Asian ones, where wages are lower than in China. Their beneficiaries include, among others, India and Pakistan, Vietnam, Cambodia, Bangladesh and Myanmar. The effects of the ongoing appreciation of the Chinese currency are adding to this process. It is getting stronger, so for wages of, let's say, 3 thousand yuan per month, you have to spend about \$475, unlike a few years ago, when for half the nominal salary of 1500 yuan, at the exchange rate of 8.2, 183 dollars was enough. With the increase in staff production costs, which have been recently growing by 20 percent per year, and currency appreciation, China ceases to be as competitive as it once was. The process that previously affected countries like Japan, Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan and also, although on a smaller scale, Malaysia and Thailand, is yet again repeated.²

What is more, in the United States and other highly developed economies of the West, one can notice that the tendency to outsource and offshore is inhibited. This happens in such cases, where low labour costs play a relatively small role in the total expenditure on the production and sale of a specific product. There are quite striking calculations demonstrating that in the price of a 16KB Apple iPad, which was sold on the US market for 499 dollars in 2010, the cost of Chinese labour amounted to only \$8, or 1.6 percent [9], though perhaps more, because the calculation includes an "unidentified" labour costs category, suggesting that they were incurred outside the US and outside China. In such situation – and in the face of political pressure to stop the "export of jobs to Communist China" – a producer may come to the conclusion that even if they pay five times more for the same labour, but the merchandise will be *Made in USA* (and with peace of mind about excuses for outsourcing and offshoring), its assembly will take place again near San Francisco and not near Shanghai. The economic calculation of costs will not be overturned, but the political narrative could be "straightened out".

This time the Chinese challenge is not derived from the old attempt to export the revolution – fortunately unsuccessful – but primarily from the export of goods and, what is important, capital. This is accompanied by various related transactions that increase Chinese presence around the world. This can be seen in international statistics, but also with the naked eye when travelling around various parts of the world. However, what is not immediately visible and what is of great significance, is the far-reaching

² Similar processes take place in other parts of the world, also in post-socialist Eastern European economies, the most developed of which can compete to an increasingly smaller extent with low wages. For example, in Poland in December 2017, the average gross monthly wage in the enterprise sector fluctuated around 1450 dollars, calculated at the current exchange rate, which at that time was subject to strong appreciation. These data refer to companies employing more than nine employees, so for the entire economy the appropriate amount may be even several hundred dollars lower.

effects of numerous infrastructure projects financed in exchange for long-term, strategic contracts for supplying raw materials. This is particularly pronounced in Africa and in Latin America, but still on relatively smaller scale in Central Asia, the Middle East, Eastern Europe, and – what is very important and interesting – in Russian Siberia. In the future, radical changes will take place here, and the great program propagated as the New Silk Road will play a key role in this matter. This is a popular term for a program known by its official name *One Belt, One Road*, OBOR, or recently more often as *Belt and Road Initiative*, BRI. It is a project of significant infrastructural investments which are intended to promote the expansion of trade between China and their foreign partners in the west, south and north. The program is aimed at cooperation with several dozen countries in Asia, the Middle East, North and East Africa and in Central and Eastern Europe.

What is BRI? How to approach it? Is this a policy or an institution? Or maybe an organisation or structure? I think it is best to talk about it, as the Chinese themselves have proposed, as an initiative. Or as a project. There are always two “i’s” behind any projects: ideas and interests. This is the case now, although this time, unlike in the times when Chairman Mao wanted to export the communist revolution, ideas are in the background. Although some argue that China intends to ideologically and politically expand outside, it is clearly not about encouraging others to follow the Chinese path or even impose the Chinese economic and political model, but about economic reasons. Yes, in some regions of the New Silk Road, like in the countries of Central Asia – where by the way this old Silk Road beautifully thrived and left its imprint centuries ago – the system with Chinese characteristics may seem more tempting than Western liberal democracy, but in Central and Eastern Europe, it hardly inspires anyone.

Chinese politicians and economists emphasise the imperative of continuing globalisation and there is nothing strange about it because it benefitted them more than anyone else. At the same time, they emphasise the need to change the character of the current course of the globalisation process. That is why so much is heard about the “transformation of globalisation”, which should be inclusive and fairly distribute the fruits of supranational cooperation in all fields: from the economy and the natural environment through security and technology to science and culture. In this context, the instrumental significance of BRI is being highlighted. This initiative is intended to help transform the globalisation from its current form, rejected by many, into a globalisation, which will be socially more useful on a global scale than what the West has proposed. And that is why some countries, rather from outside the West, place a lot of hope in it, while others, in the West, voice certain apprehension. The former are curious about what this “globalisation with Chinese characteristics” could bring them, the latter probably would prefer not to experience it, and others are watching with interest what will come out of it ...

The second “i” – interests, clearly moves to the forefront. Big business, because as regards its size, it is a great project, although its scale is still not fully known, neither in Beijing. It is said that BRI encompasses 65 Asian, European and African countries inhabited by more than 60 percent of the world’s population over 38.5 percent of its area. The trade between these countries accounts for 35 percent

of the world turnover; their gross product is 30 percent of global production, and household consumption is 24 percent of what the whole of humanity consumes.

The One Belt and One Road Initiative as an Instrument of Inclusive Globalisation

As the Chinese authorities emphasise, BRI creates great cooperation opportunities in five fields:

- cultural exchange through the promotion of interpersonal relations and cooperation;
- policy coordination through planning and supporting large infrastructural development projects;
- financial integration through strengthening the monetary policy coordination and bilateral financial cooperation;
- trade and investment through encouraging cross-border investments and cooperation in supply chains;
- *facilities connectivity* by creating facilities enabling contacts along the belt and road.

Although the name of the project is the word ‘way’, it is by no means clearly delineated by the authors. There are no official maps showing where this road is supposed to lead, therefore there exist large flexibility in their charting; a specific cartography is being developed. Of course, in the countries that the project intentionally includes, the road must lead through their territory. There are also 12 African ports on the BRI map, of which 10 is located outside Egypt, which is the only country from this continent included in the project. And that is the point: who included whom and on what basis was it carried out?

Of course, it was China that included them, although the rules are not entirely clear. This is a fascinating geopolitical and geo-economic game, the goals of which are not clearly defined and the rules are not entirely clear. There are many players; cards have been supposedly handed out, but nobody knows if all of them. And whether the game is played only on the table, or whether some cards are passed under it. Who is risking what and in the name of how high hypothetical win? Political declarations sin through vagueness and, of course, are full of assurances of the good will of the initiator, but in many places of Eurasia – and elsewhere – they arouse various reflections, doubts, suspicions, anxiety. The economic goals are still drawn with a thick line and it is impossible to form a concrete opinion about what and why, where and when, for whose money it will be built and how it will be managed. And that is how this kind of open-end game is going on.

The invited participants are looking forward to it, hoping that joining a project in this phase will not cost anything, and maybe some, maybe even significant, economic benefits will be brought thereby over time. Reputation is not endangered either, because despite the exacerbating attacks coming from the West towards China, cooperation with it is something obvious. Thus, nobody has refused to participate in the project, even the countries that have not had the best relations with the Middle Kingdom lately, such as Vietnam or the Philippines. It must be strongly emphasised that only China can afford such a huge project, announced and initiated in a way that it specified on its own.

If the United States proposed something similar under the name of, let us say, *Great Americas* and pulled out a map with an area stretching from Alaska to Tierra del Fuego, this plan would be a false start, because certainly

some of the Caribbean and Latin American countries, such as Haiti and Venezuela, would not benefit from such *dic-tum*. If the European Union announced, let us say, a *Euro-African project*, without proper arrangements made *ex ante* some of the post-colonial countries might not take part in such an enterprise. Only China can afford something whereby Pakistan and India, Poland and Russia, Israel and Syria, Myanmar and Bangladesh, Saudi Arabia and Iran, Nepal and Bhutan would more than willingly and without any pre-conditions join their project.

When looking at the map, the geographical criterion strikes the eye first. Almost all the countries of Asia, all of Central-Eastern Europe have been drawn to the project, and Egypt too, as what kind of road it would be if the Suez Canal was not en route. Almost all of Asia, because for political reasons the two Korean countries and Japan have not been included. It happened to the former because it was not possible to sign up only South Korea while sharp sanctions have been imposed on North Korea, so China have chosen to avoid accusations that they are cooperating with the regime in Pyongyang. The latter one, meaning Japan, was left out because relations with rich Japan are not the best, and it would be necessary to negotiate BRI with it, for which, unfortunately, there is no conducive atmosphere. Finland and Greece are absent from the edge of the map, because they are Western European countries, and on the other side, Papua New Guinea is missing, because it is already “Australia and Oceania”. Therefore, due to the specific political correctness and simplicity of including in the map the countries through which the New Silk Road is supposed to run, i. e. its land and sea belt – such countries as East Timor or Bahrain, Macedonia and Estonia are featured, although most probably no camels will roam that way, nor a single junk will sail nearby.

China basically did not ask anybody whether they wished to be included in this project. First, they signed up whoever was needed – and, apart from the exceptions mentioned above, they subsequently announced it. However, if someone is not on the list, it does not mean that they are omitted at all, like Greece. Greece is not a member of NATO and the European Union – yet the port of Piraeus, which is largely in the possession of Chinese capital, is marked.¹

Formally, the Latin American countries have not been invited to BRI, but the hosts refer to them as a “natural extension” and “inalienable participants” of the venture. In other words, China is carrying on as usual, investing more and more in Latin America and encouraging its companies to penetrate those markets, unlike their neighbour from the north, who quite frankly discourages such movements through Donald Trump’s behaviour, offending some, especially Mexico and El Salvador. At the same time, when the American president in his typical style says that he said something different than *de facto* he said – this time at the World Economic Forum in Davos a year later than the Chinese president – Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi appeared at a meeting of all 33 countries belonging to the Commonwealth of Latin America and the Caribbean,

CELAC (Spanish *Comunidad de Estados Latino americanos y Caribeños*) advocates against trade protectionism and offers the region “a strategy of mutual benefits and mutual profits” [4].

In fact, nobody knows exactly how much, where, when and how the Chinese intend to invest in land as well as sea routes when implementing the New Silk Road project. The amount of four trillion dollars appears in circulating information, which must impress everyone, even in the most affluent countries, which are a bit further, at the end of the road, in France and Great Britain, because it is more than their GDP. No wonder that in both of these countries celebration surrounded the arrival of a freight train from China which travelled a long way, using the already existing infrastructure, but also signalling the need for its modernization and expansion, which is what the New Silk Road concept is all about. It was similar in Poland, when in June 2016 a freight train arrived from China to receive a welcome on the platform in Warsaw from the presidents Andrzej Duda and Xi Jinping who was on an official visit to the banks of the Vistula river. It comes as no surprise either that Western European politicians who visited Beijing in early 2018 – in January French President Emmanuel Macron, a month later the British Prime Minister Theresa May – talked about trade and investments more than about security and international relations. Everyone wishes to be on the receiving end of a four thousand-billion-dollar trickle, even a little bit...

In underdeveloped countries, China contributes a good deal for the infrastructure strengthening human capital – for schools and universities, for health clinics and hospitals. For this purpose, they use a soft loan instrument, which is often partially redeemed and turns into grants. On the occasion of the implementation of projects, powerful Chinese construction companies are often involved, so it is not surprising that they are becoming global tycoons. When looking at the geopolitical map of the world from this perspective, it is fairly easy to notice that China is particularly active where the West failed. Once, in colonial times, instead of helping, the West conducted exploitation, then, in neo-colonial times, when instead of cooperating, it cheated, and recently, in times of globalisation, when sometimes instead of creating areas of positive synergy, it marginalised.

Interestingly, they are also active where the Soviet Union failed, especially Russia as its core. This let-down is still casting a long shadow over politics and economy, as well as over culture and mentality in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. Geography and history may have gone their way, but contemporary interests have their own agenda, which is clearly visible in the area of these post-Soviet Central Asian republics. In this very interesting region – and one by no means automatically set to maintain political stability and sustainable development – we have a unique mix, as it is the crossroads of deeply rooted features resulting from Russian, Asian and Islamic influences, as well as Soviet legacy. Now the impact of the Chinese is added to all of these along with Western influences. The latter is due to, on the one hand, the significance of the region in the fight against international terrorism, whose tentacles reach these lands, and, on the other one, because of the rich energy resources which are relevant in the global accounts.

¹ This is another paradox, but it is the pressure of the West, especially the so-called Big Three, i. e. the European Commission, the European Central Bank and the International Monetary Fund, that Greece should improve its fiscal situation also by privatising state property, prompted the government in Athens to sell the port of Piraeus. The investor turned out to be China COSCO Shipping Corporation.

By the way, it is worth noting that the geographical location, which economy and politics do not choose, may be a blessing, as in the case of Switzerland sandwiched between Germany, France, Italy and Austria, or may be a curse, as experienced by Iraq lying between Iran, Turkey and Saudi Arabia. It is upon the political skill and ability to implement beneficial national strategies for socioeconomic development to determine whether the post-Soviet Central Asian republics, which occupy a prominent place on the New Silk Road route, will also use this aspect of their position to their own advantage or whether others will take advantage of them. If someone is located in the zone where China and the United States or the European Union and Russia are vying for influence, there is a lot to lose just as quite a lot to win on that. For this to happen, however, in the first place one cannot allow themselves to be antagonised either with one another or in the relations with these great global players.

Global Expansion of China

Although, obviously, Chinese activity contributes to poverty reduction and supports socioeconomic development, also for this reason China is suspected and even accused of bad intentions, ideological indoctrination and of political corruption. If that was the case, even partially, it would not change the fact that such a strategy helps other economies being at a lower level of advancement in their struggle for emancipation. And if it threatens the balance of influences, then instead of unproductive criticism of Chinese expansion, it is better to increase one's own support from the rich West, and pragmatically reorient the ways and directions of international organisations remaining under the prevailing influence of the West.

There is nothing ill-advised – actually quite the opposite – if alongside the export of capital and goods, China also “exports” some of its good skills from the sphere of soft infrastructure. These are precisely the good practices that we are so keen to talk about in the management science [2]. As in China itself, even the fastest trains cannot run without proper traffic regulations, or more educated personnel do not automatically ensure socioeconomic progress, so even more so it cannot be successful in the economies being backward compared to China. Therefore, they can and should learn from them. Knowledge and skills are currently a particularly valuable “commodity”. I put this word in quotation marks on purpose, because it is not literally about a commodity, meaning a product of human labour intended for market exchange, because in this case it is often a matter of non-financial transfers.

By using scholarships, tens of thousands of foreign students reside in China, obtaining knowledge in the fields that are preferred from the point of view of China's external expansion. When I lectured at the University of Beijing for a group of 40 foreign scholarship holders, they all came from “developing” countries, amongst which the most developed ones being Turkey and Kazakhstan. Almost all of them – with exceptions of a Polynesian from Tonga and a Caribbean man from the Bahamas – were citizens of countries that have found themselves on the New Silk Road or, lying in Africa, for similar reasons remain in the sphere of the Middle Kingdom's interest. There are no coincidences here.

China also uses its presence and growing activity in international organisations, especially the World Bank, WB, the International Monetary Fund and the Asian Development Bank, ADB, to influence institutional solutions, directions and instrumentation of development policy in the countries to which these organisations channel their financial assistance and expert advice. By no means did they prevail, especially in WB and IMF, over Western influences, but increasingly often in the economies undergoing emancipation one can observe Chinese experts sent there by this or that international organisation and increasingly often one can sense the “Chinese spirit”.

In the wake of all of these follows a diplomatic offensive. Currently, Beijing hosts 166 embassies and has as many of its own ones worldwide. The United States has one more, 167. Soon, however, they will be overtaken in this regard, as soon as another country that has so far recognised Taiwan as the representation of China changes their mind. A remnant of the Cold War, the first one, there are still 20 embassies of Taiwan: as befits an island, six in the island Pacific countries and five in the Caribbean, five in Central America and one in South America, two in small African countries and in the Vatican. In time – when the reintegration of the People's Republic of China and Taiwan will take place (because it shall happen) – it will be China that has the most numerous diplomatic representation in the world. Currently, taking into account not only embassies but also all diplomatic posts, China has 268 of them, and the USA have 273. For comparison, it should be mentioned that in the case of Russia, the figure is 242 posts, and France – 266.

China is the largest or the second largest trading partner for around 80 countries. Therefore, it is no wonder that what is happening there largely determines what is happening elsewhere in the global economy. When it comes to Chinese exports amounting to USD 2.2 trillion the addressee number one is the United States (18.2 percent), followed by (without taking into account Hong Kong where the PRC sells 13.8 percent of exported goods) Japan (6.1 percent), South Korea (4.5 percent) and not much less to Germany. As for imports – about \$ 425 billion less – the number one is South Korea (10.0 percent), followed immediately by Japan (9.2), Germany (5.4) and Australia (4.4 percent). Only then, with export to China being less than Australian, do the United States rank. Note – because it is interesting – that on the New Silk Road route the two neighbouring countries, South Korea and Japan are absent, from which account for up to a fifth of Chinese export. To some extent it is so also because they are highly developed and have their own advanced infrastructure.

Dependence on the Chinese economy is multi-threaded and goes far beyond direct export and import. In the subject literature, even a neologism has been coined *sinodependency index*, i. e. an indicator reflecting the changes in the S&P 500 stock index,¹ which depends on the ranking of 135 companies included therein and earning revenues from operations in China [3]. The Chinese economy is growing, stock exchange quotations are rising – and vice versa. When in 2009–2012, marked by the global crisis, the *sinodependency index* increased by nearly 130 percent, the S&P 500 in-

¹ S&P 500 is a stock exchange index managed by Standard & Poor's, the value of which is determined by the quotations on the New York Stock Exchange and NASDAQ 500, the largest from the point of view of capitalisation of enterprises, mainly American ones.

dex increased by just over 50 percent. In other words, if it had not been for the continuation of the Chinese boom, the economic situation and stock exchanges which mirror it in many other countries, including the most developed ones, would have been much worse. Therefore, someone who wishes China ill, means harm to themselves.

Conclusion

Advocating globalisation while at the same time pointing to the imperative of its greater inclusion, recognising the indispensability of reducing the scale of commercial and financial imbalance in the global economy, caring even more than some highly developed countries for ecological balance (although they contributed to its earlier disruption), China slowly takes the path of economic policy suggested by the new pragmatism [1, 5, 8]. Neoliberalism hardly exists there, corrupt capitalism is gradually decreasing (albeit too slowly), and the notions related to new pragmatism are multiplying [6].

China can essentially help in shaping the desired face of the future, limiting the growing global threats and the risk of a great catastrophe reaching far beyond the economic sphere. And this threat is real if, on the one hand, it was possible to re-direct the economy onto the neoliberal tracks *business as usual* and on the other hand if it was impossible to control the escalation of new nationalism. However, one can hope that none of them will happen, and this is largely thanks to China.¹

References

1. Baltowski M. Evolution of economics and the new pragmatism of Grzegorz W. Kolodko // TIGER Working Papers. – 2017. – № 136. – URL: http://www.tiger.edu.pl/Baltowski_Evolution%20of%20economics%20and%20the%20new%20pragmatism%20of%20Grzegorz%20W.%20Kolodko_III%202017.pdf
2. Cieřlik J. Entrepreneurship in Emerging Economies: Enhancing its Contribution to Socio-Economic Development. – Basingstoke ; Houndmills : Palgrave MacMillan, 2016.
3. Teenage angst // The Economist. – 2012. – August 25th. – URL: <http://www.economist.com/node/21560890>
4. China moves into Latin America // The Economist. – 2018. – Febr. 3rd. – URL: <https://www.economist.com/news/americas/21736192-asian-giant-taking-advantage-other-powers-lack-interest-region-china-moves>
5. Galbraith J. K. Backwater Economics and New Pragmatism: Institutions and Evolution in the Search for a Sustainable Economics // TIGER Working Papers Series. – Warsaw : Kozminski University, 2018. – № 138 (Jan.). – URL: <http://www.tiger.edu.pl/TWP%20No.%20138%20-%20Galbraith.pdf>
6. Hu B. The Belt and Road Initiative and the Transformation of Globalization // Distinguished Lectures Series. – 2018. – № 26. – Warsaw : Kozminski University. – URL: <http://www.tiger.edu.pl/publikacje/dist.htm>
7. Huang Y. Cracking the China Conundrum: Why Conventional Economic Wisdom is Wrong. – N. Y. : Oxford University Press, 2017.
8. Kolodko G. W. The New Pragmatism, or Economics and Policy for the Future // Acta Oeconomica. – 2014. – Vol. 64, № 2. – S. 139–160.
9. Kraemer K. L. Capturing Value in Global Networks: Apple's iPad and iPhone / K. L. Kraemer, G. Linden, J. Dedrick // PCIC Working Paper. – Irvine : Personal Computing Industry Center, University of California. – 2011, July. – URL: http://pcic.merage.uci.edu/papers/2011/value_ipad_iphone.pdf
10. Morris I. Why the West Rules – for Now: The Patterns of History and What They Reveal about the Future. – L. : Profile Books, 2010.

V. A. Konev²

FROM THE PRESENTATION CULTURE TO THE CULTURE OF PRESENCE

The title of the book by Oswald Spengler *The Decline of the West* (Der Untergang des Abendlandes), in which it's impossible not to hear a peculiar echo of the final words from *Capital* by Marx, became an original epigraph to intellectual reflections in the 20th century about the fates of the European culture and civilization. The best minds of the 19th century lived with the idea that all problems of the human society could be solved, that development of science and technology fully guaranteed that, that there were true values, which in the end would be able to convince everyone and become the foundation of happy life. But world wars of the 20th century, death camps, the threat of a nuclear catastrophe, environmental crises – all that and similar to that made the best minds of the 20th century doubt a possibility of an easy solution of the human so-

ciety's problems and possibilities of culture. "Auschwitz proved that culture utterly failed", Neo-Marxist Theodor Adorno says. He comes to the conclusion that "After Auschwitz any culture together with any humiliating it criticism are just rubbish".³ Wasn't that attitude to culture the reason of its treatment that got the name of "postmodernism"? Postmodernism as it is usually presented is freedom of ideas and styles – there are no canons now (God is dead!); allusions, quotations, remakes – there is no author now (Author's death!); combination of this or that with anything – there is no harmony now (Rhizome!); constant worry, alarm – something will happen, something is impending (Waiting for Godot!). But much more serious cultural processes are evidently hidden behind the stylistic symptoms. These processes are revolutionary shifts in culture, change of dominant messages of the culture of the Enlightenment, or modernity culture.

The culture of the New Times (modernity culture) established as a result of the multi-stage cultural revolution – Renaissance, Reformation and Enlightenment – built an orderly and clear picture of life for the society and individual.

¹ The article was based on excerpts from the book "Czy Chiny zbawia świat?", Prószyński i S-ka Publishing House, Warsaw, 2018.

² Professor, Department of Philosophy, Academician S. P. Korolev Samara National Research University, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Honored Worker of Science of the Russian Federation. Author of 300 scientific publications, including: "Meanings of culture", "The Anthropological Project of S. L. Frank", "Two concepts of the logic of meaning: Gilles Deleuze and Andrey Smirnov", "Umberto Eco: Joyce's poetic style and transition to a new type of culture", "Concept of creative act", etc. Member of the Russian Philosophical Society, Scientific and Educational Culturological Society.

³ Adorno T. W. Negative Dialectics. Moscow: Scientific World, 2003. P. 327.

This picture included:

- precise division of kinds of activities – division of labour in material production, specialist fields in science (establishment of science structured according branches of knowledge), division of kinds of arts, etc.;

- normative arrangement of each kind of activities in accordance with a certain logic – philosophy (Bacon, Descartes, Kant, Hegel) determined methods and logic of science, “The Grammar of Port-Royal” (Grammaire générale et raisonnée de Port-Royal) structured the language, Bach’s “well-tempered piano score” put the musical language in order, “Poetics” by Boileau established the method of Classicism in arts (after which the very idea of artistic method originated), Barrême rules regulate accounting, etc.;

- monologue of the mind, which is acknowledged as the manager and holder of the only for all Truth (the mind respects only those “who can hold one’s ground under its free and open test” [Kant], “The sensible is real, the real is sensible” [Hegel]);

- utilitarian attitude and private interests dominate over the values: usefulness or attitude to usefulness serve as the final justification of any action (J. Bentham says that the principle of usefulness does not require and does not recognize any other regulator except itself).

An individual in culture organized in such a way becomes subordinate to those kinds of activities, the experience and contents of which determine the meanings and values of culture. The modernity culture, regulating methods and logic of activities in various fields of life, creates a certain, whole and unified *idea* of the world and an individual acting in this world. The world, *represented in knowledge*, is the world of Kant (let’s remember his Copernican Revolution), this is the world of the Enlightenment culture. A well-structured text becomes a representative of this world. Text *presents* to an individual of the Enlightenment the world in which he lives. A scientific text is the world of nature in accordance with governing laws, a fictional text of a novel is the world of family and public life, painting (text of a picture) is the world of things and the look of an individual, music (text of a music piece) is feelings and sentiments of an individual. The ideas of the author of text present the logic of the mind, beauty, justice and moral ideas of human life. The right perception of these ideas was directed and controlled by critics and the system of education. A printed book becomes the material form of the *presentation culture* existence – the world of the Gutenberg Galaxy as Marshall McLuhan said. Reproduction and repetition of printed text strengthened the idea of the constancy of truth and existence of universal interest.

The result of the modernity culture’s activity is an individual identifying himself thanks to acquired ideas with a certain community (nation, class/stratum, state), having certain knowledge, skills and ability to use his brain (*Sapere aude!* as Kant calls to do), acting freely in accordance with the cognized necessity. In 1862, Thomas Huxley expressed the idea of a worthy representative of the Enlightenment culture as follows: “I think that only the one who got the free man education can speak, the one who from his youth taught his body to be an obedient servant of his will and has the strength to perform the work he is capable of like a machine, easily and happily; whose mind is clear, cool like a counting mechanism, where all parts function in time and with the same efficiency; the one who is ready

like a steam engine to find how to apply his abilities in any kind of occupation...”¹

Surely, this is the idealized image of the Gutenberg Galaxy resident but it highlights the cultural and genetic code of understanding freedom by an individual from the Age of Enlightenment: freedom is achieved via knowledge of the objective necessity and assertion of reasonable reality. And the idea of that was in abundance provided by the book galaxy. The civilization progress and freedom in the society are undoubtedly inseparable from the Age of Enlightenment thinking, which is established by the modernity culture. But at the same time the Enlightenment thinking became the reason of the Enlightenment’s self-destruction. According to Neo-Marxists Horkheimer and Adorno, “the idea of exactly this thinking, in no less extent than concrete historical forms, the institutions of the society, with which it is inseparably interlinked, already contains an embryo of the regress that is viewed everywhere today”.²

Nowadays, more than half a century after these words were said, the European culture is looking for the ways to overcome the crisis, in which the culture of the Enlightenment found itself.

The direction of this search is related to return of freedom to the individual of the technological civilization and bourgeois society, of freedom expropriated from him. This struggle against expropriation is manifested in culture that starts destroying partitions, separating meanings, values and kinds of activities that divide people.

The contemporary culture:

- stopped being the culture of sectors, it is a mosaic culture (A. Mohl), and that is directly demonstrated by TV screens in every house;

- is aleatory and not normative: randomness often plays the decisive role both in case of arrangement and carrying out activities;

- dialogue of consciousnesses and not the mind’s monologue determines the Truth and Value;

- not usefulness but action *a recentiori* (according to the situation, proceeding from the situation) manages humans, uniqueness and individuality are becoming the dominating values.

An individual in the culture arranged like that runs across the necessity to arrange his actions himself, orienting to the requirements of a certain situation. *Presence* here and now, a certain situation and not an *idea* and knowledge about repeating circumstances, becomes the basis for action in the contemporary culture. The world of ideas is the world, in which life is mediated by texts presenting it. And the world of presence is the world in which life expresses itself by events. These are two different types of culture, two different types of *being*.

The importance of human presence in the world on the philosophical level was expressed by M. Bakhtin by existentiality of “my non-alibi in being”: “The uniqueness of the present being is forcibly obligatory. This fact of *my non-alibi in being*, as the foundation of the most concrete and unique obligation of action, is *not recognized and not cognized* by me but is *acknowledged and asserted* in a unique

¹ Quoted by: Маклюэн М. Галактика Гутенберга / пер. с англ. А. Юдина. Киев : Ника-центр, 2003. С. 254.

² Адорно Т., Хоркхаймер М. Диалектика просвещения. Философские фрагменты / пер. с нем. М. Кузнецова. М. : СПб. : Медиум : Ювента, 1997. С. 10–11.

way".¹ Pay attention – not recognized and not cognized but acknowledged and asserted, i. e. *my non-alibi in being*, my *presence* is not revealed to me by someone or something (knowledge, tradition, rule) but is stated and acknowledged.

In 2004, 80 years after Bakhtin, Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht will say in his book *Production of Presence*, which became very popular, that in the contemporary culture "the interest shifted from identifying meanings (from 'interpretation') to the problems related to origination of meaning both at the certain historical and meta-historical levels",² where origination of meaning is tied with certain situations. The significance of presence reveals itself at the level of common consciousness and everyday behaviour by the most widespread questions, with which the talk over the cell phone begins: "Where are you?" or "Can you speak now?"³

The direction of the contemporary culture's activities is built in such a way as to put an individual in the situation of presence all the time, where he has to attest himself and choose the adequate for this situation behaviour. As situations are always concrete, they always differ in something, and human actions cannot be constructed based on established norms, patterns but require flexible algorithms, inventiveness, innovations, insight into the essence of the situation, understanding the situation as a here-and-now point, where all the global forces cross at this moment. The concreteness of the situation (environment) puts not the "what?" question to the action, but "how?". Individuality as a person's characteristic as well as uniqueness, originality as characteristics of the works of culture acquire the status of value in the culture of presence.

Establishment of the value of individualization in the contemporary culture reveals its historical meaning. The culture of presence should be understood as realization of the new variant of the modernity culture. This is not what is usually called postmodernism. Postmodernism originated as a certain trend in style, which refused "pureness" of style – this is mosaic character of style, in which the sector character of the contemporary culture was reflected.

The contemporary state of the European culture's development (and Russian culture is a national form of its existence) did not start from appearance of postmodernist works, it started much earlier. Establishment of the contemporary state of culture, which modifies the idea of private interest of a modernity culture individual into the idea of personal, individual striving of a *new* modernity culture individual, takes place in the form of a new cultural revolution, which is like a new European revolution that established the modernity culture.

The first step of this new cultural revolution is revival of the idea of freedom of the man, not tied up by any limitations. This idea of freedom was developed by Friedrich Nietzsche in his philosophy, he connected it with the image of

a superman for whom the strength of the life's establishment is the only justification of actions. Nietzsche, like the Renaissance humanists, turns to the antiquity but not the tradition of Apollo relying on the strength of form, but the tradition of Dionysus giving priority to the strength of elements and passion. Nietzsche emphasized the aspects in the contents of freedom that were typical for the Renaissance humanists as well, but which were emasculated by the Enlightenment rationalism. This is mentioned by Thomas Mann, who says that the Nietzsche's philosophy called "to come to a new, deeper understanding of humanism, alien to self-satisfied limitedness, characterizing the humanism of the bourgeois era".⁴ It's not accidental that the Nietzschean tradition became one of the sources for the new renewal of culture – the new modernity of the late 19th century and early 20th century.

But a new cultural revolution also requires "reformation" of the domineering sphere in culture. And that was science in the culture of the Enlightenment, it answered for preservation and justification of presentation of truth and rationalism. A new attitude to truth and rational thinking was to originate inside science. And that new attitude originated in science thanks to Einstein's theory of relativity and quantum physics. The science itself demonstrated that there is no single truth, and what is logical for the macroworld turns out to be illogical for the world of elementary particles. Physicists of the early 20th century performed not only as reformers of science but also reformers of the consciousness sphere, which was picked up by arts and literature. It's not accidental that artists and writers of the early 20th century all the time refer to achievements of new physics.

What will be the third step for establishment of the new modernity culture? The Enlightenment of the 18th century fixed institutional responsibility for establishment of unified truth and freedom based on knowledge and presentation of the necessity in the first modernity culture, as the function of science based on *cogito* rationality represented by Kant's pure reason and Hegel's science of logic, and "enlightenment of the mind" based on mastering the rules of dealing with the acquired knowledge. And what institution or sphere of culture will take upon itself the responsibility for establishment of individuality?

Surely, individuality is formed in the certain environment, but its meaning is in the fact that its being is self-sufficient, it is free in its manifestations, and these manifestations are always its. Freedom is the field for establishment of personal peculiarity. The first modern culture (culture of the Enlightenment) uncovered freedom as understanding and comprehended use of the necessity, the necessity controlled freedom,⁵ the new modernity culture (culture of presence) adds a new motive to that – within what framework an individual can do anything he wants and be anyone he desires,⁶ i. e. where the limits of freedom are.

¹ Бахтин М. М. К философии поступка (публикация и вступительная заметка С. Г. Бочарова, примечания С. С. Аверинцева) // Философия и социология науки и техники : ежегод. 1984–1985. М. : Наука, 1986. С. 112. (Italics by Bakhtin, bold print mine – V. K.)

² Гумбрехт Х. У. Производство присутствия: чего не может передать значение. М. : Новое литературное обозрение, 2006. С. 26.

³ Italian philosopher Maurizio Ferraris rightly comes to the conclusion in his book *Where Are You? An Ontology of the Cell Phone* that "there is a problem of omnipresence and individuality hidden in 'being by phone': you and only you (individuality) can be found anywhere (omnipresence)", that "the phone [cell phone. – V. K.] can without exaggeration be characterized as 'being always mine' (Jemeinnikeit)" (Ferraris M. *Where Are you? An Ontology of the Cell Phone*. Translated from the Italian by K. Timenchik, M. Ustyuzhaninova. Moscow: New Literary Review, 2010. P. 44.

⁴ Манн Т. Философия Ницше в свете нашего опыта // Манн Т. Собр. соч. : в 10 т. М. : Худ. лит., 1961. Т. 10. С. 389.

⁵ В. Спinoза: "Freedom is such a thing that exists only because of the necessity of its own nature and is determined for action only by itself" (Спиноза Б. *Этика* // Спиноза Б. Избр. произведения : в 2 т. М. : Госполитиздат, 1957. Т. 1. С. 362).

⁶ I. Berlin about the two meanings of freedom: "The first of these meanings or essences, which, after many precedents, I call 'negative', is contained in the answer to the question: 'Is the space, within the limits of which an individual or a group of people can do anything they want or be like they want to be, big?'. The second meaning, which I call 'positive' originates in the answer to the question: 'Where is the source of pressure or intrusion that makes

The presence cultivated by the current state of the culture's development, places certain demands on an individual. He even has to present or show himself – either reveal his name or close his face with a mask (a nickname, avatar on the Internet). In both cases the individual enters a responsibility area determined by his own actions. “My non-alibi in being” is always an impact on the world. What borders can I reach in this impact? In 1974, the well-known artist specializing in actual arts Marina Abramovich held a significant performance-test “Rhythm 0”: “Do anything you want with my body with the offered items – from scissors to loaded gun”. A viewer/participant of performance finds himself in the situation where his freedom is tested. What borders can I reach “doing anything I want”? This is the freedom's challenge – what will you dare to do? “An individual *should not* be free, he is *destined* to be free!” Sartre said. So, a new attitude to freedom appears, the attitude of experiencing freedom itself, comprehension of *what* freedom means to an individual, *what* the new situation means for him, the one that does not demand any duty but presents itself to him as an open opportunity for action – “Take everything from life!”. This is the test for freedom, *freedom's challenge*.

The task of the new culture coming to replace the culture of the Enlightenment is to answer this challenge. Freedom in the culture of the Enlightenment is the answer to the call of the necessity, the knowledge of the necessity and

action in accordance with it were guarantees of freedom. In case of the new modernity culture variant, modernity not in the presentation variant but the presence variant, the answer to freedom's challenge is rooted in the *experience of freedom* an individual has.

Where and how is the experience of freedom acquired? It is acquired when an individual puts his actions in relation to the limit, in relation to overcoming borders as testing his potentialities and abilities. Freedom is tension of transgression, ability to see the limits, to which your actions are directed and which charge them.

How can this be realized? It's hardly possible to imagine a methodical complex, which could point at certain practices, definitely leading to achievement of the goal one looks for. It's clear that experience of freedom is not just a personal experience but also a deeply individual experience, acquired in the process of individualization itself. Cultivation of the ability to recognize individualization and understanding its value should determine the logic of the contemporary culture's actions.

If a text in the form of a printed book (the Gutenberg Galaxy) created the ideal environment for establishment of the presentation culture, appearance of “the *book* of faces” – Facebook, and the galaxy of new information technologies (the Zuckerberg Galaxy) creates a new space, requiring the acting individual to be directly present, provokes a new culture, which is capable to inhabit this space.

H. Köchler¹

CULTURE IN THE AGE OF GLOBALIZATION

I. The Dynamics of Cultural Identity in the Global Context

For today's citizen, “globalization” has come to mean an ever more complex system of *interdependence* in the economic, but also in the social and cultural fields. Unlike in previous centuries, individual as well as community are faced with the *global* reality of “constant interaction”, a process that has been further accelerated by the rapid development of information technology, with pervasive an-

someone do this and not that, or be like this and not like that?”. These questions are different, though answers to them may partly coincide” (Берлин И. Философия свободы. Европа. М.: Новое литературное обозрение, 2001. С. 126). However, answering these questions, Berlin thinks that the borders for the space of freedom are set not by the one using freedom but by some external for him force, because of that freedom here is also limited (subjected) by/to necessity.

¹ President of the International Progress Organization (Vienna, Austria), Professor Emeritus at the University of Innsbruck, former Chairman of the Institute of Philosophy, Ph.D. Author of 40 scholarly books, including: “Phenomenological Realism: Selected Essays”, “Democracy and the International Rule of Law. Propositions for an Alternative World Order”, “The Concept of Humanitarian Intervention in the Context of Modern Power Politics”, “Global Justice or Global Revenge? International Criminal Justice at the Crossroads”, “Muslim-Christian Ties in Europe: Past, Present and Future”, “Security Council as Administrator of Justice?”, “World Order: Vision and Reality”, etc. Awarded the Honorary Medal of the Austrian College Society, Honorary Medal of the International Peace Bureau (Geneva, Switzerland), Grand Medal of David the Invincible of the Armenian Academy of Philosophy, Gusi Peace Prize. Honorary doctor of Mindanao State University (Philippines) and Armenian State Pedagogical University. Honorary professor of Pamukkale University (Turkey). Member of the Advisory Council, Academy for Cultural Diplomacy (Berlin, Germany).

thropological consequences.² It is stating the obvious that, under those circumstances, the sovereign nation-state – whether large or small, weak or powerful – cannot continue to operate as a strictly insular entity, and that, due to the multidimensional nature of globalization, the balance of power among states has become much more dynamic, and at the same time more fragile and unpredictable.

At first glance, this process are characterized by two different trends, both in the direction of cultural uniformity, and both overlapping and mutually reinforcing:

1. In the framework of global interconnectedness, the strongest culture – by virtue of economic, technological and military superiority – tends to impose itself upon the “life-worlds” (to use a Husserlian term)³ of relatively weaker communities. This has led to the creation of *hybrid cultures* all around the globe, whereby the most powerful community (civilization) has been able to become a trendsetter of life styles especially among the youth, and most obviously in pop culture. In the decades since World War II, this has been most visible in the fields of music, fashion, en-

² For details see: Köchler H. Philosophical Aspects of Globalization: Basic Theses on the Interrelation of Economics, Politics, Morals and Metaphysics in a Globalized World // *Globality versus Democracy? Studies in International Relations* / ed. H. Köchler. Vienna: International Progress Organization, 2000. Vol. XXV. P. 3–18.

³ The term was introduced to describe the multitude of human perceptions of the world – in distinction from the uniformity of an abstract (“objectivistic”) approach: (Husserl E. *Die Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendente Phänomenologie. Ergänzungsband: Texte aus dem Nachlass, 1934–1937* // *Husserliana*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1993. Vol. 29).

tertainment, or esthetical perception in general. In Europe, the most drastic example of this trend towards uniformity along Anglo-American lines (often generalized as “Western”) has been the development of the so-called “Eurovision Song Contest” – from a celebration of the diversity of national cultures to a rather boring display of the homogeneity of Western pop music, mostly interpreted in English.

The loss of the distinct features of ethnic traditions on our continent has been the price of “Americanization” (in more general terms, “Westernization”) in the period that has been dubbed the “American Century”, a process that has been further accelerated in the *unipolar setting* after the end of the Cold War. As early as 1941, in the course of the Second World War, Henry R. Luce, in a programmatic article for *Life* magazine, defined the essentials of what, as of now, is generally identified as “globalization”, but what started as the very project of reshaping the world along American lines. He stated, as a fact, that, “for the first time in the history of the world”, our world is “fundamentally indivisible”;¹ and outlined – in declamatory style – four areas of life and thought where the American vision of the world would be realized: the economic (particularly in terms of freedom of worldwide trade), technology, arts, and humanitarian commitment.² It is important to understand that this proclamation – at that early stage – was borne out of an assessment of military superiority, though euphemistically described as necessity of “defense”.³ This aspect has later become dominant also in considerations of the role of culture in world order in general, when culture was described as so-called “soft power”.⁴ In whichever way this role may be justified or rationalized, it is essentially about the “strongest” (i. e. most powerful) culture that imposes itself upon the others.

2. Independently of the above-described dynamics of global interconnectedness, backed up by military power, the trend towards cultural uniformity has also been a basic element of *technological civilization* as such. Technical processes – according to organizational, logistical, or efficiency requirements of production – have increasingly shaped cultural perceptions. This has meant a kind of *functionalization* of our life-world according to maxims of efficiency, and not of aesthetics or morality. The *tools* of economic exchange and social interaction have indeed acquired a life of their own. Functionalization of this kind, oriented at the mathematical (technical) form, is *universal*, not culture-specific. In the era of technology, the *interdependence* between technical development and the processes of globalization has become one of the main determinants of world order. While technological development has fuelled the process of economic and socio-cultural globalization, the ever more complex interdependencies – and synergies – in the global world have enabled further rapid advances in the domain of technology.

This interdependence has also been an important factor of social change, which, in many regions of the world, has meant a permanent state of social and political instability. A further result, and factor of instability, has been the earlier mentioned emergence of “hybrid cultures”, indeed “hybrid cultural identities” (if one may use this term, combin-

ing contradicting notions), with “Western” cultural traits as common denominator. This has also been evident in the increasing dominance of *one* language over all the others, with English effectively having become the *lingua franca*.

While culture, under the pressures and dynamics of technology and globalization, is undeniably becoming more and more a “hybrid phenomenon”, the *dialectics of cultural identity*⁵ have taught us that this process is not irreversible, and certainly more complex than the advocates of a “New World Order” under the aegis of Western “Leitkultur” (lead culture) are prepared to admit. Pressure towards uniformity of the life-worlds (in terms of specific cultural traits, perceptions of the world, value systems, forms of political organization, and life styles in general) creates *counter pressure*. This has been particularly obvious in the course of military interventions, falsely labeled as “humanitarian”, since the end of the bipolar world order, but also in earlier policies of the colonial powers.⁶ Through all of history, the mechanism of *action and reaction* has shaped the processes of cultural identity. In an earlier analysis of the role of culture on a system of peaceful co-existence, we have described this as the “dialectics of cultural self-comprehension”.⁷ The features of this dialectics are even more salient under the conditions of today’s globalization, with a multitude of interacting factors at different levels of social action and cultural awareness. It could be argued that what is nowadays famously described as “clash of civilizations” is the ultimate consequence of forces that are determined to negate the essentially dialectic nature of cultural identity.⁸

In the environment of technological and global civilization that, in the logic of cultural imperialism, tends to establish itself as *common denominator* of all national cultures – in what Marshall McLuhan much earlier has described as “global village”,⁹ the conditions under which culture (cultural identity) develops and asserts itself have become much more complex and challenging for each and every community, and in each and every nation-state. We can identify here only some exemplary characteristics of the “status quo of cultural self-realization” under conditions of “globality”.¹⁰

– **simultaneity** of life-worlds: In the globalized environment, the “simultaneity” of cultures, i. e. their constant “presence” in each other’s life-world, has become a deter-

⁵ See also: Köchler H. Culture and Empire: The Imperial Claim to Cultural Supremacy versus the Dialectics of Cultural Identity // Köchler H. Force or Dialogue: Conflicting Paradigms of World Order: Collected Papers / ed. by D. Armstrong. New Delhi: Manak Publications, 2015. P. 263–273. (Studies in International Relations. Vol. XXXIII).

⁶ For details see the author’s analysis: Köchler H. Civilization as Instrument of World Order? The Role of the Civilizational Paradigm in the Absence of Balance of Power // IKIM. Journal of Islam and International Affairs. 2008. Vol. 2, № 3. P. 1–22.

⁷ Köchler H. The Cultural Self-comprehension of Nations (Introductory remarks, fundamental considerations, structuring of Problems) // International Progress Organization. Innsbruck: International Progress Organization, 1974. P. 10–15. См. также: Cultural Self-comprehension of Nations. Studies in International (Cultural) Relations / ed. H. Köchler. Tübingen; Basel: Erdmann, 1978. Vol. I.

⁸ On the notion of “clash of civilizations” see: Köchler H. Clash of civilizations // The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social Theory / ed. B. S. Turner [et al.]. Chichester, West Sussex (UK): Wiley Blackwell, 2017.

⁹ Understanding Media: The extensions of man. London and New York: Routledge Classics, 2001 (first published 1964): “As electrically contracted, the globe is no more than a village” (p. 5).

¹⁰ “As electrically contracted, the globe is no more than a village” (see: Understanding Media: The extensions of man. L.; N. Y.: Routledge Classics, 2001 (first published: 1964). P. 5).

¹ Luce H. R. The American Century // Life. 1941. 17 Febr. P. 64.

² Op. cit. P. 65.

³ “We got in via defense” (Luce H. R. Op. cit. P. 62).

⁴ Nye Jr. J. S. Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics. N. Y.: Public Affairs, 2004.

mining feature of cultural identity (which, by many, is perceived as a threat);

- **interaction** as need of self-realization: No one, whether individual or community, can “shield” himself anymore from outside influence lest being marginalized in the global interplay of forces;

- **multidimensionality** of interaction: The simultaneity exists not only at the *global*, but also at the *local* (domestic) level, and both overlap. Herein lie the *challenges* and *risks* of “multiculturalism”;

- **constant self-assertion** (more precisely: the inevitability of the assertion of cultural identity) is the direct consequence of the above-listed factors, and constitutes a permanent source of conflict and instability at the local, regional and global level, but with the chance of the emergence of a new balance of power in the latter two domains;

- **volatility**, in the absence of a global balance of power, due to the dominant player’s claiming a status of cultural – or, more generally, civilizational – hegemony: The overbearing influence of one particular system, proclaiming to be the “paradigmatic” or “indispensable” civilization,¹ risks triggering a chain reaction of “clashes of civilizations” – a scenario now playing out (since the end of global bipolarity) in the region of the Middle East.

Against this background of perpetual interdependence and competition for influence, the major question is that of the *resilience* of culture (i. e. the assertion of cultural identity) in a technological-cum-globalized environment – where the structural pressure towards uniformity is further reinforced by the dominant global player. One of the major issues, in this regard, will be that of *religious identity*. Can Western secularism effectively “neutralize” religion – as it appears to have done in most of Western Europe, or can there be “sanitized” versions of religion, making the assertion of religious identity compatible with the “modern” secular state? This will become the major challenge in relations between the Western and Muslim world, and the answer to this question may ultimately decide about social and political stability not only in the greater Middle East, but also in the Euro-Mediterranean region.

II. Culture and World Order

The consideration of the dynamics of cultural identity in today’s global environment takes us to the more general question of world order. What are the implications of culture for peaceful co-existence among states, and what are the risks of political instrumentalization of culture in the global concert of powers?

As we have explained above, **culture** – more specifically, cultural identity – is a *dialectical* phenomenon. Culture cannot be understood as a never changing “substance”, exclusively determining an individual’s or a community’s world– and self-perception within strictly defined parameters. Culture is constantly being shaped and reshaped by interaction with other cultures – and in the era of globalization considerably more so. Cultural *identity* is not something static, but a never-ending process that stretches over space and time, a continuous flow of world perceptions – “life-worlds” – through the history of mankind.

¹ For a critical analysis of this claim in regard to the United States see: Walt S. M. The Myth of American Exceptionalism // Foreign Policy. 2011. 11 Oct. URL: <http://foreignpolicy.com/2011/10/11/the-myth-of-american-exceptionalism>

World order is the status of relations between states, peoples and cultures (or civilizations, in the most universal sense) at a given moment in history. In our era of globalization, it has become an ever more complex system of interaction and rules. Ideally, it will result in a *balance of power*, but often in history, as in the present transitory phase, it has been characterized by its absence.²

It is exactly in the latter case – namely in the absence of a balance of power – that the role and position of culture in the global interplay of forces is most *fragile* and *delicate*, but at the same time also must crucial, indeed *indispensable* – as is now the case – for the transition from a unipolar to a multipolar order. Only the latter is conducive to stable and peaceful co-existence among a multitude of actors, states and peoples alike, in our ever more interconnected “global village”.

In a unipolar constellation, the imbalance of power relations is exploited by the dominant actor for the sake of “canonizing” his own position, and almost unavoidably so as far as the psychology of power is concerned. As has been evident throughout history, hegemonic powers tend to negate the “dialectics of cultural identity” in a twofold manner:³

- a) *cultural exclusivism*: Hegemonic powers make efforts to “civilize” those that are subordinated to them, by imposing their peculiar worldview and system of values, thus marginalizing “lesser” cultures or stigmatizing them as “primitive”. A claim to cultural universality – in fact, exceptionalism – has been typical for imperial rule, and in particular for the self-perception of colonial empires. This has been even more so in cases where polities have been able to claim a status of effectively “global” rule of the then-known world;

- b) *instrumentalization of culture*: At the same time, the dominant player – in many, though not all, instances – uses his own culture as a tool to *legitimize* and *perpetuate* his rule. (This has also been evident in the so-called “humanitarian interventions” since the end of the Cold War.⁴) This essentially *ideological* strategy goes in tandem with the above-described trend towards *cultural uniformity*.

It would be worthy of some further reflection as to whether, and in what sense, “culture” may indeed be seen, or characterized, as an intrinsic *element of power*, as is also evident in the earlier mentioned “soft power” approach of recent international relations discourse.⁵ Can culture adequately be perceived as *one* aspect of a broad spectrum of power relations that, as far as states and world order are concerned, includes the use of armed force as last resort?

Whatever the answers to the questions about the structural relationship, or interdependence, between *culture* and *power* and its implications for the international system may be, the *dialectics of cultural identity* will always make itself

² On the dynamics of power relations among states see also: Köchler H. The Politics of Global Powers // The Global Community. Yearbook of International Law and Jurisprudence. 2009. Vol. I. P. 173–201.

³ For details see the author’s analysis “Culture and Empire” (Powers // The Global Community. Yearbook of International Law and Jurisprudence. 2009. Vol. I).

⁴ For a general analysis of this practice see: Köchler H. The Concept of Humanitarian Intervention in the Context of Modern Power Politics: Is the Revival of the Doctrine of “Just War” Compatible with the International Rule of Law? // Studies in International Relations. Vienna : International Progress Organization, 2001. Vol. XXVI.

⁵ For a critical analysis of Joseph Nye’s concept (Nye Jr. J. S. Op. cit.) see also: Lukes S. Power and the Battle for Hearts and Minds // Millennium: Journal of International Studies. 2005. Vol. 33 (3). P. 477–493.

felt in some shape or form. Especially under conditions of unequal power relations and social injustice, whether perceived or real, a forceful assertion of a cultural paradigm, its propagation as *universal* standard, may provoke an attitude of *resistance* and lead to new *self-awareness* of those who are expected to adapt to a dominant culture.

The dynamics of this process were manifest in the period of decolonization since the 1960s, especially on the African continent where intellectuals and activists such as Frantz Fanon, Aimé Césaire or Léopold Sédar Senghor, the founding president of Senegal and philosopher of *négritude*, reminded Europe, in particular, of its cultural arrogance, and identified the core issues of cultural alienation between the colonizing and colonized world.¹

In recent decades, around the turn of the century, the dynamics of cultural identity has been particularly felt in relations between the Muslim and Western or, more generally, secular world, albeit in a different kind – one that now appears to shake the very foundations of world order and challenge the underlying paradigm of peaceful co-existence. The emergence of Islamic revival movements – whether Sunni- or Shia-inspired – has marked a process of ever increasing cultural alienation, often fuelled by conflicts of interests and geopolitical aspirations. It is important to stress that the so-called “clash of civilizations” is, to a large extent, a *consequence* of these “clashes of interests” on the geopolitical scene.²

One of the most consequential events, in that regard, was the Islamic revolution in Iran in 1979. Though dismissed by most pundits outside of the country, a broad popular movement eventually prevailed against an Emperor who considered himself invulnerable – as ally of some of the most powerful countries of the time – and who had arrogantly lectured leaders in Europe about political stability and good statesmanship. The most recent development in this field – though structurally and ideologically different from what happened in Iran almost four decades ago – was the proclamation of a so-called “Islamic State” in the course of the disintegration of the state system in Iraq, Libya and, partially, also Syria, with ramifications in the wider Arab and Muslim world, whether in Egypt, Tunisia, Mali, Nigeria, the Balkans, or even Mindanao in the Southern Philippines. Whichever its organizational form or actual status may be in terms of governance and territorial control, this new movement understands itself as the very *antithesis* to Western (secular) civilization. It derives its strength not only from the *alienation* of Sunnis in Iraq and Syria (since the events of 2003 and 2011 respectively), and the centuries-old Sunni-Shia rift, but from a deep sense of cultural humiliation that accumulated over decades of colonial tutelage and foreign, essentially Western, supremacy in the region – in fact since the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire at the end of World War I.³ These events have contrib-

uted, and still are contributing, to a dramatic shift of the regional power equation, and have triggered a chain of events that has now also reached Europe.⁴ The migration crisis – with the crisis of multiculturalism at the domestic level of European nation-states – is one of the most serious consequences.⁵

As these and many other examples have drastically demonstrated, a claim to cultural superiority, backed by measures of conventional power, may, so to speak, “dialectically” produce a counter-claim, or a new, more radical form of cultural exclusivism. Especially as religious belief, one of the most decisive factors of cultural identity, is concerned, time and again efforts at “reeducation” – by way of “enlightenment” or “modernization” campaigns – have proven unsuccessful in the long term. This is a lesson that should be heeded by those global actors that have embarked on a strategy of exporting their culture in the name of universal values. As Amy Chua has brilliantly shown, even the most powerful actors in history, the global empires, were not immune from the dynamics of cultural identity. Only those that were prepared to *include* into their realm the cultures and religions on the territory they ruled, to accept and integrate distinct identities instead of trying to *exclude* and eventually eradicate them, were able to preserve their rule and guarantee a stable order over a longer period of time, often over centuries.⁶ The destiny of radical exclusivist approaches, however, has almost always been their sudden demise. The fate of German fascism upon the end of World War II is a case in point.

A just and stable world order will require mutual respect among cultures and civilizations – and even more so in our era of *global interconnectivity*. Culture must not be made an *instrument* of world order, or a tool to enforce *obedience* from the less powerful. Culture must be accepted as *expression sui generis of a community's identity* on the basis of *mutuality*.⁷ At the international level, neglecting this principle may trigger a cycle of aggressive self-assertion on the part of those ignored, which it will be difficult to arrest. Trying to recreate, or “reinvent”, other cultures in the image of a dominant one will ultimately be an exercise in self-deception. No one can arrest history and impose his paradigm upon the rest of the world until the end of times. The world has rather quickly woken up from the post-Cold War proclamation of the “End of History”.⁸

A stable world order requires a balance of power in a *multidimensional* sense (including politics, economy and culture). In the 21st century, and under the conditions of globalization, this is expected to be a *multipolar* one, based

¹ See e. g.: *Fanon F. The Wretched of the Earth* (1961) / transl. from the French by R. Philcox; with comment. by J.-P. Sartre, H. K. Bhabha. N. Y.: Grove Press, 2004. Cf. also the more “hermeneutical”, conciliatory, approach of Léopold Sédar Senghor, President of the Republic of Senegal, Preface: *The New International Economic Order: Philosophical and Socio-cultural Implications* / ed. H. Köchler. Guildford (Surrey): Guildford Educational Press, 1980. P. vii–ix. (Studies in International Relations, vol. III).

² See: *Köchler H. Clash of Civilizations // The New International Economic Order: Philosophical and Socio-cultural Implications* / ed. H. Köchler. Guildford (Surrey): Guildford Educational Press, 1980. (Studies in International Relations, vol. III).

³ On the aspect of cultural alienation, with Islam as focus for the assertion of identity, see also the author's analysis: “Using History to Understand

Muslim-Western Relations and the ‘Arab Spring’”, in: Fletcher Forum of World Affairs. The Fletcher School / Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts, USA. 2013. 1 May. URL: <http://www.fletcherforum.org/2013/05/01/kochler>

⁴ On the wider geopolitical implications see also: *Brzezinski Z. Toward a Global Realignment // The American Interest*. 2016. July-Aug. Vol. 11, № 6. P. 1–3.

⁵ *Köchler H. Mass migration and state failure — legal, political and cultural aspects of the refugee crisis // Current Concerns*. Zurich, 2016. 10 Oct. № 21/22. P. 5–12.

⁶ *Chua Amy. Day of Empire: How Hyperpowers Rise to Global Dominance — and Why They Fail*. N. Y.: Doubleday, 2007.

⁷ On the importance of this principle in the domain of foreign policy see: *Köchler H. Cultural Diplomacy in a World of Conflict // Current Concerns*. Zurich, 2018. 22 Jan. № 2. P. 1–4.

⁸ *Fukuyama F. The ‘End of History’? Debate // Dialogue*. 1990. Vol. 98 (3). P. 8–13. См. также: *Fukuyama F. The End of History and the Last Man*. N. Y.: Free Press; Maxwell Macmillan International; Toronto: Maxwell Macmillan Canada, 1992.

on a system of rules agreed upon among sovereign nations. Sovereign equality of states should be complemented by *sovereign equality of cultures* and civilizations if “culture wars” – that always in history have carried the risk of perpetual conflict – are to be avoided.¹ It goes without saying that the principle of *equality* cannot be defined, and practiced, without *mutuality* (mutual respect) and that there can be no tolerance vis-à-vis those who reject it.² There must be no self-contradiction in the assertion of cultural identity. This is exactly the dilemma the world is faced with when

cultural paradigms exclude each other in the name of universality.

Thus, *good statesmanship* on a global scale will try to avoid actions that can trigger an aggressive assertion of identity by any ethnicity or state³ – as difficult and delicate a task as this may be in today’s multicultural world.⁴ World order – with peace as its ideal quality – is ultimately also a function of culture, implying mutual respect among different expressions of collective identity. Negation of this truth may lead to a state of global disorder – with no end in sight.

A. M. Kramarenko⁵

THE FUTURE OF THE WEST-RUSSIA RELATIONS: THE ROLE OF CULTURAL AND CIVILIZATION FACTOR

Recently, the general state of the socio-political discourse on the issues of the relations between Russia and the West has been the source of concern. Harsh assessments and doom-laden forecasts have nothing to do with statements by the top leadership and the minister of foreign affairs that are kept in the spirit of classical diplomacy and neither close any doors, nor burn any bridges, and that inspires optimism.

Really, the situation has been aggravated, our Western opponents refer to belligerent declamations and use irresponsible words as the Skripal case and recent escalation around Syria demonstrated. But there is an explanation for that: now it’s their turn – after China and Russia – to come across stagnation/decline, systemic crisis of the society and a challenge to its complex transformation. We should add that Western elites turned out intellectually unsound; they are at a loss and cling like grim death to the status quo politics as having no alternative. This is understandable: how could the hothouse conditions of the Cold War and euphoria of “the end of history” after as if “victory” in it prepare for such fundamental challenges?

Besides, the whole complex of the Russia-West relations cannot be reviewed outside the wider, global context. Everything in the world is moving – there is nothing permanent left, at least from what everyone has become used to

over the whole post-war period, which turned to be the notorious time wrap both in the international relations and capitalist economy. It was easy to forget about the age-old experience of the whole proceeding history over the life of the three generations. The established policy has worn out and stopped being in accordance with the requirements of the current development. Because of that any talks about the status quo that cannot be, and “revisionism”, in which Russia is accused, have no sense. Hence special demands to personalities of the leaders that found themselves both in America and Europe in the conditions previously described as Bonapartism.

Averaging at the level of political orientation and practical politics destroys political systems and nearly the very political process in Western countries. Because of that the end of the Cold War without formal post-war settlement really became a geopolitical catastrophe and one of the reasons of upheavals ripening in the West. Their seeds refer to the earlier period – this is the Bretton Woods system based on the dollar, its one-sided reform via annulment of the gold standard at the peak of the Vietnam War in 1971, erosion of the Glass-Steagall Act and many other things. They carry the generic features of the Western society in themselves, the political culture of elites, its cultural genotype that determined the fates of Christianity in the West, first of all in its key segments – Anglo-Saxon and German. The experience of the comparable previous transformation moments shows that leaders in order to satisfy their requirements have to undergo their personal transformation. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, John Kennedy and, to my mind, Nikita Khrushchev were like that. Now, only Donald Trump among Western leaders can have such a conditionally revolutionary potential.

About “the Russian responsibility” for the today’s crisis in our relations with the West. In my opinion, we behaved peacefully, conciliatory and moderately. We reacted only when it was already impossible not to react, preempting a bigger disaster, for example, another Crimean War and establishment of the Sunni fundamentalist regime in Syria. The experience in Syrian crisis’ development convinces that clearly there are not so many people left in such a civilized country, ready to fight for it on both sides, as a result of which it would have sooner or later become the prey of outsider Jihadists, and that in its turn would have guaran-

¹ The so-called “global war on terror” risks to become such a perpetual war.

² This particularly holds true for the groups that presently articulate themselves under the banner of a so-called “Islamic State”.

³ The United Nations’ initiative for an “Alliance of Civilizations”, co-sponsored by Turkey and Spain, is a step in the right direction. The Alliance was established in 2005, in the spirit of President Mohammad Khatami’s 2001 call for a “dialogue among civilizations”, and following an initiative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

⁴ “Multicultural” relates here to the level of international relations. The multicultural reality at the global level does not necessarily imply “multiculturalism” at the domestic level.

⁵ Director of Development of Russian International Affairs Council, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Russian Federation. Author of publications in the journal “International Life”, on the website of RIAC, “Gazeta.ru”, “Expert” magazine including publications titled: “Russian Revolution Geopolitics: Verdict of Alternative History?”, “The Meiji Restoration and Russia: Modernization Experience Comparative Analysis”, “Russia and NATO: Background of the ‘Fateful Decision’. What to do?”, “Brexit Negotiations: First Outcomes” and others. Head of the Foreign Policy Planning Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation (2005–2011), Minister Counsellor (in the rank of an Ambassador) at the Embassy of the Russian Federation to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (2011–2017). Member of the Foreign and Defense Policy Council. Awarded the Order of Honour and the Order of Friendship.

teed structuring of the whole regional policy in line with the Sunni-Shiite confrontation. By that time Russia got a small potential for projecting force, satisfying the set tasks and, it must be said, a wider potential for opposing external challenges, including information challenges.

It is clear that before improvement of our relations with the West, they should degrade even more. At least, till the point when Europeans will no longer risk going step-in-step with Washington in military escalation because of the threat of war already in Europe. It seems that this moment will determine the rock bottom, after which stabilization and straightening of our relations will start. Transatlantic disagreements are already evident on the issue of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action on Iran's Nuclear Program, which the United States have already left.

Including because of that, Europe should not be given up, it's coming home after tough ideological incarnation in the form of historical and as if timeless West. Geopolitical solitude does not threaten Russia here either. I remember that when NATO and the European Union expanded, we told our Western partners that they should not hurry with conclusions as the East Europeans' view of life is closer to ours, i. e. traditional and conservative. These countries preserved the potential of historical vigilance in "Soviet captivity" (if we use Western terms), and that is manifested differently already within the frameworks of NATO and EU. Everything may change in time but not in the foreseeable future. Everyone has to proceed from the today's requirements. By the way, when John Maynard Keynes was told about the usefulness of long-term decisions, he answered that all of us would die in long-term perspective. Had Franklin Roosevelt limited the measures during the Great Depression by long-term ones only, half of the Americans would have died from hunger.

Though everyone says that Russia is not challenging the West ideologically, it's exactly like that in practice, only not in the previous system of ideological coordinates but in the new one – the majority becoming sovereign against cosmopolitan liberalism of elites in Western countries themselves. In principle this is no less dangerous for elites themselves that are inclined to view this "Russian challenge" as existential – at the level of the "Soviet" one from the Cold War period. However, at that time West European economy was "socialized" in response to the "Soviet Union's challenge" and a sustainable model of socioeconomic development was formed. Its destruction as a result of Reaganomics/Thatcherism was related to forgetting the lessons of the Great Depression and coincided in time with the end of the Cold War and disintegration of the USSR. The destructive impact of the visible disappearance of competitive environment and technocratic approach to social processes played their role: if there is not one ideology and development model, then the whole space (and time) are taken by their antipodes, and *automatically*.

What does, in my opinion, allow to look with optimism at the future of relations between Russia and the West?

First, the crisis in the West should not be ignored, it is a part of the context that often determined the significance of some or the others phenomena. The crisis is existential, and because of that it provides dangerous ejections outside – as a variant of a kind of crisis mobilization of Western elites. They hold on to the slipping away status quo, including the established globalization format, and globaliza-

tion is not thought of other than as an inalienable condition for the "liberal order" (domestic and international). Another consequence of this state of affairs is that we are dealing not only with elites but also with protest voters. The main thing is that we have no problems with the people of European countries, and that should not be forgotten.

Second, the whole global politics entered the end game – after hovering in the "anteroom" of the period after the Cold War. Actually, these 25 years that were required for the Western elites to comprehend the real meaning of "the end of the Cold War", pulled the 20th century into the 21st century, which to a large extent starts from 2014, i. e. the Ukrainian crisis. The nature of the end game is that all processes are sharply accelerating and events may fairly take the collapse scenario. We in Russia have to be internally ready for that. We have a lot of strategic patience: it's enough to take the time from the Munich speech of the President Vladimir Putin to the Ukrainian and Syrian crises.

Russia responded but did not outrun the development of events; it did not violate history and did not engage in social engineering at the international level. As a result, both crises turned out to be manageable, and to manage several crises simultaneously is possibly an unprecedented achievement in the history of international relations. Moscow does not set ultimate tasks in the sense of the ultimate solution of some or the other problems. Such an approach is the functions of the protestant view of life in the spirit of "the end of history", a possibility of rational settlement of humans in this world, outside God and history.

That which is usually called "the crisis of liberal order" refers us to such fundamental ideas as freedom, the balance of rights and responsibilities. The evident excess of the first was witnessed in recent decades. In this connection I'd like to give the opinion of the Most Reverend Rowan Williams, former Archbishop of Canterbury, presented in his research of Dostoyevsky. He writes addressing the sketches of "revolutionary" freedom, outlined in *Demons*, that here there is a diagnosis of pathological fantasies about absolute freedom presented to us, it can be compared to the one worded in *The Phenomenology* by Hegel: "freedom without limits" is the dream of freedom, in no way dependent on any other – human, non-human or divine – will; as there is no "other" existing for it, it also loses its content. But it follows that the desire of such freedom cannot be only embodied in destruction ...; self-destruction becomes the culmination of that.¹ The author refers to Terry Eagleton's authority: according to him, as limitations make us as we are, the idea of absolute freedom is doomed to be terrorist.²

The idea of "the end of history", i. e. a possibility of "the final statement" is directly connected with the subject of freedom. Exactly negation of such a possibility runs through all Dostoyevsky's creative works. The Soviet Union's experience proved in the course of history that he was right, now the Western society proves it by its experience.

Russia proceeds from life in its foreign policy, fitting in its flow, it behaves flexibly and takes decisions as it goes along; it does not shy away from modest but realistic results

¹ Уильямс Р. Достоевский. Язык, вера, повествование. М.: РОССПЭН, 2013. С. 34.

² Eagleton T. Holy Terror. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005. P. 71.

as well as network diplomacy, negating the very division of partners into allies and enemies, which is fairly in the spirit of our transitional time, requiring complex "reevaluation of values". The American elite only begin to understand the lack of options of such a response format, but they are not ready psychologically for such a "change of course" as they have to refuse the too fundamental for their self-awareness things. And they have to normalize, of all things, to become a normal country like others. Because of that it is easier to transfer into a new state via neo-isolationism and even "from the position of strength".

Third, Russia found itself on the razor's edge of the USA/West geopolitical pressure – hence the acuteness of our antagonisms. But this is also brought about by our history, proving the pseudomorphous (according to Oswald Spengler) nature of the Russian society's development. I tried to substantiate the dialectics of our participation in common, exactly common European affairs in my article "The Geopolitics of the Russian Revolution" (*International Life* magazine, March, 2018 and the Russian International Affairs Council website). Numerous convergent moments over at least three last centuries speak in favor of that. This is inevitable in the present and in the future as it was inevitable in history. We have been living in such period from the middle of the 1980s, and the oncoming move-

ment on the part of the West was outlined with the start of the 2008 global financial crisis.

The history of Europe would have been absolutely different without that and, most likely, much more disastrous, for example, had Russia joined the orbit of Germany united under the Prussian power, refusing from its natural right to historical creativity, and inter-western bipolarity would have gotten the upper hand in the world – the Anglo-Saxons on the one side, and the German and Japanese Empires on the other side.

Russia has to wait when Western elites get used to the new reality, first of all under the impact of their own elections, and at the same time demonstrate readiness for dialogue and cooperation, without stopping promotion of the positive agenda in global and regional affairs. The main thing is to attain restoration of the political unity of Europe/European civilization, including its North American branch and Russia, on the extra-bloc grounds. This could be in the interests of all members of the European family in the qualitatively new competitive global environment, when Europe can no longer force its will and its values upon the rest of the world and should prove its cultural and civilization compatibility with it. In my opinion, the uniting/balancing (no matter how you call it) role of Russia in world politics at the contemporary stage can be exactly in that.

A. B. Kudelin¹

ALIVE AND 'TANGIBLE' EMBODIMENT OF THE WORLD LITERARY PROCESS (D. S. Likhachov and the Literary Monuments Academic Series)

In 2018, we celebrate the 70th anniversary of the *Literary Monuments* academic series, the first books of which saw print in 1948. More than 675 books have been published in the series, which, over the years, has received recognition of scholars and vast readership in our country and abroad. Academician Dmitry S. Likhachov, who had served as head of the *Literary Monuments* committee for many years, described the series as "alive and 'tangible' embodiment of the world literary process".²

He became chair of the editorial board of the *Literary Monuments* in 1971 after academician Nikolai I. Konrad had passed away and kept this position till December 1990, after which he was elected the honorary president of the board and performed these duties during the next decade until his death, "actually remaining all the time at the wheel of the editorial committee, having his finger on the pulse of the publication process, initiating new projects, setting forth new ideas". In other words, he had been in

charge of the series for about 30 years.³ This fact allows us, without any disrespect towards other outstanding scholars, to mark the special place, which D. S. Likhachov kept in the 70-year-long history of the series.

N. I. Konrad in his program article dedicated to the *Literary Monuments* and written to regard the 20th anniversary of the series, pointed out the tasks of the series as follows: "We're looking forward to presenting our readers with such works from national literatures, which stand out as mainstays in the history of each particular literature; that is, these works are valuable deposits of artistic and literary, as well as of cultural and historical meaning. It is well-known, that presently the Academy of Sciences of the Soviet Union is working on the multi-volume *History of World Literature*; meanwhile our book series is suited to provide, to a certain extent, the material basis for this History – to prepare for publication the monuments and masterpieces, which define the unique character of each national literature and, when taken together, make whole the history of world literature".⁴

Since N. I. Konrad mentioned *The History of World Literature*, it is appropriate here to say a few words on the correlation of the *Literary Monuments* series and the literary history in question. The bringing together of two big aca-

¹ Research Advisor of A. M. Gorky World Literature Institute of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, a full professor at the Arab philology department of Asia and Africa Institute of the Lomonosov Moscow State University and Dr. Sc. (Philology). Kudelin is the author of over 200 scientific works, including the monographs titled "Classical Hispano-Arab Poetry (end of 10th – mid 13th cent.)", "Medieval Arab Poetics (second half of 8–11th cent.)", "Arab Literature: Poetics, Stylistics, Typology, Interconnections" and others. Chairman of editorial boards of the book series by the RAS titled "Literary Memorials", "Literary Heritage" and "Memorials of Oriental Writing". He is a member of the European Union of Arabists and Islam Scholars (UEAI) and a winner of the RAS's Veselovskiy award.

² Лихачев Д. С. Задачи серии «Литературные памятники» // Литературные памятники : справочник. М. : Наука, 1973. С. 10.

³ For details, see: Егоров Б. Ф. Лихачев и «Литературные памятники» // Археологический ежегодник за 1999 год. М., 2000. С. 407.

⁴ Конрад Н. И. От редколлегии // Литературные памятники. Итоги и перспективы серии. М. : Наука, 1967. С. 7. The multi-volume study mentioned by N. I. Konrad was created with recourse to resources and potentialities of the Gorky Institute of World Literature of the USSR Academy of Sciences (presently, the RAS): История всемирной литературы : в 9 т. М. : Наука, 1983–1994. Т. 1–8.

demical projects, whereby, as it was truly noted, “theoretical research seemed to yield a practical outcome in the form of book-publishing syllabus”, was answering the urgent needs of its time. It was N. I. Konrad himself, an active participant of both projects and co-author of their concept, who was first to declare the common ground of the *Literary Monuments* series and *The History of World Literature*. Beside him, there were many notorious scholars who not only energetically contributed to both projects as writers, but also served on both editorial committees as managing editors.

We'll limit ourselves to four names here. Academicians Nikolai I. Konrad, Dmitry S. Likhachov, Nikolai I. Balashov and corresponding member Andrey D. Mikhaylov, who in different periods of time served as chairmen of the Literary Monuments editorial committee and also considerably contributed to the development of *The History of World Literature* concept. All of them, except perhaps N. I. Konrad, who passed away before the work on *The History* was over, served as chief editors of certain volumes of *The History*, were members of the general editorial committee and of editorial teams working on separate volumes. They also wrote articles for *The History*. With these facts in mind, a former chairman of the editorial committee of the *Literary Monuments* (who currently serves as vice-chairman) Boris F. Yegorov writes with fairly enough substantiation: “As a matter of fact, it's difficult to find any big expert in the study of literature or historian in the recent half a century, who did not participate in the *Literary Monuments*”.¹

The consolidation of the academic personnel around the *Literary Monuments* series and *The History of World Literature* in many volumes reflected on their conceptual closeness. We'll confirm this thought by several quotations.

N. I. Konrad asks the question in *The History of World Literature* as to what is to be considered literature for a certain period, i. e. he puts “the question about the very composition of literature” as “the fact of different compositions of literature in different historical times is absolutely evident” and “very similar in the theme, nature, undoubtedly significant, if you take literary features, works are included in the composition of literature in the earlier historical times and not included later”, or, on the contrary, certain works can be for a long time viewed “beyond what was considered literature”, when “the published article, philosophical treatise... were literature, and of the top level”, and only later works, which were “beyond the limits” before, will be viewed as literary works. “Consequently, the recognized composition of literature consists of the ideas of the type of a literary work, and these ideas are always secondary, i. e. determined by the general position of literature in a certain historical period: its place in the cultural life of the country, its role in this life, they are determined by the attitude of the society in that time to the nature of the literary work's theme, its material, form, genre, purpose”, N. I. Konrad wrote. Thus, the scientist says, “historical changes of the composition of literature are one of the most important phenomena in its history”.² And exactly the historical change of the composition of literature “determined the real condition of literature of that time and

associated with it idea of a literary work”.³ We can finish N. I. Konrad's reasoning on the topic by his final thought: “...Gradually, what the humankind called ‘literature’ is outlined in the process of historical changes of the composition of literature, taking more and more certain contours and getting independent being, i. e. the category of spiritual creative activities of the society, different from philosophy and science and at the same time associated with them as they use common means: notions, symbols, images and even meter, rhythm, euphony. This process is inevitably viewed in the history of all separate literatures, i. e. it is common”.⁴

The idea of historical changeability of the composition of literature was inalienably connected in N. I. Konrad's concept of world literature with thoughts about the list of classical writers. The scientist's ideas of world literature are closely linked in the latter aspect with discussions of the principles for drawing up lists of authors for the *Literary Monuments* academic series. In this connection, D. S. Likhachov rightfully wrote in 1978 that N. I. Konrad was “the first to theoretically conceptualize the tasks of the series”.⁵ And really, N. I. Konrad's thoughts about historical changeability of the composition of literature were supported by many participants of *The History of World Literature* project and were practically applied in the *Literary Monuments* series when the composition of the series was discussed and its repertoire was definitely formed.

D. S. Likhachov speaks about historical changeability of the composition of literature and the idea of a literary monument in accordance with N. I. Konrad's spirit of ideas, and develops them. We'll quote D. S. Likhachov's work here (the quotation is necessarily long): “What does the editorial board (of the *Literary Monuments* – A. K.) understand under the ‘literary monument’? No unambiguous answer can be given to this question. First of all, we have to take into account historically changeable ideas of literature as a whole. There is a period in the history of each culture, when literature was not yet singled out into an independent field – the period when literature still does not perceive itself as literature. It was like that, for example, in Old Russia before the 17th century. In that period, encompassing six centuries, literature in its certain monuments linked up to clearly business written language or religious written language, business works included fiction elements and fiction monuments often had ‘business’ purpose. The ‘clause lists’ (a kind of official record keeping in Old Russia) of Russian ambassadors published as a part of the *Literary Monuments* series in 1954, were not ‘literary monuments’ in our sense of this word, in today's understanding of what literature is, however, these business documents, ambassador's reports about what they saw abroad and the talks they had there, played an outstanding role in formation of Russian literature in the 16th – 17th centuries. It's usual to understand only written works under literature (the word ‘literature’ itself, originating from ‘litera’ meaning ‘letter of the alphabet’, points at that). However, we don't refuse publishing folklore works, the whole cycles of them. We publish not only written monuments but also those that were created orally and lived orally and were only later written down. Folklore played a primary role in origination of cer-

¹ Егоров Б. Ф. Полувековой юбилей «Литературных памятников» // Вестник Российской академии наук. 1998. Т. 68, № 7. С. 653.

² Конрад Н. И. Введение. Место первого тома в «Истории всемирной литературы» // История всемирной литературы : в 9 т. М. : Наука, 1983. Т. 1. С. 14–15.

³ Конрад Н. И. Введение. Р. 17.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Лихачев Д. С. Опр. cit. Р. 12.

tain literatures and has been accompanying literature along the whole way of its development, interacting with it. Because of that we included great folklore works from the feudal period into the series – such as *The Song of the Nibelungs* (1972), *The Song of Roland* (1964), *The Legend of Tristan and Isolde* (1976), *The Song of El Cid* (1959), *The Epic of Gilgamesh* (1961), *Elder Edda* (1963), *Younger Edda* (1970) and many others. Cycles of folklore works are also published in our series: *Ilya Muromets* (1958), *Dobrynya Nikitich and Alesha Popovich* (1974), *The Epic of the Serbian People* (1963), etc.”¹

D. S. Likhachov did not contrast the *Literary Monuments* and *The History of World Literature*, nevertheless he wrote in 1973: “N. I. Konrad modestly thought that the *Literary Monuments* series can to a certain extent show the ‘material basis’ of the multi-volume publication of *The History of World Literature* undertaken by the Institute of World Literature of the USSR Academy of Sciences. However, practice showed that the series he supervised not only ‘outran’ *The History of World Literature* but also provides independent attitude to the preserved monuments, independent concept of the world literature development and its values. Selection of monuments for the series, articles and comments it provides are in a sense wider than the tasks set for itself by *The History of World Literature*. The series underlines not only the historical importance of the monuments but their ‘eternal’ meaning to a much greater extent than it is possible in the most serious histories of literature, their importance for our times and their general humanitarian values. Any world literature monument is always bigger than its interpretation”².

D. S. Likhachov in this appraisal proceeded from his own, “contrary to established and deep-rooted ideas” of understanding the nature of textology as a “wide” literary scientific branch of knowledge. Actually he starts his article dedicated to N. I. Konrad with the thoughts on the subject. The scientist writes that “Textology is a very wide science encompassing problems of a very various range from special and technical to connected with general attitudes to the fates of the mankind and the essence of world history”³. After that D. S. Likhachov divides textology into *microtextology* and *macrotextology* for the purpose of discussion. He refers the problems of the text history to the first with “exits” “into technical practices of editing technology”. He sees the tasks of the second in the studies of the nature and typology of texts’ movements in various periods, types of texts’ changing in pre-individual and individual periods with practical “exit” “to general publication principles for texts from various historical periods, choice and selection of monuments for publications in collected works and multi-volume series”⁴. D. S. Likhachov finishes his discussion of textology in the context of the said article with the following conclusion: “N. I. Konrad as the scientist was as if called to supervise the series, encompassing world literary monuments on the largest known until now scales. He was a ‘macrotextologist’ – a scientist capable to select monuments and establish principles for their publication on worldwide scales”⁵.

When D. S. Likhachov defined N. I. Konrad as a “macrotextologist”, he did not mean lack of “microtextological” interests of his predecessor in supervising the *Literary Monuments*, he just put the emphases: “N. I. Konrad gave a special role to the historical and literary aspect of the monuments’ publication and attached importance to a narrow-textological one: the history of the work’s text”⁶. It seems possible to present an opinion based on the analysis of D. S. Likhachov’s words, that the scientist, who stood up for combination of the “micro-” and “macrotextological” approaches and brought that combination into life practically from the time he headed the *Literary Monuments*, emphasized the “microtextology” only because “macrotextological” aspects had been mostly worked out by that time and actually accepted unanimously basing on the “theoretical conceptualization of the tasks of the series” offered by N. I. Konrad.

In any case, various members of the editorial board of the series were enthusiastic about many of the above mentioned N. I. Konrad’s ideas. We’ll mention only some of them here, directly referring to the editorial board’s practical work. “N. I. Konrad paid attention to considerable change of the idea of ‘classics’ and expansion of the list of world classical writers in recent years”, D. S. Likhachov writes as about a generally accepted fact; he was “a scientist capable to select monuments and establish the principles of their publication on worldwide scales”⁷. D. S. Likhachov added, giving reasons for this thought, that “N. I. Konrad’s understanding of the common character of cultural and historical development of the mankind, common main stages and formations in nations development did a good service to selection of works for the *Literary Monuments* series: first of all, the ancient times, the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. At the same time, N. I. Konrad highly evaluated not only the ancient times and the Renaissance but the Middle Ages as well, which was a principally important provision of his concept of the unity of world development and cultural value of all eras”⁸.

And another important note by D. S. Likhachov, referring to the general concept of the series: “N. I. Konrad’s views of the tasks and the nature of the *Literary Monuments* series were not frozen, established once and for all, they grew and developed together with the series’ growth and advancement”⁹.

The listed ideas of historical, theoretical and literary as well as comparative and historical studies of Eastern and Western literature, world literary process were practically realized in the *Literary Monuments* series¹⁰. Addressing these ideas turned out extremely useful in the components of scientific, “microtextological” “accompanying” of texts in the *Literary Monuments* series, as the works in the se-

¹ Лихачев Д. С. Опр. cit. P. 15, 16.

² Лихачев Д. С. Николай Иосифович Конрад // Литературные памятники : справочник. М. : Наука, 1973. С. 35.

³ Ibid. P. 28.

⁴ Ibid. P. 28, 29.

⁵ Ibid. P. 29.

⁶ Лихачев Д. С. Николай Иосифович Конрад. P. 33. We’ll also refer here to Vyacheslav Vs. Ivanov’s opinion, who says well-groundedly that “the problem of text’s interpretation was central to all multi-faceted N. I. Konrad’s scientific and literary activities” and that “Konrad as text interpreter was unthinkable without Konrad as culture historian” (Иванов Вяч. Вс. Н. И. Конрад как интерпретатор текста // Исэ монографии. М. : Наука, 1979. С. 260, 261).

⁷ Ibid. P. 32.

⁸ Ibid. P. 29, 30.

⁹ Ibid. P. 33.

¹⁰ Thus, for example, the above note by D. S. Likhachov about high evaluation of the Middle Ages by N. I. Konrad was worded not accidentally. It was done at the time when many people still thought that the Middle Ages were dark ages, the time of “obscurantism”, etc. Criticism of such ideas was practically unanimous both in the *Literary Monuments* series and *The History of World Literature* volumes.

ries, in the opinion of its direct participants, should be scientific publications, publications-researches, they are called to publish "the fullest and most recent research materials" in order to provide "deep and comprehensive understanding" of the published monuments.¹ Practically "the scientific character of the books from the series" was manifested in the nature of its publications. As a rule, they consist of three main sections: "1) text of the monument; 2) "Supplements" – other wordings and variants of the text; here documents and materials helping to understand the published monument more thoroughly can also be placed; 3) "Annexes" – a research paper as well as references and notes, including textological substantiations, real historical notes and indices".²

In this connection D. S. Likhachov wrote that "The *Literary Monuments* series was published for 'slow reading', the heuristic meaning of which was worked out in Russian philological science by academician L. V. Shcherba in his time basing on A. A. Potebnya's ideas".³ "The prerogative and privilege of the *Literary Monuments* are detailed 'academic' comments to the texts", B. F. Yegorov⁴ adds.

D. S. Likhachov wrote about the two main tasks of the *Literary Monuments* exactly in this context (in case of "microtextological" and macrotextological" aspects' com-

bination), which "were performed in... the series unflinchingly and successively, but surely not without some miscalculations and mistakes: 1) give monuments to readers rightly readable and in the most 'explained' way, and 2) encompass all countries of the world geographically, nationally and historically".⁵ These tasks remain urgent for the series today as well, as according to the scientist, "encompassing all countries of the world is far from being completed, and it's difficult to say when it can be completed".⁶ At the same time, D. S. Likhachov repeats the words about real difficulties of the whole series and finishes his vision of the future of the series optimistically: "A lot of time should pass before general contours of all world literature, all verbal arts of the globe start taking shape in the general mass of published works, but it is already possible to say now with assurance that the task set for the *Literary Monuments* series is real and it will be brought into life".⁷

Likhachov's insights and assessments of the *LM* book series are especially weighty, since he, from where he sat, could know and feel the gist of the matter, which is more than knowing the conceptual basis of the series or the schedule of new projects and publications; he knew perfectly well the real picture as to how the theory and inspirations were brought to life.

A. V. Kuznetsov⁸

THE FACTOR OF LANGUAGE AND OTHER CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL PROXIMITY IN THE PROCESSES OF BUSINESS' TRANSNATIONALIZATION

The culture's impact on the business transnationalization character has been studied for four decades already. At the same time, it's possible to single out works studying this issue both within the framework of just microeconomic approaches (i. e. at the level of certain enterprises) and with employment of macroeconomic methods. In the first case we are first of all speaking about the research stimulated by G. Hofstede's works, he offered to measure national cultures by a number of indicators to reveal the degree of various countries' proximity from the point of view of or-

ganizational aspects of doing business.⁹ When reviewing the second case, we should specially mention the Uppsala school of the internationalization process of the firm that was the first to correlate geographical governing laws of distribution of overall foreign direct investments (FDI), exported from certain countries, and the process of gradual informing businessmen about special features of foreign business.¹⁰ Later, after generalizing and developing the conclusions from the main publications by J. Johanson, the leader of this school, as well as a number of other researches, we offered to single out the factor of language and other cultural and historical proximity as very important in the processes of transnational corporations' (TNC) foreign expansion.¹¹ We'll mention in passing that the name of the factor will most likely require clarification and closer definition.

Urgent Tasks for Academic Analysis

Many aspects still stay insufficiently studied no matter the relatively long period of academic analysis of the culture's impact on special features of business' transnationalization.¹²

¹ Предисловие / М. Л. Гаспаров [и др.] // Литературные памятники. 1948–1998 : аннот. каталог. М. : Наука, 1999. С. 16, 20.

² Ibid. P. 19–20.

³ Лихачев Д. С. Задачи серии «Литературные памятники». С. 14–15.

⁴ Егоров Б. Ф. Полувесковой юбилей «Литературных памятников». С. 654–655.

⁵ Лихачев Д. С. Задачи серии «Литературные памятники». С. 12.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ Ibid. P. 20.

⁸ Deputy Director of the Primakov National Research Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the RAS, Head of the Centre of European Studies of IMEMO RAS, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics). Author of more than 300 scientific publications, including a monograph: "Internalization of Russian Economy: Investment Aspect" (awarded the RAS medal); 20 articles in journals indexed by Scopus and WoS, including "Foreign Investments of Russian Companies: Competition with West European and East Asian Multinationals", "Prospects of Diversifying Russian Direct Investment Abroad", "Framework for the Analysis of Geography Transnational Corporations Investments Abroad" and others (RSCI profile: https://elibrary.ru/author_profile.asp?authorid=569615). Chief Editor of the journal "Outlines of Global Transformations: politics, economics, law". Member of the Academic Council of the Russian Geographical Society, of executive board of Association of European Studies. Was awarded the Russian Federation Presidential Certificate of Honour in recognition of scientific work.

⁹ Hofstede G. Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values. Beverly Hills, CA : Sage, 1980.

¹⁰ Johanson J., Vahlne J.-E. The Internationalization Process of the Firm – A Model of Knowledge Development and Increasing Foreign Market Commitments // Journal of International Business Studies. 1977. № 1. P. 23–32.

¹¹ Кузнецов А. В. Прямые иностранные инвестиции: "эффект соседства" // Мировая экономика и международные отношения. 2008. № 9. С. 40–47.

¹² Though it is much shorter than the period during which the culture's impact on other economic processes is studied, including those of world economic dimension – it's enough to remember, for example, works by M. Weber.

First, some hypotheses presented in the 1970–80s were not duly confirmed later by empirical materials. However, that was mostly related to the necessity of detailed specification of this or that culture's impact on special features of doing business – in particular, the first G. Hofstede's calculations were made on the basis of non-representative material. At the same time, we'll emphasize that, as a rule, corrections of conceptions made in the course of new empirical research, do not disprove the main theoretical ideas.

Second, the requirement to take the expanding impact of globalization into account originated only recently. When J. Johanson and his colleagues from Sweden described stage-by-stage internationalization of companies set up by their compatriots, they proceeded from the fact that “teaching” a company was synonymous to teaching its managers. However, it is possible in the contemporary environment that an individual with already a good experience in doing business abroad in some other TNC can join the company (such examples were unusual in the 1970s). Foreigners quite often become top managers of today's TNC, so it's rather difficult to speak about a national character of this or that business environment. It's not accidental that firms becoming TNC in the first year after their setting up are fairly widespread in the 21st century, so it's correct to speak about the birth of “international” companies and not their transnationalization (or internationalization – here the terminological variant reading is also preserved).

At the same time, the impact of language barriers and other obstacles for free foreign expansion of companies-investors, caused by cultural differences, is undoubtedly preserved, though clipped. This means that it is not always possible to use some exact mathematical calculations, while selection of a fairly representative set of facts still allows to draw general governing laws and later explain the presence of numerous exceptions. For example, in case of FDI geography's analysis it's very difficult to divide the impact of the language factor, common history of the two countries (often being parts of one state for a long time) and just territorial proximity within the framework of “the neighbourhood effect”. Thus, according to the IMF data, mostly based on national statistics, by the end of 2016 26.8% of all Finnish foreign direct investments were concentrated in Sweden, 23.5% of all Greek FDI were in Cyprus, 35.1% of all Slovakian were in the Czech Republic, etc. At the same time, 57.5% of all accumulated FDI in Cuba were Spanish and 20.5% FDI in Austria were German.¹

The states, where companies started turning into true TNC only recently, are of special interest for analysis of the factor of the language and other cultural and historical proximity in business' transnationalization processes. This allows following the whole evolution of their internationalization well. In this connection, Russian empirical material becomes interesting not only for development of some certain practical recommendations for our country but also for revision of theoretical concepts created abroad. We have already managed to come to a number of interesting conclusions based on the materials of the leading Russian TNC, which we have been studying for two decades already. Recently, respective works are supported by the Russian Science Foundation (grant #14-28-00097)² and more applied

orders from the Eurasian Development Bank, connected with direct investments' monitoring in post-Soviet space.³

The Proximity Effect in Direct Investments' Geography

The language and other cultural and historical proximity effect has been well traced in such an indicator as the share of Russian capital investments in the total sum of accumulated FDI in the country. Thus, we evaluated the accumulated sums of Russian direct investments in the end of 2016 in various states, taking into account investments via offshore companies and other “transshipping points”. For example, the share of Russian investments exceeding 30% of total accumulated FDI in Europe was seen only in Byelorussia, from 5% to 20% in the Ukraine, Moldova, Latvia, Bulgaria, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina (thanks to Republica Srpska) and Turkey.

However, the importance of Russian investments is also determined by other factors. In particular, high figures outside Europe can be determined by political barriers for considerable foreign capital investments in case of significant Russian TNC projects – the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (total FDI amount from all countries is less than US\$ 1 billion) and Tajikistan (total FDI amount is less than US\$ 2.5 billion) can serve as examples. The presence of an important Russian investor can turn out to be decisive for the countries with more considerable total FDI as well. Thus, in South Asia Russian investors play the biggest role not in India but in Pakistan and Bangladesh only because of capital investments by VEON (former VimpelCom) that inherited affiliations in these countries in the course of merger of Russian and their Western partners' assets. Currently, the company, in which the LetterOne Foundation controlled by the Russians owns 47.9% of the voting shares, has nearly 85 mln clients in Pakistan and Bangladesh, which is more than the total VEON figures for Russia and the Ukraine.⁴

Previously this method was tested by us on the geography of Austrian and Swedish FDI in Europe.⁵ Notwithstanding similar scales of capital investments exported from Austria and Sweden, their joining the European Union in 1995 at the same time and some other common for the two countries factors, geographical preferences of investors differ greatly in their case. This can't be explained by difference in the investment climate of recipient countries – there is Austro-Hungarian striving for expansion to the Balkan Peninsular “surfacing” after nearly a hundred years in a queer way in the geography of Austrian FDI, and traces of Swedish imperial domineering in the Baltic Sea “come through” after even a longer period. Really, according to the IMF, in the end of 2016 the share of Swedish FDI in

Russia / Ed. by A. V. Kuznetsov. Moscow : Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the RAS, 2016 (the text is freely available on the website <http://www.imemo.ru>).

³ The two latest brochures published both in Russian and in English are: *Kuznetsov A. V. et al. Mutual Investments Monitoring in the CIS States – 2017*. SPb. : Center for Integration Studies of the Eurasian Development Bank, 2017 (report № 45); *Kuznetsov A. V. et al. The EAEU and Countries on the Eurasian Continent: Monitoring and Analysis of Direct Investments – 2017*. SPb. : Center for Integration Studies of the Eurasian Development Bank, 2017. URL: <http://www.eabr.org>

⁴ The statistics for the companies is mostly given by us according to their corporate reporting. In this case: Form 20–F. 2017. VEON Ltd. Bermuda. P. 11.

⁵ Кузнецов А. В. Переосмысление концепции большой Европы в связи с украинским кризисом // *Международная жизнь*. 2014. № 12. С. 1–17.

¹ Our calculations are based on the IMF data (<http://www.imf.org>).

² The collective monograph became the main intermediary result of the work under the grant: Optimization of Investment Relations in Contemporary

the total amount of accumulated direct capital investments in the world was 1.3%, but per 21% in Norway and Denmark, per 29% in Lithuania and Latvia, 38% in Finland and more than 48% in Estonia. Cf: the share of Austrian FDI did not reach 3% in any of the mentioned countries (it was less than 1% in Denmark, Finland and Lithuania). But the share of Austrian capital investments in Slovenia and Macedonia amounted to 28%, in Bosnia and Herzegovina and alienated from Serbia autonomous province of Kosovo and Metohija – 20%, Slovakia, Serbia, Croatia – 15–16%, Czech Republic, Bulgaria and Romania – 13–14%, while on the whole the share of Austrian FDI in the world amounted to 0.8%. It's not surprising that the share of Swedish capital investments in the total FDI amount did not exceed even 2% in any of the mentioned 10 countries of Central and Eastern Europe (CEE).¹

The presence of the factor of cultural and historical proximity in both cases is not a researcher's invention. Companies-investors quite often call some adjacent countries their "home" markets. It's easy to be convinced of that seeing official websites and annual reports of the three biggest financial TNC of Austria and Sweden presented there. Thus, Austrian Erste Group Bank singles out three geographical levels of its activities – Austria, CEE and all other states (including neighbouring Germany and Switzerland). The two other leaders of the Austrian financial sector – Raiffeisenbank International and Vienna Insurance Group – directly call Austria and all CEE countries their "home market".² The definition of "home" markets differs in case of Swedish transnational banks. In particular, Nordea Group refers Sweden, Finland, Denmark and Norway to them but, for example, does not include the Baltic States. Swedbank, on the contrary, refers only Sweden, Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania to them but not Finland, Denmark and Norway. Svenska Handelsbanken announced 6 "home" markets – Sweden, Finland, Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands and the UK (however, the Baltic States are not referred to them).³

Looking for the Border between Cultural and Historical Proximity and Political Partnership

Surely, it's not always possible to find the border between the language and / or other cultural and historical proximity and political expediency (including supported by economic profits) in the FDI geography. For example, why does Russian Alrosa mine diamonds abroad only at its subsidiary in Angola or why is the main foreign asset of OMZ – the engineering company in nuclear power engineering – located exactly in the Czech Republic?

Development of bilateral agreements on encouragement and mutual protection of capital investments is a good illustration for a non-evident border between cultural and historical proximity and political partnership. By now, nearly 3 thousand such agreements were already signed in the world.⁴ The record breakers are Germany, China and

Switzerland, but Russia has investment agreements with 68 countries that have come into force.⁵ Among others, this list includes Abkhazia and South Ossetia, which are not taken into consideration by UNCTAD, Serbia and Montenegro (successors of Russia's agreement with Yugoslavia) as well as Byelorussia and Tajikistan, with which Russia had only multilateral investment agreements (entered into within the EAEC framework).

The oldest acting bilateral agreements on encouragement and mutual protection of capital investments, in which Russia participates, were concluded by the Soviet Union – in 1989 with Belgium, the UK, Canada, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Finland, France and FRG, and in 1990 with Austria, Spain, Republic of Korea, and Switzerland. All of them came into force in 1991 after ratification (there were also agreements with Italy of 1989 and Denmark, China and Turkey of 1990, later replaced with new agreements). The choice of the countries is fairly evident: the USSR expected to attract new technologies into joint ventures from developed Western countries that were traditional trade partners of the Soviet Union. However, addition of South Korea, China and Turkey in 1990 certified search for new investment partners in the East (and capital inflow from all three countries turned out to be fairly considerable already in the 2000s).

Unfortunately, these agreements are nearly unsuitable for protection of foreign capital investments of Russian TNC that originated in the 2000s (no one thought about that at the final stage of the Gorbachev's Perestroika (restructuring) – there was the task to attract direct European investments into the USSR). The list of countries, with which the Russian Federation signed bilateral investment agreements, was noticeably expanded in the first decade of the Russian Federation's existence (the years when they were signed and came into force after ratification are given in brackets): Denmark (instead of the Soviet agreement), Cuba, Romania and Slovakia (1993/1996); Greece (1993/1997); Bulgaria (1993/2005); India (several years ago the agreement was terminated on the initiative of the Indian party), Vietnam, Kuwait and the Czech Republic (1994/1996); Albania, Hungary, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and Sweden (1995/1996); Norway (1995/1998); Mongolia (1995/2006); Italy (instead of the Soviet, 1996/1997); the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Laos (1996/2006); Macedonia and the Philippines (1997/1998); Turkey (instead of the Soviet) and Egypt (1997/2000); Lebanon (1997/2003); Argentina, Kazakhstan, the Ukraine, South Africa and Japan (1998/2000); Moldova (1998/2001); Lithuania (1999/2004); Armenia (2001/2006). As you see, they were mostly European and Asian countries – the exceptions among 32 countries were Cuba, Egypt, Argentina and South Africa. Agreements were signed but not ratified with several more countries – the United States and Poland (1992), Portugal (1994), Croatia and Ecuador (1996), Cyprus and Uzbekistan (1997), Tajikistan (1999), Slovenia and Ethiopia (2000). It became clear by the middle of the 2000s that ratification of some of these documents had in principle no sense any more.

¹ Author's calculations are based on the IMF data: Table 6-o: Outward Direct Investment Positions US Dollars, by All Reporting Economies Cross-classified by Counterpart Economies, as of end-2016 (<http://data.imf.org>).

² See information on the official websites: <http://www.erstegroup.com>; <http://investor.rbinternational.com> and <http://www.vig.com>

³ See information on the official websites: <http://www.nordea.com>; <http://www.swedbank.com> and <http://www.handelsbanken.com>

⁴ Out of 3,324 international investment agreements, taken into consideration by UNCTAD in the end of 2016, 2,957 were bilateral. See: World Invest-

ment Report 2017: Investment and the Digital Economy. P. 111. URL: <http://www.unctad.org>

⁵ The basis of the analysis is the UNCTAD database (<http://investmentpolicyhub.unctad.org/IIA/CountryBits/175#iaInnerMenu>), made more accurate with the help of Russian legal databases.

On the whole, investment agreements signing by Russia in the 1990s was not very systemic. The state of affairs started changing in 2002, when the new standard agreement on encouragement and mutual protection of capital investments was used as the basis, it was called to protect the interests of not only foreign investors in Russia, but also guarantee the rights of Russian companies investing capital abroad. This standard agreement was approved by the decision of the Government of June 9, 2001, #456 (with the following editions of April 11, 2002, #229 and of December 17, 2010, #1037), replacing the previously acting standard agreement approved by the decision of the Government of 1992 (with alterations and addenda of 1995). The new standard agreement takes into account the WTO requirements and contains a number of important provisions referring to the mechanism of settlement of investment disputes.¹ On the whole, one can see Russia turning to emerging countries: Yemen (2002/2005), Syria (2005/2007), China (instead of the Soviet, 2006/2009), Indonesia, Jordan and Qatar (2007/2009), Venezuela (2008/2009), Libya (2008/2010), Abkhazia, Turkmenistan, and South Ossetia (2009/2010), Angola (2009/2011), Singapore (2010/2012), UAE (2010/2013), Equatorial Guinea (2011/2016), Nicaragua (2012/2013), Zimbabwe (2012/2014), Uzbeki-

stan (instead of the old non-ratified, 2013/2014), Azerbaijan and Bahrain (2014/2015), Cambodia (2015/2016), Iran (2015/2017). In 2003–2015, a number of agreements were signed as a part of Eurasian integration projects' development, supported by Russia. As a result, a new format of agreements was offered in various years for Armenia, Byelorussia, Vietnam, Kazakhstan, Kirgizia, Tajikistan, and the Ukraine. Bilateral agreements between Russia and Thailand (2002), Algeria (2006), Namibia and Nigeria (2009), Guatemala (2013), Morocco and Palestinian territories (2016) await their ratification. In some cases we are speaking about Russian companies-investors lobbying their interests to protect from political risks in some or the other countries. In other cases there is progress in Russia's political dialogue with partners in Asia, Africa or Latin America (this is quite often accompanied by the first in history official visits by the heads of states and governments).

The presentation of examples like the ones above can be continued for a long time. However, in our opinion, it is already evident that the use of analysis of the factor of the language and other cultural and historical proximity may turn out very productive to reveal new governing laws within the framework of the usually carried out strictly economical or political and economical research of FDI.

V. L. Kvint²

THE ROLE OF PROPHETS, PREDICTORS, LEADERS AND STRATEGISTS IN DEFINING CONTOURS AND SCENARIOS OF THE FUTURE

People always strived to acquire knowledge of characteristics and "contours" of the future of humanity, nations, associations, groups or individuals. For this end various forms, methods and tools were developed and used. Professions, professional expertise, skills and sciences emerged for people to comprehend the future hidden with invisible chaos of time. Initially intuitive, subconscious perception of the future was mostly used (even now it's not recommended to ignore these non-scientific feelings when reflecting on future opportunities and threats strategically). Over the last years some serious studies, mostly international ones, have

been focused on this subject,³ though these processes were first comprehended in the Soviet school of philosophy and futurology (e. g. in works by I. V. Bestuzhev-Lada.⁴ Until the mid-20th century to get contours, scenarios and temporal characteristics of the future in scientific studies it was common to use various methods of analyzing processes in the past and projecting the results to obscure conditions of the future. First of all, those methods included extrapolation and interpretation of the past in schematic concepts of long-term periods and other heuristic methods and approaches to terms of high degree uncertainty of the future.

In the 20th century, psychological schools of logical-psychological analysis and professional practice researches were established, and thought theories regarding the future emerged. Various functions of professional perspective thinking in processes of predicting, forecasting, long-term planning and – to a lesser degree – strategizing are studied. By the end of the 20th century it was initiated to analyze different behavioral models in field of economic decision making in terms of high degree uncertainty, in processes of forecasting, long-term planning and strategizing using neoclassical economics. It led to establishment of a brand new sphere of economic researches – behavioral economics. Due to its unusual and unconventional subject, methodology and study findings scientists who were dedicated to that issue struggled a lot for the very idea of such researches to be recognized. For example, a scientist who was the first

¹ http://www.mid.ru/foreign_policy/economic_diplomacy/-/asset_publisher/VVbcl0f1FVU/content/id/2631716

² Foreign member of the RAS (USA), Head of the Financial Strategy Department at the Lomonosov Moscow State University, Head of the Department of strategic studies at the Institute of mathematical studies of complex systems at the Lomonosov MSU, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor, Honorary Figure of Russian Higher Education. Academic advisor of the Department of North-West Institute of Management, branch of RANEPA. Chief Researcher at the Central Economic Mathematical Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Author of many academic papers in the USA, Albania, Great Britain, Slovenia, including books "Strategy for the Global Market", "The Global Emerging Market: Strategic Management and Economics" and others. Number of works is translated into Russian. Doctor Honoris Causa of a number of Russian and foreign universities. Member of the Bretton Woods Committee (Washington), of the World Academy of Art and Science. Member of the Editorial Boards of the "Economics and Mathematic Methods" magazine, international magazine "The International Journal of Emerging Markets" and others. Chief Editor of the journal "Economy in the industry". Was awarded the Order of Friendship, the Order of Honor, Certificate of Appreciation of the Federation Council of the Federal Assembly of Russia, golden medal of N. Kondratyev and scientific awards in Russia, Albania, Belgium, Hungary, Great Britain, Kazakhstan, Kirgizia, Slovenia, the USA and Ukraine.

³ Gladwell M. Blink: The Power of Thinking Without Thinking. N. Y. : Little, Brown, 2005.

⁴ Бестужев-Лада И. В. Предвидение // Малая российская энциклопедия прогностики. М., 2011. Т. 3.

winner of the Nobel Prize in economics for his researches in that field (awarded in 2002), Daniel Kahneman, told that his first article written together with his main co-author Amos Tversky (who didn't last till awarding of the highest prize) was rejected by the magazine as a "poorly researched" one. The editor considered their paper too shallow for academy publication. As Kahneman says, "Psychologists really aim to be scientists, white-coat stuff, with elaborate statistics, running experiments. The idea that you can ask one question and it makes the point ... well, that wasn't how psychology was done at the time".¹ Since then three Nobel Prize for researches in field of behavioral economics have been awarded, including Robert John Aumann in 2005 and Richard H. Thaler in 2017. After Daniel Kahneman had turned to researches and understanding of the future, he came to an exceptionally unexpected and productive conclusion: "We think of our future as anticipated memories".² In this regard Kahneman himself concludes what understanding is, and how our vision of the future makes us think about it one more time with particular perception of our future expectations from important decisions.

It makes us conduct a deeper analysis of activities of prophets and seers described in sacred books – those who strived to shed light on the unknown and thus even more frightening future that seemed so irrational. Besides, it was studies in "predictable irrationality" that Kahneman and Tversky turned to subsequently to work out the prospect theory in high risk terms which was vitally important for theoretical and practical strategizing (including development of strategic thinking bases).³ Understanding the future is also connected with conclusions of the cognitive science that allows better comprehending and evaluating of the potential of decisions being made with respect to risks they create and efficiency in the analyzed future. The right decisions based on strategic thinking are undoubtedly enabled by using results of Robert Aumann's studies related to behavior analysis and reactions of competitors and opponents or partners to interaction or fight in the future. Forecasting and, moreover, strategizing are not a way to describe desired pictures of the future, but a way to find out possible and often quite undesirable scenarios and results in the long-term. And here it is important to evaluate and differentiate scenarios of objective and subjective probabilities where values, interests and priorities of subjects of strategizing may collide or cooperate. Besides, according to Aumann's conclusions, it's those who put their long-term strategic priorities above fast, but short-term success that win in long-term interactions and conflicts.⁴

As for seers and predicators, first of all, it should be acknowledged how often they have to face manifestations of irrationality when studying and strategizing the future. Irrational characteristics of future processes sometimes generated by the subconscious and intuition are so often used in predictions and previsions that in some cases they turn into almost serendipitous unlikely reality of the future. Seers and/or prophets, those individuals who could "see" visions of the future, were the first known experts in identifying

and understanding the routes that led people to the future, its characteristics and "contours". Foresight and prophecy are ancient categories and concepts. They represent a profession and a set of skills that had manifested themselves long before any records indicating activities of prophets and seers or their previsions appeared in Christian scripts. There are even some artefacts and notes about "professional" diviners and messengers considered mouthpieces of some invisible power or divine being, going back to the time before the Sumerian and Mesopotamian civilizations.

Vision of the future, prevision is a completely established category of scientific studies. Thus, the Russian Sociological Encyclopedia defines **prevision (P)** as "an informational (narrative and cognitive) by its nature aspect of anticipatory reflection in the function of a basic property of ultimate forms of matter. Prevision is divided into scientific and unscientific P., and the latter – into intuitive (connected with the subconscious), ordinary (by country lores based on life experience) and mantic (pseudo-prevision in the form of prophecies, oracles, "revelations", divinations, etc.) kinds. P. as an abstract category has several more concrete forms: forefeeling (simple anticipation) typical for any living organism, guessing (complicated anticipation) – a kind of intellectual activity of a person, reflections on the future based on personal experience..."⁵ It would appear reasonable that historically previsions and prophecies appeared not in the result of some special knowledge, but rather due to certain attributes of the subconscious and intuition of the individuals who announced them.

In the history of monotheistic religions it was possibly the most important function of a prophet to be an annunciator, an emissary of the Almighty. Nevertheless, in communities on different social and economic maturity phases, in social environments with different religious and cultural traditions and social preferences prophets performed in a peculiar manner; they were not only taken and accepted as heralds and messengers, but also served as predicators or even leaders from time to time. In hagiographies of Abraham and Moses presented in the Book of Genesis and the Book of Exodus in the Hebrew canon – the Old Testament, and Christian Bibles, as well as in the Quran these prophets appear granted with proactive roles and can be seen as leaders. Moses' abilities are described as huge: thus, it is stated in the Hebrew canon of Torah, "No prophet has arisen again in Israel like Moses" (Genesis 34:10). Moses starts as an annunciator of the Divine Will and a messenger and arises to an undeniable leader and becomes the greatest strategists from the visionary point of view. His successor Joshua (Joshua Bin Nun or Yehoshua Ben Nun) doesn't need to be considered a prophet or a seer, but rather the major military strategy leader.

Another outstanding prophet and seer in the biblical history is Samuel (Shmuel). He starts as a prophet and, just like Moses, becomes an outstanding leader and strategists during the War with the Philistines about 1040 B. C. (though the event and its date don't have enough historical evidence). As per results of studies by J. Hampton Keathley III represented in his article *The Major Prophets* there are some discrepancies in descriptions of prophets and evaluations of their roles and significance between the English Bible published by King James and the Old Testament

¹ Kahneman D. We're beautiful devices // The Guardian. L., 2011. Nov. 14.

² Kahneman D. 9 TED Talks that will teach you how your mind works // Business Insider. N. Y., 2015. July 20.

³ Kahneman D., Tversky A. Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk // Econometrica. 1979. Vol. 47, is. 2. P. 263–291.

⁴ Aumann R. Agreeing to Disagree. (Working Paper). Stanford: Institute for Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences, Stanford University, 1975.

⁵ Российская социологическая энциклопедия / под общ. ред. Г. В. Осипова. М.: Норма-Инфра, 1998.

(the Hebrew Bible). For example, Keathley highlights that Daniel is usually seen as one of the major prophets in the English Bible, but in the Old Testament he appears in the third part only – the one called Ketuvim (the Writings).¹ In the Book of Samuel – Sefer Shmuel, the eighth book of the Hebrew canon – some prophets are granted various functions or even strengths. A prophet is someone who watches and understands, and who is also a seer. In another verse Samuel describes a prophet as a “Nabu”, or someone who calls and announces (1 Samuel 9:9).

Sacred texts studied from this point of view let us suppose that in some Christian traditions prophets as seers are acknowledged and described not with their actions (or in a lesser degree with their actions); they are rather called saints than impress with “professionalism” of their vision and announcements of prophecies. At any rate, it can be concluded that, as it’s depicted in sacred scripts, both types of prophets either were used by a higher power in order to make them announce the major events that would (presumably) happen in the future, or had an extra capacity – to see the future and announce it to the audience. In both versions a prophet is a seer and predicator, but not necessarily a leader.

In the majority of cases delivered prophecies were so much outside of the common person’s understanding that prophets as seers were not taken serious by their contemporaries. For example, it happened with Cassandra, a daughter of Priam, the mythical king of Troy, who foretold the fall of Troy, but no one believed her predictions until they turned into the crude reality.

In the Torah the word “Navi” is associated with strong and precise vision of such great leaders as Moses and Samuel, while “Navi’im” also indicates a prophet as a seer, but with no leadership qualities. It is not uncommon in the history of prophecies for a leader/a strategist to present their strategic vision in such a way that it is even considered a prophecy for a short period of time after it is implemented. At the same time it’s fair to stress that even though some strategists can be close to making prophetic predictions in their activities in a few cases, they can’t be considered prophets yet. In history there are recorded cases of various degrees of credibility when some predicators could (or can) foresee events of distant future (even through centuries), though it can be said with high confidence that they were neither seers nor messengers of the higher reason. These undoubtedly gifted people were, for example, fantastic fiction writers, such as Jules Verne who had foreseen inventing of metal submarines (based on researching a few prognoses and practical, though unsuccessful attempts of creative people); Jonathan Swift who had made a guess about moons of Mars that were discovered later; Aldous Huxley who had described the life of society functioning on the basis of genetic engineering – an unknown science at the time – a few decades before it was introduced; Martin Caidin who had anticipated future in his novel *Cyborg* about a man with bionic prosthetics that were created more than 40 years later.

Several dozens of such examples can be given, but the most famous genius is outstanding *Michel de Nostradamus* – Nostradamus (1503–1566). In about 1550 he started to publish his predictions, and in 1555 he collected them in the first edition of his book *Centuries* which

since then has been translated and republished multiple times as *The Complete Prophecies of Nostradamus*. Nostradamus considered his predictions prophecies. In his preface to the first edition of the book he addressed his son Caesar, presenting himself as a prophet: “Such alone as are inspired by the divine power can predict particular events in a spirit of prophecy”. Nonetheless, in the same preface Nostradamus wrote: “Now, my son, although I have inserted the name of prophet here, I will not attribute to myself so sublime a title; he who is called prophet now, once was called seer, and prophets are those properly, my son, that see things remote from the natural knowledge of mankind. Or, to put the case, the prophets, by the means of the perfect light of prophecy, may see divine things, as well as human (which cannot but be seeing the effects of future predictions) and do extend a great distance, for the secrets of God are incomprehensible, and their efficient power is far remote from natural knowledge, taking their origin in the free will, causing those things to appear which otherwise could not be known, neither by human auguries nor by any hidden knowledge or secret virtue under Heaven. Only by the means of some indivisible eternal being, and by Herculean agitation the causes come to be known by the celestial motion”.

Reading the above text by Nostradamus, it seems possible to conclude that he attributed both powers to himself, as a prophet and a visionary.² Though he attributes these powers, he also does not appear sure of whether he is a prophet or a seer, or if he has both capacities. He sometimes conflates and mixes the visionary power of a prophet with the “professional” force of a predictor.

For years I have been impressed with the accuracy of Nostradamus’ predictions of events, their internal relations and interinfluence, closed off from him by centuries of uncertainty and chaos. After fighting my own doubts for a few months, I concluded with reluctance and without any excitement that Nostradamus was a predictor, but not a prophet. I cannot judge all his quatrains, but with his prophetic precision many of his predictions have come true. In particular, one of them was about the Soviet Union.

The overwhelming majority of biblical prophets demonstrate their ability over long periods of time, and make predictions about events much further in the future that the best specialists in field of strategizing and strategic planning and even developers of strategic concepts, not detailed scenarios, are able to. Wisdom and vision of prophets encompass centuries, like visions of prophet Daniel, for example. Sure, for the contemporaries of prophets it’s difficult to confirm and/or refute such abilities: what the prophet announces might come true, when these contemporaries are long gone already.

It’s essential to emphasize that it’s not correct to conclude from things mentioned above that every single leader mentioned in sacred texts was a prophet. The Biblical King David is an excellent example of a man who was not a prophet, but the greatest leader. David didn’t demonstrate his prophetic qualities, but respected seers and surrounded himself with them, including Nathan who announced several prophecies that came true in the Bible. It was Nathan who foreseen Solomon to become David’s successor destined to raise the Temple. From this point of view “professions”

¹ Keathley J. H. III. The Major Prophets. Old Testament Gateway. N. d., 2013.

² Nostradamus. The Complete Prophecies of Nostradamus / H. C. Roberts. L.: Thorsons, 1994. P. XVIII–XIX.

of prophets and leaders were already divided in the biblical history. Prophets were almost always considered people gifted with wisdom, though typically their first descriptive characteristic was them "being not quite normal".

In Ancient Greek mythology and history the role of a wise person and a diviner were split. Philosophers didn't consider seers seriously as well, and philosophers' contemporaries didn't take them as prophets. At the same time, neither philosophers nor predictors saw leaders as prophets or even diviners (predictors). Although Plato in his dialogue *Republic* argues that philosophers should be leaders in a perfect state, possibly assuming that in this case perfect ideas and theories will be perfectly implemented by real government. Actually, in view of split functions of a leader and a predictor, let alone a seer, stressed above, it's logically possible (as some historians note) that Alexander the Great consulted the oracle at Delphi for better understanding of his mission and future.

For strategists the most important value of prophets as seers is their rule (and often a need) to connect prophecies with a time scale, since a time factor dominates in the strategy (according to my researches).¹ Such a prophetic correlation of announced future events with time is not typical for philosophers though. Strategy and strategic scenarios are always related and correlated to the time scale. The law of economy of time, as it is proven in my researches, is the first and the most important law of strategy and strategizing processes. Though the Marxian economic theory considers the first economic law to be the law of values, other economic schools prove the first law of economics to be the law of supply and demand. In strategy both these criteria – price and supply-and-demand balance – can be fundamentally changed by time. Professionals who offered strategic advices also existed in the ancient times. In fact, it's an institute of advisors providing long-term recommendations. It is fair to say that the advisors of pharaohs in Ancient Egypt were strategists to a certain extent. The same can be said about the viziers who advised, for example, khans or sultans in the Ottoman Empire and in the Muslim world in general. What we don't know exactly about that time is the balance between myth, early beliefs, psychology connected with abilities to foresee the future subconsciously and/or instinctively and practically and/or scientifically grounded strategic knowledge.

What is the difference between a prophet and a strategist? In most historical or legendary cases prophets foresee the future of the nation or an individual, be it positive or negative, or even tragic. Prophets do not plan and do not present multiple scenarios based on the analysis of facts and factors predetermining things they foresee. They somehow perceive the future subconsciously, instinctively – and (in cases I'm aware of) without alternatives. Characteristics of this futuristic vision of the future are connected with both a general cultural and scientific level of society, and the seer's surrounding and their personal knowledge, cultural and moral values and interests. A strategist just by necessity must always have and present multiple scenarios, often alternative ones. If a strategist is absolutely certain in the results of his analysis, it's possible to present and offer one scenario only, but it's a rare case which can have far more dangerous consequences than having the main sce-

nario and some alternatives. Even strategic geniuses have more than one scenario after the strategy is developed and planned; and it's unprofessional to foresee one absolute result only and to rely on it. My researches show that it's recommended having two or three objectively applied effective scenarios in case new opportunities or threats emerge in the period being strategized.²

Prophets can't have alternatives, because they don't strategize the future, they rather "see" or foresee it as a complete (or mostly complete) "picture". Let's say a theoretical strategist or a practitioner admits and accepts this ability of prophets to foresee the future without any strategic development or implementation; then the strategist also has to understand that he/she has no capability to change this period of the future predicted by the prophet, regardless of all strict conclusions about the high probability of other scenarios and contours of this fragment of the future he/she came to using their knowledge, experience and strategic thinking. Actually, in this case a strategist and their long-term strategy is opposed to irrational *fate*, because relying on a prophet, trusting their ability to foresee, a strategist subconsciously relies on *fate*, and it brings the human-kind as an unmoored boat to a predicted end. In previsions and descriptions of the future foretold by a prophet the only response is to be ready to face it. Though even knowing that there are no alternatives in the irrational future instinctively foreseen by a prophet allows meeting it with a prepared scenario of further actions...

I know some unique examples that represent how even the greatest strategists who acknowledged drastic consequences of their concrete long-term decisions sometimes proceeded absurdly considering those decisions "all-seeing" irrational fate neglecting their own knowledge and experience. In this regard it appears acceptable to give such an example, which, I believe, demonstrates how a strategist went beyond a strategy predicting the high probability of incorrectness and unjustified risk of his rather unnecessary actions. Reading Napoleon's memoirs of his 1812 military campaign in Russia it's easy to note some passages where he emphasized optionality of that campaign and very high risks and directly noted a lack of any framed plan. Yet Napoleon stressed, "Even if I had had a well-thought plan, disposition of the Russian troops would have inevitably made me step back from it".³ It means Napoleon who could foresee inevitable loss of all his Empire to the devastating force just led an army of four thousand soldiers abandoning himself and his troops to absurd *fate*. Here it's appropriate to remember a passage attributed to an Epichristian theologian and philosopher Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus, "Credo quia absurdum est", where a triumph of the subconscious and the irrational is virtually announced (the accuracy of this translation raises some questions). Yet, despite huge losses and growing criticism of associates Napoleon continued on his disastrous course. That strategic genius had no clear explanation for his action and emphasized multiple times that due to some political and military factors he didn't have any alternatives. I have thought about Napoleon's attitude to his own decisions in that company, and I have concluded that while he understood the outcome, he could not change his course. He finished the war

¹ Kvint V. L. Strategy for the Global Market: Theory and Practical Applications. N. Y. ; L. : Routledge, 2015. P. 63, 64.

² Kvint V. L. Op. cit. P. 104, 105.

³ Мемориал 1812 года. Война глазами Наполеона / коммент. В. Димова. М. : Классика, 2012. С. 38.

with empty and tied hands, lost not only that campaign, but his army and thousands of lives on both sides and changed the course of France for the worse significantly, though not totally. He was abruptly and severely vanquished at the relatively young age of 43 and at the height of his talent and success as a statesman and a military leader. In his memoirs he made statements about the inevitability of attacking Russia, because he honestly believed he had no other choice. I am convinced, it was fate destined by a prophecy which affected Napoleon's subconscious so much. It's difficult to find another explanation why a person with such a brilliant strategic mind could write that confession despite losing everything he had achieved before.

A prophet and/or a predictor is rarely a leader of any practical decisions and actions. A prophet is first of all a spiritual guide and a part of the soul of his nation, his surrounding and his followers on the way to "seen" or foreseen future. This is why prophets, who combine their abilities of a seer and a messenger of a higher power with leadership skills of a practitioner, are absolutely unique. In the majority of the Christian beliefs and doctrines three separate leadership roles presented in the Old Testament are described: a prophet, a priest and a king. The rarest individuals unite these roles. Biblical Aaron was the first priest, but Moses was a prophet and de facto leader. During the whole "Time of the Judges" before the Saul, the first King of people of Israel from the Old Testament, judges were leaders and priests. Aside from historical facts, even in mythological stories it's difficult to find a prophet who is also a practical leader, except, first of all, Moses and Mohammad (Mahomet). However Moses was never an official or state leader of the Israelites even in biblical stories; he died before the nation settled its territorial borders, according to the Old Testament. Comparing talents of a strategist and a leader it should be emphasized that, first of all, a strategist is a profession going back to historical depths of military activity. However, as it's explained in my studies, people with strong intuition (if they don't ignore it, of course), a deep knowledge and a clear vision of the future can be considered practical or theoretical strategists regardless of their fields of work. Such a unique (in not the only) example of a person gifted with all those qualities at the same time in a varying degree was Marcus Aurelius Antoninus. Few speak about this great philosopher of the stoic school, emperor and strategic leader seeing him as a seer, though throughout his life and even after he had gone to a better world, there have never been any evidences of serious mistakes in his actions and

decisions caused by a contrariety of such a surprising combination of Emperor's various traits. In the history of civilization only a few major philosophers and masterminds who had important roles in leadership of the state or in the government can be singled out. Francis Bacon is undoubtedly one of them, since he was a Lord High Chancellor in the 17th century, which was the highest position in the English Government, who wrote some works lying at the root of empiricism and English materialism, and also left a few profound theological studies behind. But even this giant is inferior to a Roman philosopher and Emperor: Bacon was never a seer unlike Marcus Aurelius.

The process of strategizing trajectories and vectors of movement toward the future separated from today with some years, decades or even centuries gradually acquired its own characteristics, skills and knowledge, and by the mid-20th century a new profession was established. Departments to train professional strategists began to appear in leading universities of the world. At the same time a professional strategist doesn't have to be a person in charge or a leader. If a great professional strategist doesn't have leadership qualities or doesn't develop them by some reasons, even without any interest in managerial work they can get better as a specialist in field of practical strategizing, a consultant and/or a researcher of theory and methodology of the strategy. A professional strategist is a wise, optimistic and disciplined specialist with strategical thinking, some vision of the future and intuition he/she must never just neglect.¹ A strategist has to study and consider the cultural and religious environment of the strategized object and regions where the strategy is implemented. It is clear that a professional strategist should have a strategic methodology, be able to use profound knowledge of the subject to multiply its achievements and to strengthen its reputation; they must have a broad understanding and fast perception of new technological, social, economic and ecological patterns and trends. When interacting with a leader and helping him/her, a professional strategist can make indispensable contribution to leader's activity in correct evaluation of competitive edges of the subject being strategized, processes of establishing priorities, developing scenarios and plans, forms and methods of implementation on the way to scenarios of the future. In 21st century contours and features of the future, values and priorities the society should aspire to, vectors and rates of this movement can't be defined correctly and efficiently without professionally developed and consistently implemented strategies.

¹ *Квент В. Л. Стратегическое управление и экономика на глобальном формирующемся рынке. М. : Бизнес Атлас, 2012. С. 353, 362–363.*

Ch. T. Laumulin¹

THE ROLE OF SCIENCE AND CULTURE IN EAEU REINDUSTRIALIZATION

It was the technology begotten by science that brought about such a significant change in the development of mankind over the last couple of centuries. *Human life owes its change to the scientific and technological progress more than to politics, ideologies and various "isms"*. This statement is becoming even more relevant as we witness the world entering the era of a new industrial revolution. Its first phase appears to manifest itself in the explosive growth of digital IT penetration and communications, causing step changes in speed and nature of scientific, technological, cultural, economic, sociopolitical and other relationships. By improving human communications and facilitating information exchange, digitalization raises the question of knowledge and meaningfulness of transmitted information, which are developing in direct connection with scientific research and cultural and humanitarian foundations as the essential components of this process.

The question of the place of Eurasia in the global technological chain is of primary importance and can only be resolved through organization and development of proper research capacity, which, in addition, can potentially become the region's contribution to the future of mankind. The research capacity should primarily comprise such disciplines as geology, physics, chemistry, mathematics, and others. Speaking of the nucleus of the new economic growth center in Eurasia, one should realize that all strong global economies are fueled by development of natural sciences and, consequently, technologies, which constitute the lion's share of GDP (including post-industrial service market) and directly spring from the scientific discoveries. Fundamental sciences, especially physics and chemistry, are the knowledge pool for applied scientific solutions and technologies driving the development of innovative economy. Ignorance of this fundamental premise in managing the industrial politics, aggravated by insufficient financing of culture, humanities, education and health services, which are the core of the innovative social policy ecosystem, threaten contemporary societies with decline and degradation. And vice versa, investments in this area leverage overall development of the system and economics, increasing international heft and influence of individual countries and regions. Social development drives the development of the social ecosystem, in which science and culture grow side by side, being the products of the humanity's higher intellectual function.

The following phases of the new industrial revolution will be predetermined by the pending discoveries and developments in such fields of knowledge as materials science, energy conservation and transportation (e. g. superconductivity), cryogenics, quantum matter, astrophysics, optical physics, high-energy physics, optical and micro-electronics

(in particular, non-siliceous electronics), condensed matter theory, biology, chemistry, biotechnologies, medicine, Earth sciences and many others. The breakthrough in science and technology is already prepared and imminent; it will instill a new nature of political, economic, financial, international and other relations and determine the novel human environment, life style and way of development in the 21st century.

The overwhelming majority of these new discoveries are still to be made; however, they will constitute the foundation of events, relations and the very image of our future history, just like steam engine predetermined the history and geopolitics in the 19th century, and discovery of electron, industrialization of internal combustion engine and electricity were their key driver in the 20th century. As of today, the consequences of this process are unimaginable. Nevertheless, there is no doubt that it will be driven by institutional development of human intelligence. Thus, the human factor, development of education and human capital, creation of development-friendly cultural and social ecosystem are becoming the key to successful development in the changing environment.

On the other hand, availability of or access to material and natural resources, which are the foundation for transformations and research, are a prerequisite of no small importance for this revolution. For EAEU, with its biggest territory in the world, the development of Earth sciences is probably the most important knowledge priority, which should be closely followed by multi- and inter-disciplinary research. Central Eurasia is a unique region of the Earth, as its reserves contain all elements from the Periodic Table; further research of their properties is important, beyond EAEU countries, for global technological development, and especially in the conditions of yet another industrial revolution that we are witnessing. One of its most noticeable features is the importance of new properties of new materials. These properties can be discovered from studying the properties of old materials, through experimenting with or research of the well-known basic materials available or produced in EAEU territory. Furthermore, many elements, in particular rare-earth metals, are an extremely important part of the present and future global technological chains. According to Dr. Siddharth Saxena, Professor in quantum physics at the Cavendish Laboratory, University of Cambridge, nearly every conductive device in every room of the world contains an element from mineral resources of Russia or Kazakhstan. Mineral wealth, extended mining and metallurgical network, and human capital, including presence of diverse and ancient cultures, make Central Eurasia one of the most important regions in the development of the global civilization.

Research activities and discoveries are a primary and foundational factor in the new industrial economic reality and in the knowledge economy which should be a priority of any developed country. Technology transfer is a way out for many emerging countries. However, it requires a sufficient level of development of their own research capacity: for successful technology transfer, its recipient should be as technologically prepared as the source of import. This is impossible without development of endogenous funda-

¹ Researcher at Centre of Development Studies, University of Cambridge (Great Britain). Author of a number of scientific and op-ed publications, including "Science as a Natural Resource of Development, Irreplaceable Instrument of a Country's Modernisation and a Global Project", "On the Eurasian Idea and National States", "The Great Game and EAEU Creation", "Blood and Sweat. Victory Day", "The Kazakhs: Children of the Steppes" (co-author). Executive producer of documentary "Murder by Proxy or How America went Postal". The title of the PhD thesis submitted at Cambridge is as follows: "Science and Social Policy: Underpinning of Soviet Industrial Paradigms".

mental science as a source of expertise, new knowledge and trained competent professionals. Besides, in case of technology transfer the probable pitfall is that the country can become dependent and dominated, which may be a strategic threat to its sovereignty.

However, the geographic position, climate, historical and social conditions in the Central Eurasia make most technological transfers inefficient or noncompetitive globally, while endogenous scientific research could become the basis for development of unique technologies and innovations. Any domestic high-tech production has a considerable margin and minor transportation cost, in comparison with the end price.

Development of research in natural sciences can boost the economy – its fundamental nucleus of the new advanced industrial and agricultural industries – and enrich, deepen and expand national moral, social, cultural and political paradigm in post-soviet societies. At the same time, the institute of academic thought and research is the integral processor of the entire system, delivering valuable and actually competent personnel to manage the governmental and private economy and the society.

To an unknown user, the innovation process is a gate for life-changing technology; in fact, technological achievement is the root of innovation. Technology itself is a result of efforts in applied science, namely engineering. It its turn, the latter is essentially the result of development of fundamental science, which is impossible without a certain level of culture and is driven by curiosity and purely spiritual craving for knowledge.

Apart from their direct practical application, these two phenomena, science and culture, have presently crystallized into the most important source of global influence and “soft power”. This logic is in favor of the necessity to focus efforts of post-soviet academic circles, society and state on enabling the research capability in the above-mentioned fields of knowledge, as historically it is the only available journey to successful national development. As a result, this process can lead to emergence of a high-tech and unique economy based on the “discovery industry”, and provide sustainable development and international influence for the region in the period of inevitable tempestuous and unpredictable global changes.

According to the contemporary concept of the triple helix model of innovation,¹ the society owes its progressive development to rotational interaction of three (conditionally round) centers with overlapping borders inside the helix: state, academia (institutionalized science and culture) and industry, creating the innovative core of development. It makes the centers rotate, propelling the progressive development of the whole model, providing backup solutions and duplicating the other centers’ functions. However, this is the ideal model. Autonomous functioning of these development centers in many developed countries, including the United States, brings about the task of their convergence through respective industrial policies. These centers were being formed over many centuries and represent a complex evolutionary social model of the “discovery industry”. It’s very difficult for the emerging countries to simply copy

this effective model because of their underdeveloped centers and lack of time. In EAEU the state can assume the role of a development locomotive for the other two centers (industry and research) in order to put the whole system in motion, even if it implies potential and mostly inevitable risks of deteriorating interaction between the other elements due to the dominant role of the state.

For instance, EAEU countries can apply their national efforts to research in the field of generation, transfer, storage and use of energy through superconductivity. Another breakthrough field can emerge from development of new structures capable of revolutionizing the output of solar cells, batteries, fuel cells, light construction materials, refrigerating equipment, water treatment etc., to avoid failure in today’s industrial race for small transistors. Such “magic” technologies are not pursued globally because of the lack of the necessary chemical elements which are abundant in our reserves. Meanwhile, the global industry continues to excessively invest in classical technologies. This situation opens limitless global opportunities to EAEU.

The task of launching scientific research simultaneously with a step change in historical development implies engagement of leading global natural scientists and engineers, in combination with development of domestic culture in all its diversity, as well as development of social and economic sciences to reinforce the domestic philosophical basis, academic culture and knowledge. However, in order to achieve true success, EAEU countries will need a reform and evolution of approaches to management of such a sensitive sector and to search for valuable professionals who will manage the interaction between science and industry. Development and implementation of a successful Eurasian and, consequently, global industrial policy is an innovative task in itself, as it is evident from the learnings of the latest industrial history. But, strictly speaking, it is the existence of institutionally established science and culture that directly certifies the extent of the society’s development, level of civilization, and its readiness for a developmental breakthrough.

Development of science and research is a necessary condition for global development. Extent of allocations in fundamental science and R&D is a reliable indicator of a country’s extent of development. According to the current average data for OECD countries, R&D expenses in a developed country can vary around 2.4 percent of GDP per year (about one third of this amount is direct financing of fundamental science by the state). 1.1 percent of GDP in Russia, 0.67 percent in Belarus and 0.17 percent in Kazakhstan are clearly not enough for the three EAEU founding countries. Compare this to now virtually unrealistic 5 percent of GNP reached by the USSR in 1980.

Investments in development of science and culture are the best option for any nation. Joining the Central Eurasian research capacity to the global research, simultaneously with development of the endogenous scientific research paradigm based on the USSR scientific potential, can become a considerable contribution to the global development and strengthen the position of the new Union on the international scene. For EAEU, the development of research is a strategic priority which can be fairly easily accomplished. First of all, we should revive and establish the proper research and experimental infrastructure, and engage the right personnel. Annual allocations amounting

¹ Ranga M., Etzkowitz H. Triple Helix Systems: An Analytical Framework for Innovation Policy and Practice in the Knowledge Society. Stanford University, 2013. URL: https://triplehelix.stanford.edu/images/Triple_Helix_Systems.pdf

up to two percent of GDP would be a strategic investment in the future of a country and could enable the Eurasian Economic Union to take a new place in the future global organization. At the same time, it should be kept in mind

that no efforts or allocations will bring a significant result without enforcement of social policy and development of culture, education and healthcare as the critical aspects shaping a social environment.

L. F. Lebedeva¹

GLOBAL CHALLENGES AND NATIONAL PRIORITIES IN THE SOCIO-LABOR FIELD: "TRUMP'S REVOLUTION"

The globalization processes, principal technological changes taking place in the global economy are accompanied by widening of the gap between economic growth and improvement of social indicators, increase of the number of employable individuals outside the workforce, decrease of the population's social security as a result of reforms of state people's social support systems, increase of inequality on the global, regional, national levels.²

Revision of the home and foreign economic policy goals of the country in line with the *America First* policy by the current President of the United States (from January 20, 2017) D. Trump has become a new challenge not only for the international trade, economic relations of the subjects of the world economy but also for millions of people engaged outside the USA in manufacture of products supplied to the American market; as well as foreign enterprises of American companies. High-quality job creation, job protection from foreign competition, return of jobs from foreign branches of American companies to the territory of the United States were recognized as the key national priorities at the top state level.

Notwithstanding the fairly good key indicators in employment³ in the United States as a whole, which were emphasized by D. Trump in his annual address to the Congress (*State of the Union Address*, delivered on January 30, 2018), the state of affairs is characterized by sustainable reduction of the employable population's participation in labor; the already habitual unemployment disproportions as to age, race and ethnic groups, depending on the education level; origination of new features demonstrating inequality growth in incomes, availability of social programs for working people at the place of employment.⁴

¹ Head of the Center for Socioeconomic Research and Projects of the Institute for the USA and Canadian Studies of the RAS, Professor at the State Academic University of the Humanities (Moscow), Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor (World Economy). Author of more than 270 academic publications, including: "Foreign Capital in the United States Economy", "State and Business: The Interaction Strategy in the Economy of the 21st Century", "The United States: the State and Social Policy", "The Budget Priorities of the United States", "The United States: State-Man-Economy: Regional Dimension", "The United States: the State and Social Security", "The Priorities of the United States Scientific and Technological Policy", "The State and Human Potential's Development in the Late 20th Century and Early 21st Century", "The United States Positions in International Trade at the New Stage of Global Rivalry", "The Federal Budget during Barack Obama's Presidency" (executive editor), etc. Member of editorial boards of the journals *International Trade and Trade Policy*; *USA-Canada: Economics, Politics, Culture*; *Russia and America in the 21st Century*.

² Employment Outlook. OECD. 2017. 220 p.

³ In January, 2018, the number of the employed increased by 200,000, including by 15,000 in processing and treating industry; the unemployment for the whole country amounted to 4.1%.

⁴ The Employment situation. US Bureau of Labor Statistics. Washington, 2018. February.

There is no doubt that D. Trump's ideas to return American transnational corporations' production back to the United States, restoration of "justice" in foreign trade relations for protection of producers operating on the American market and consequently jobs, increased his support by his voters. At the same time, measures introduced in the beginning of 2018 to limit import of steel, aluminum, solar panels, washing machines as well as the threat of new protectionist steps by the USA, increase uncertainty for all world economy actors and create additional risks and tension in their relations.

D. Trump's foreign economic course directly and indirectly affects the position of millions of people in the countries of the world, with which the United States maintain trade and economic relations, in particular, people engaged in companies, annually supplying products to the American market for more than US\$ 2 trillion (according to the 2017 estimates, import amounted to US\$ 2.36 trillion);⁵ employed by foreign enterprises of American transnational corporations (about 16 mln people).⁶

Traditional during a long period calls of American leaders to "free trade", "open markets", liberalization of capital flow, did not prevent the United States from using trade barriers on the way of import in the past as well, when that was required for national interests.⁷ A possibility to protect the home market from foreign competition to provide national security was legally fixed more than half a century ago. According to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, article 232 gives the executive authorities the right to order investigations of import effects on the state security, and depending on the results of such investigations, the President has the right to introduce (and he may not introduce) tariffs, quotas, etc.⁸

The Trade Act of 1974 allowed imposing additional customs duties to protect American producers from import (article 201), undertake measures as an answer to "unjust" trading (article 301). This law's coming into force coincided with the era of the US permanent foreign trade deficit, the amounts of which as to commodity trade amounted to US\$ 811 billion in 2017 (according to evaluations).⁹

Fighting against "unfair" competition is not D. Trump's invention. But after he came to the White House, foreign

⁵ US International Trade. Washington, BEA, 2018. March 7.

⁶ Survey of Current Business. December 2017.

⁷ It's enough to remember e. g. the home market protection measures in the middle of the 1970s, including limitations of the amounts; "free-will limitations" of export to the United States by Japanese automobile companies at the time of R. Reagan's Presidency; introduction of "temporary" increased import customs tariffs for ferrous metals in the beginning of this century by the then President George Walker Bush (2002).

⁸ US Department of Commerce. URL: <https://www.commerce.gov/what-you-need-know-about-section-232-investigations-and-tariffs>

⁹ US International Trade. Washington, BEA, 2018. March 7.

trade policy became more straight-forward and, one can say, more aggressive in its protection of the interests of American business.

In January, 2018, import customs duties on solar panels amounting to 30% were imposed based on the special Commission's conclusions that there was "considerable damage done" to American manufacturers. They will be gradually reduced in the following years down to 15% in 2021. However, according to the employment yearbook (National Solar Jobs Census), only 14.7% of all jobs in this sector are directly related to manufacture of solar panels (2016–2017), and 52% of them are jobs in installation, 33.3% are other services in solar panels operation and maintenance; and this biggest part of the jobs is under a threat of job cuts as a result of the adopted measures for limitation of finished products import.

In March, 2018, D. Trump signed the decree on increase of import duties on steel and aluminum,¹ keeping his pre-election promises to protect American manufacturers from "unfair competition".² Retaliation followed immediately, the Chinese authorities announced that they intend to limit import of soy beans from the USA; Japan and South Korea intend to challenge this United States measure to protect domestic manufacturers from foreign competition in the WTO.

D. Trump promised to be flexible in increase of tariffs, but only Canada and Mexico felt that "flexibility" for the time being, new duties do not refer to them while talks on introduction of changes within the NAFTA framework are going on. Had it been not for this exception, exactly Canada and Mexico would have suffered most from imposed duties, with respective consequences for employment as the American market absorbs 87% of Canadian export of steel and 73% of Mexican.³

The other countries mostly dependent on steel export to the American market, creating jobs in this sector, are Turkey (15% of Turkish steel export goes to the USA), South Korea (12.1%), to say nothing of Brazil, where export to the United States amounts to 34% of all steel export. China is the world leader in steel export but only 1.1% of the total Chinese export of this product goes to the United States⁴.

Not only the trade partners of the United States feel uneasy because of the consequences of the new US foreign trade course. Consumers in the United States will have to buy products the prices for which will be higher, and in case D. Trump's aggressive protectionist course continues, the difference for American consumers may be significant.

Reduction of finished products import as a result of imposing customs duties as, for example, in case of solar panels, may lead to considerable reduction of the number of jobs in accompanying services for imported products. It should be also reminded that inclusion in global production chains reached such a high level and led to such interdependence of the world economy subjects that launching a trade war may not only turn into job creation but also job cuts in American economy as a considerable part of pro-

ducts imported to the USA from China, Mexico, other countries contains American component parts.

Trump's activities for protection of jobs from import make Americans, connected with export production, worry, as their jobs may be under a threat of cutting as a result of retaliatory measures by the trade partners of the United States. In 2016–2017, about 11 mln Americans were engaged in export production of goods and services.⁵

As to measures in domestic economy, the current Administration first of all counts on employment growth because of acceleration of economic growth as a result of the tax cuts' stimulating effect (according to the 2017 Tax Cuts and Jobs Act). The Office of Management and Budget forecasts 3% economic growth in the next years and more (3.2% in 2019 fiscal year), and that should lead to creation of jobs, formation of favorable environment for the 2020 Presidential campaign.

There is no doubt that impressive scales of tax mechanism's use for "Restoring America's Greatness" (reduction of profit tax for legal entities from 35% down to 21%, reduction of tax rates for natural persons – down to 10%, 12, 22, 24, 32, 35, 37% instead of 10%, 15, 25, 28, 33, 35; 39.6%) will be an important factor for entrepreneurship activities, economic growth. Besides cuts in income tax rates for natural persons,⁶ there are provisions for increase of standard tax deductions, tax credits for children; cuts in taxation of gifts and inheritance, and that will lead to reduction of the tax load for the most part of the population paying taxes in the next years. But according to the calculations of the Tax Policy Center, Washington, and other analytical centers, Americans with incomes in the upper end of the income scale will profit most from the tax reform, and Americans from the lower end of the income scale will profit least of all.⁷

The tax mechanism was used in D. Trump's "revolutionary" changes in case of Obamacare⁸ – B. Obama's achievement during his Presidential term. Attempts to legally annul Obamacare in 2017 were severely opposed by the Democrats. Because of that the current Administration used decrees and budgetary and tax tools. Thus, according to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the fine imposed during B. Obama's Presidential term in case if an insurance policy was not bought, amounting to 2.5% since 2016, was cancelled.

Tax cuts for natural persons and legal entities in the United States go on simultaneously with reduction of financing expenses for social purposes from the budget, with considerable growth of defense expenditures as a background. According to evaluations for 2018 fiscal year, defense expenditures should amount to US\$ 643.3 billion, 2019 fiscal year – US\$ 688.7 billion, in comparison with US\$ 598.7 billion in 2017. As for civil purposes expenditures, including social, the budget for 2019 fiscal year presented by D. Trump's Administration in February 2018, fully reflects the current Ad-

¹ Import duty on steel was imposed in the amount of 25%, import duty on aluminum in the amount of 10%.

² In 2017, the first place among countries – steel suppliers to the United States was taken by Canada; the following are among the biggest suppliers: Brazil, South Korea, Mexico, Russia, Turkey, Japan, Taiwan, Germany, India, China. US Steel Imports: US. Global Trade Atlas, 2017.

³ In metric tons.

⁴ US International Trade Administration. Washington, 2017. December.

⁵ Jobs Supported by State Exports, 2016. International Trade Administration. Washington, 2017. Dec. URL: https://www.trade.gov/mas/ian/build/groups/public/@tg_ian/documents/webcontent/tg_ian_005558.pdf

⁶ The lowest rate (10%) for a natural person, filling in the tax declaration individually, is for the annual income less than US\$ 9,525, and the highest rate of 37% is for US\$ 500,000 (Tax Cuts and Jobs Act 2017. URL: <http://docs.house.gov>).

⁷ Tax Policy Center. Washington, 2017. December.

⁸ The health care reform launched during the first B. Obama's Presidential term. B. Obama thought adoption of the 2010 Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act one of the most important achievements of his Presidency.

ministration's position – market forces as a foothold, personal responsibility and omnipotence of economic growth – for solution of employment issues.

Financing from the budget of education, professional training, assistance in finding employment decreases from US\$ 142.9 billion (2017 fiscal year) down to US\$ 98.6 billion (2018 fiscal year) and US\$ 100.6 billion (2019 fiscal year),¹ and that may considerably limit the availability of professional knowledge and skills, corresponding to development of science and technology of the country, for Americans from low-income households. According to the *Gallup survey* in February, 2018, only 43% of working respondents were sure that they would be able to secure additional educational and/or professional training, required for the next adequate employment in case they lose their current jobs.²

Young people just starting their employment history have special difficulties in looking for a job. The unemployment level in case of the 2016 school graduates, who did not enter college, amounted to 12.5% in case of white people and 41% in case of black people in October, 2016.³

On the whole, the unemployment for those who are 16 and older has really reached the record low level of 4.1% in the United States (February, 2018), but at the same time the number of Americans, who are not working and not trying to find a job, is unprecedentedly high. According to the US Bureau of Labor Statistics, there were 96,743 thousand Americans beyond the workforce in January, 2018 (1,337 thousand more than in January, 2017).⁴

Speaking about the consequences of "Trump's revolution" in taxation, it should be noted that it will cost a lot for the American budget, and it will considerably increase the national debt of the United States. Notwithstanding con-

siderable reduction of financing for civil purposes, it won't be able to compensate the growth of defense expenditures in the next years and reduction of budget receipts as a result of the tax reform at the same time. According to the Office of Management and Budget, federal budget expenditures in 2018 fiscal year will amount to US\$ 4,214 billion with receipts of US\$ 3,340 billion, thus providing budget deficit in the amount of US\$ 874 billion (compare with US\$ 666 billion in 2017 fiscal year).⁵

According to the Congressional Budget Justification Department, tax cuts will lead to increase of budget deficit by US\$ 1.45 trillion in the next decade (starting from this year). Taking into account the expected impact of tax cuts on GDP growth, this figure is corrected by experts but no more than down to US\$ 1.07 trillion.⁶ As a result, the national debt of the federal government may increase from US\$ 20.2 trillion in 2017 fiscal year up to US\$ 30.0 trillion in 2028 fiscal year, which will naturally reduce expenditures for social purposes.

D. Trump's winning the US Presidential Election in November, 2016 led to a qualitatively new stage in the United States policy in a wide range of sectors. The United States like other countries will have to adapt to the new financial, economic, political environment in future for co-existence in the world economy; and measures undertaken unilaterally may not always give the forecasted effect, they may bring about new risks, including in employment, population's polarization on the income scale, support of the population's social security for the Americans themselves. Any trade, tax wars lead to disruption of the formed relations and finally affect the working people and their families. At the same time, consequences may be far from the expected, including for initiators of such wars.

V. A. Lektorsky⁷

INDEFINITENESS, UNPREDICTABILITY AND SUPER-DEFINITENESS

It's impossible to live if you don't know what will follow after this or that action. This knowledge is acquired already in the first days or months after birth and then supplemented during the whole lifespan. It's known that it is possible to walk on the ground but it is not possible to walk on water, and in order to jump on the leaving bus, you have to accelerate your step and may be even run. Each of us knows that it's possible to count on one person in difficult situations and not possible on the other. If I know someone well, I can approximately guess his response to my address to him (though I can't definitely predict his behaviour). Elementary perception of the surrounding world is only possible in case there are memories of the preceding moment (as well as memories of the perceptive pattern for research of the situation) and anticipation of the nearest future includ-

ed in the process of sensory information's extraction from the world at every certain moment. A world with constantly changing features would be unsuitable for live creatures to dwell in it.

But indefiniteness and unpredictability accompanied human life in all times, endangering the man's existence.

⁷ Chief Researcher of the Theory of Knowledge Department, Institute of Philosophy of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Academic Supervisor of the Philosophy Faculty, Head of the Epistemology and Logic Department of the State Academic University for the Humanities (Moscow), Academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor. Author of more than 400 scientific publications, including monographs: "Philosophy in Contemporary Culture", "Subject, Object, Cognition", "Classical and Non-Classical Epistemology", "Transformations of Rationality in Contemporary Culture", "Philosophy in the Context of Culture", "Philosophy, Cognition, Culture", "Science Through the Eyes of a Humanities Scholar" (co-author), "Cognition and Consciousness from the Interdisciplinary Perspective" in two parts (ed.), "The Problem of Consciousness from the Interdisciplinary Perspective" (ed.), etc. Chief Editor and one of the authors of the book series "Philosophy of Russia in the Second Half of the 20th Century". Chief Editor of the journal "Philosophy of Science and Technology", Chairman of the International Editorial Board of the journal "Matters of Philosophy", member of the Editorial Board of the journals "Epistemology and Philosophy of Science" and "Personality. Culture. Society". Member of the International Institute of Philosophy (France), foreign member of the Center for Philosophy of Science at the University of Pittsburgh (USA), member of the International Academy of Philosophy of Science (Bel-

¹ An American Budget. Fiscal Year 2019. Washington, White house, 2018. February.

² U. S. Workers Unsure About Securing Training. Gallup. 2018. Febr. 12. URL: <http://news.gallup.com/poll>

³ College Enrollment and Work Activity. BLS. Washington, 2017.

⁴ Employment Situation. Washington, BLS, 2018. February.

⁵ An American Budget. Fiscal Year 2019. Washington, White house, 2018. February.

⁶ Tax Policy Center. URL: <http://www.taxpolicycenter.org>

They were the forces of nature (bad harvests, earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, floods, etc.) and social conflicts (wars, uprisings, etc.). There was always a danger of unexpected death. Development of science and technologies based on it helped to manage with numerous natural threats and predict the course of a number of complex processes: movements of man-made satellites, rocket trajectories, thermonuclear fusion, etc. Just recently it was possible to think (and a lot of people thought) that a scientific technological civilization will be able to fully control the forces of nature, that a man will become a unique master of nature, that with the help of his mind he will be able to avoid risks related to actions of the forces of nature and transform nature in his interests. In particular, such an idea was the basis of V. I. Vernadsky's idea of the future noospheric civilization. Other thinkers thought that it will be possible to create a sapient society with the help of science of society and man, and that it will make human behaviour predictable and transparent. K. Marx was sure that it could be done with the help of the social development theory created by him. The classic of American psychology B. Skinner suggested an idea of rational society's creation based on programming human behaviour.

Life did not confirm these expectations. Today, there is an established idea that nature and society should be understandable like an aggregate of complexly arranged and self-developing systems, the special feature of which is many processes taking place in them that are indefinite and because of that unpredictable, especially in the points of transfer from one such system to another (the so-called bifurcation points). Because of that possibilities to affect processes taking place in such systems have important limitations.

But this refers to any social system – both in the past and the present. At the same time, it's clear today that there is something that distinguishes the contemporary social life from what took place recently. Though indefiniteness, unpredictability and connected with them risks always accompanied human life, there were some stable rhythms typical for it over millennia and centuries. The fate of parents determined the future of children and grandchildren to a considerable extent (and it was absolutely impossible in the class society to get beyond the previously laid social track). Everyone knew what was good and what was bad, what should be done, what to strive for, how to evaluate your own behaviour and behaviour of others.

Currently, that state of affairs has changed principally. Developed countries and the whole world after them entered the stage, which is sometimes called "post-modernity" and sometimes "liquid modernity". It means that social structures start changing quicker and quicker, they are becoming more ephemeral and flowing. Communication flow is complicating very much, at the same time people are frequently getting such information that is controversial internally. "Post-modernity" coincides with what was called information society and later knowledge society. It turns out that multiplication of knowledge, in particular and first of all scientific and technological did not make human life

easier, on the contrary, it created a lot of new problems. The idea of conquering nature turned into an environmental crisis. Use of modern information and communication technologies not only created a possibility to obtain information from various sources but also generated a giant disinformation flow. At the same time, in contrast to what we had recently, today it's difficult to tell information from disinformation in many cases. The "post-truth" term was thought up not long ago. It means a possibility of such messages' wide spreading via mass media, television and social networks, in which grains of truth are included in the mass of deliberate lies. There are information (really disinformation) wars going on in the world, frequently determining political and social actions and generating events, on which lives of people depend. Today, people live in virtual reality (the Internet, cell phone) more and more, in many cases it does not help to deal with real reality but separates an individual from it. Today's technostucture increases a possibility of such technogenic disasters (accidents at nuclear power stations, breakdown of computer systems serving the population of a big city, etc.) that are incomparable in their scales with those malfunctions and failures that took place in the past. To put it simply, development of science and technologies based on it generated civilization, in which indefiniteness, unpredictability and risk are the most important factors.

Individuals had to act in indefinite situations in the past as well, and not infrequently, when they had to take a decision and there was not enough knowledge to guess the results of the action. There could be not enough knowledge because of a principal impossibility to get all knowledge required for success beforehand (that happens), and as a consequence of insufficiency of time in some cases to get all the required knowledge and the necessity to act quickly (the so-called "bounded rationality"). In such cases the subject's belief that his actions will be successful, his assurance that he does what is necessary to do play an important role. And not infrequently such actions lead to a desired result. This is explained by the fact that in social life the very subject's assuredness becomes a real factor, included into the situation, and completes the definition of indefiniteness that existed before that. This is the most important phenomenon of social life, which was analysed by Popper under the name of the "Oedipus Effect".

But today social indefiniteness is much more dramatic. I already said about much increased indefiniteness of social processes and structures in the environment of information civilization (also called "liquid modernity"). A most important fact that a contemporary individual more and more loses ideas of what he is, what standards and rules of life are, what is good and what is bad, should be added to the above. Ideas of human identity, unshakable before, are diluted in information-disinformation flows, in the environment of social structures' and processes' ethereality, in the global world of interaction and struggle of various cultural senses. Individuals with blurred identity, with poly-identity appear (and there are becoming more and more of them). The topic of identity crisis has become one of the most discussed today by philosophers, psychologists, sociologists. An individual with firm convictions, sure of himself and his values could successfully act in indefinite situations. His own definiteness could complete the external for him indefiniteness. But an individual with a distorted identity being indefinite

gium). Honorary Professor of the Institute of Philosophy at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Honorary member of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan. Awar ded the Order of "the Badge of Honor", Lomonosov Order, 1st Class Chelpanov medal, the Institute of Philosophy of the RAS medal "For Contribution to Philosophy", and the medal "In Commemoration of the 850th Anniversary of Moscow".

himself, cannot resist external indefiniteness. As a result, social indefiniteness, unpredictability, risk increase many times.

Various behaviours are possible in such an environment. It's possible to orient people not to fear of risk but the skill to take non-standard decisions in unexpected situations. It's possible to cultivate adventurism, readiness to recklessly jump into a whirlpool of unpredictabilities, fraught with a fatal outcome (there are such people now as well). It's possible to take a completely different stand: try to give oneself definiteness by hiding behind some system of unshakeable values and fanatic beliefs. Today, this is in particular the way of Islamic fundamentalists, including international terrorists.

But another idea is becoming more and more popular today: that it is possible to take natural, social and human indefiniteness under control (and even turn into definiteness) with the help of modern NBIC technologies (nano-, bio-, information and cognitive).

Genetics and genetic engineering allow "editing" the human genetic system. In the not far-off future it will be possible to "order" children to your liking: cleverer, more emotional, stronger than other children, with big musical talents, etc. There is a whole movement (with many scientists participating in it) the goal of which is "human enhancement". Some go even further and think that it's necessary to start designing a "post-human" creature that should replace humans living now. This "post-man" will be not only without a number of human flaws and imperfections but can become immortal in principle. Release from death is a millennia-old human dream. The ideas of "post-man" and "immortality" proceed from the fact that currently humans have an opportunity to experiment freely with their bodies, brain and psyche, they can recreate and create themselves and even infinitely prolong their lives.

The idea of conscious evolution management is also presented in connection with the idea of human designing. Until now, the evolution process was spontaneous and uncontrolled. At the same time, we are speaking not only about biological and social evolution but also about evolution of the whole nature, starting from the origin of atoms and then the first molecules (the so-called concept of "Global Evolution" worked out by many scientists, in particular academician N. N. Moiseyev). Today, the idea that humans with the help of modern technologies based on research and development, can create such formations, which nature has not managed to create till now for certain reasons, is popular in some circles. This is called "exiting beyond natural limitations". We are speaking not about going beyond the laws of nature (it's impossible) but about a man performing as some space force basing on these laws, like a kind of space demiurge. This is going back to famous I. V. Michurin's slogan (which was in keeping with the pathos of socialist transformations in our country): "We can't wait for favours from nature, our task is to take them from it". It's thought that the artificial can recreate or even replace everything given naturally. Nature will be artificially recreated according to a certain program.

It's possible to control human behaviour from the outside in risky situations in the society of indefiniteness, when an individual is incapable of taking the right decision. It's enough to send a signal to his gadget. Most people in the risk society can agree to such a control and manage-

ment from the outside. Meanwhile, a very particular question is: in whose interests will this control be? This can be a force pursuing one's own interests.

Division of "personal" and public space is blurring more and more. A cell phone has now become a part of a man, it does not give a chance to be alone: calls and e-mail letters will be regularly received, and it's necessary to answer them. Even if you switch your cell phone off for some time, inquiries will continue, and sooner or later you'll have to respond.

And here is another idea: "smart house" or "the Internet of Things". In the near future, things in such an imagined house will inform you themselves as to what you should do: buy certain food and put it in the refrigerator, call a doctor as your body requires treatment. And even better if these "smart things" order the food required for the fridge and call a doctor, without informing you, as they know better what you need. You won't be the master of "smart" things, you'll be fulfilling their orders. What autonomy of yours can be spoken about in this case?

In such cases an individual and the outside world acquire a new definiteness as spontaneously originating natural processes from this point of view can in principle be pushed out by artificial processes and a man can be turned into some sum of technologies, into a creature controlled by his own technological devices and controlled from the outside – by external to him forces.

However, this idea is really unfeasible. And that's for the best. As its bringing into life would have meant the end of humans.

The matter is that a man cannot turn into a sum of technologies. Today, it's clear that even in cases of natural phenomena we cannot always predict the course of some processes and the results of our affecting them – for example, when we are dealing with systems having a complex structure. And all the more so it refers to social processes. The most interesting thing is that origination and development of such phenomena in our life, which we especially appreciate as they are related to high human essences and values, are not programmed. Because of that such phenomena can't be controlled from the outside and managed. They are such phenomena like love, communication, dialogue, creative work, moral act. There is no "love technology" and there can't be. It's possible and important to apply all efforts to keep it, but love itself is not actions according to some rules and set program. All the more so acts in the name of love are not such actions – they may be absolutely reckless. It's possible to create the environment for a fruitful dialogue. But its value lies in the fact that its result is not known beforehand and can turn out unexpected for each one of its participants. It's impossible to manage the creative process. It's possible to create favourable conditions for it – social and interpersonal (a number of such conditions were revealed in research of sociology of knowledge and psychology of creativity). But creativity itself is discovery of what was unknown before. The dream of many philosophers about discovery of the "logic of creation" turned out unfeasible in principle (use of the so-called "heuristics" does not predetermine a creative process). There is no and can't be a technology for performing a moral act.

Had a man been able to become immortal and turned into a "post-man", such fundamental values as courage,

selflessness, love would have lost sense as they are tied with such actions, which suppose a possibility of death. If death loses its meaning, life loses its meaning as well.

So, an individual finds himself between two poles today. There are social and human indefiniteness, loss of identity, unpredictability, risk, fear of death from external threats on one of them. There are super-definiteness of the world and individual himself in case of loss of one's autonomy and consequently oneself on the other. In both cases it means death of an individual.

Meanwhile, getting into the new world of information, nano- and biotechnologies, an individual must preserve his subjective world and his autonomy. It means knowing how to take risky situations under control (including with the help of state-of-the-art technologies) to the extent it is possible to do, and at the same time be ready to find non-standard solutions where it's impossible to avoid risk. This also means that it's required to preserve those values that make a person human, and at the same time be not a slave but the master of any technologies.

R. Lewis¹

THE CULTURAL IMPERATIVE – GLOBAL TRENDS IN THE 21st CENTURY

This conference is being held at a time when cross-cultural-ists are engaged in lively debate about the future course of humankind in the 21st century. In an age of developing globalisation, questions are being raised about the importance and impact of cultural differences that in all likelihood will impede rapid progress towards standardisation of rules and behaviour and uniform acceptance of mutual goals.

With the increasing internationalisation of trade and the ubiquitous presence of the Internet, are cultural differences on the decline? Or are the roots of culture so varied that worldwide convergence of ideals can never succeed? Will the currently detectable examples of rising nationalism continue to increase? Will considerations of gender, growing in importance, outweigh those of national characteristics? Will shifts and alliances among nations occur along civilizational fault lines, as Samuel Huntington prophesied, or will national traits continue to dominate? Did history really end in 1989, as Francis Fukuyama suggested? Are cross-cultural universals, programmed into us by evolution, in danger of being eliminated by genetic engineering?

When positivism took over the social sciences in American universities in the 1950s, cultural diversity was depicted as a "soft" subject based on uncertain knowledge, itself culture-bound. It became fashionable in the closed world of academia to seek an explanation of human behaviour in two "reliable" theories: genetic determinism and economic determinism. On February 12th, 2001, (Darwin's birthday, incidentally) genetic determinism received a deadly blow. Two groups of researchers released the formal report of data for the human genome, revealing that all humans, with all their evident diversity, were found to share 99.9% of their genes. According to this finding, all human beings should be extraordinarily alike, if genetic code determines behaviours. But, of course, we are not alike.

A study of economic determinism proved it to be equally irrelevant. This leads us to a third recourse: **cultural determinism**. Laurence Harrison and Samuel Huntington in "Culture Matters: How Values Shape Human Progress" (2001) reiterate assertions made by Edward Hall, Geert Hofstede, and myself in my earlier work "When Cultures Collide" (1996) namely *culture counts most in economic development* (not the other way round). Can one not point to a cultural development emerging from Classical Greece and Rome, the Christian religion and the European Renaissance? Can this momentum of 2000 years be stopped that easily? Unbroken cultures have strongly defined modern humanity in China, India, France, Spain, Japan and elsewhere. Culture is passed on from a number of sources – parents, peers, social institutions – but *governments* have a vested interest in their citizens sharing cultural values in order to reduce the potential for cultural or regional conflicts. Education systems transmit and reinforce national culture; history is taught "thoughtfully", often being "remodelled" in a concern for the consolidation of shared values, even myths. Figures such as Napoleon, Peter the Great, George Washington, Abraham Lincoln and Queen Elizabeth I are depicted frequently in a favourable light, as part of the cultural heritage.

A nation's culture is its *blueprint for survival* and hopefully, success. It is worthy of note that the current trends of rising nationalism are most evident in countries or peoples that have a traditional *obsession with survival* – Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Korea, Austria, Catalonia and the Kurds. Poland and Korea are vulnerably sandwiched between powerful neighbours; the Hungarians, Czechs and Austrians mourn loss of territory; Catalonia is bullied by Madrid, the Kurds by Turkey. Nationalism, or populism is also showing its teeth in the English-speaking world. BREXIT, which made no sense politically, and even less economically, was purely a cultural decision, reflecting British insularity and uneasiness with "foreigners". American working-class culture, with its growing feeling of insecurity and loss of agency, enabled Trump to champion nationalism ("America First").

One realises that if liberalism was a clear legacy of the Enlightenment, so was nationalism, successfully embedded more securely in global politics than ideological systems, such as communism, capitalism, even liberalism. The most energetic attempt at minimising nationalism was the foundation of the European Union, which,

¹ Founder of the International Institute of Language and Cross-Cultural Training "Richard Lewis Communications Ltd." (Great Britain), Professor. Author of a new approach to the problems of analysis of cross-cultural communications. More than 40 years of work in the field of applied and anthropological linguistics. Founder of Berlitz language school in East Asia, Finland, Portugal, of Linguarama School in Riversdown House. Author of a large number of books on the topics of intercultural interaction, including: "When Cultures Collide", "Cross-Cultural Communication, a Visual Approach", "The Cultural Imperative", "Humor Across Frontiers", "Finland: Cultural Lone Wolf", "When Teams Collide", "Fish Cannot See Water", etc. Author of the world's first television series of English lessons (1961). World Bank Culture Advisor. Chevalier of the Order of the Lion of Finland. Awarded for the most innovative technology of Duke University (USA), and with the Society for Intercultural Education, Training and Research (SIETAR) Founders Award.

though eliminating war between its members, now lives with restlessness and criticism in the Netherlands, Austria, Poland, Hungary and other Eastern European countries, not to mention Italy's problems with the Eurozone and, of course, the Brexit body blow. A union seemingly on course for effective economic and political cohesion by mid-century may struggle to survive that long if popular parties continue to gain ascendancy (even in founder states such as France and Germany!).

Driving Forces of the 21st Century

Which forces, cultural, civilizational or otherwise, are likely to mold the contours of human activity during the 21st century? History would seem to indicate that peaks of civilisation have proceeded with some consistency, in the direction of East to West. Cultures have flourished successively through Ancient China and India to the Middle East (Mesopotamia, Egypt), Greece, Rome and the European Renaissance, Britain, (in her Empire days), motoring on to 20th century America. In the light of this momentum, it would seem that now it is the turn of China again! In view of recent economic developments in China, this prediction no longer appears so naïve.

The merits of globalisation notwithstanding, there is some evidence to suggest that the driving forces guiding human destiny will be limited in number (four, five or six) and will be linked to SIZE (population, land area, wealth of resources or military power). The 21st century stage will have a cast of Big Actors, with leading or dominating roles. Smaller, stand-alone nations will have lessened influence and be swept along with the major players (in possible alignment).

The engines of power and progress in the present century have to be China, India, Russia and the West (Europe plus N. America). China and India pick themselves by dint of their staggering populations and longevity of culture. Russia, if she holds on to her mind-boggling landmass, has the Eurasian breadth of vision and military prowess to lead; the West, though seemingly in decline, must not be underestimated. This is because of its belief in linear-active superiority.

The Three Cultural Categories

The Lewis Model (Dimensions of Behaviour) proposes a tripartite division of cultural categories, namely: linear active, multi-active and reactive.

Linear-actives (e. g. Germans) are task-oriented, highly-organised planners, who complete action chains by doing one thing at a time, in accordance with a linear agenda.

Multi-actives (e. g. Latins) are emotional, loquacious and impulsive people who attach great importance to family, feelings, relationships. They like to do any things at the same time and are poor followers of agendas.

Reactives (e. g. Asians) are good listeners, who rarely initiate action or discussion, preferring to listen to and establish the other's position then react to it.

Linear-active Sense of Superiority

Linear-active behaviour is an Anglo-Germanic phenomenon originating in North-Western Europe and rolling out through colonisation to North America, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand. Among non-Germanic peoples

only Finns have joined this category and even they are partly reactive. Two continents – North America (minus Mexico) and Australia – are completely linear-active. The strikingly different destinies of North and South America (the latter colonized by multi-active Spaniards and Portuguese) are an indication of the yawning behavioural gap between the two categories. How history would have been different if Columbus had continued on a north-westerly course to Florida or if the Pilgrim Fathers had been blown off course (like Cabral) and settled in North-eastern Brazil!

It is important to note that, through a quirk of fate or historical accident, the Anglo-Germanic bloc from the 18th century onwards began to regard itself as *superior* in efficiency, both in commerce and ability to rule, than other cultural categories. This conviction of superiority, with its accompanying drive, may have had its roots in cold climate competence and energy, Protestant reforming zeal or German thoroughness. It certainly blossomed subsequent to the English Industrial Revolution, the rapid development of British and American manufacturing (fuelled by the abundance of coal) and the continuous existence of democratic institutions in the Anglo and Nordic communities. This belief was, bolstered by the fact that the linear-active “powers”, though numbering only 700 million, leading up to and after two World wars, emerged with *de facto* world leadership based on military might and, even more significantly, over 50% of global GDP.

This sense of pre-eminence, particularly in the English-speaking world, but also shared in no small measure by the Germans, Dutch, Swiss and Nordics, *has not yet subsided*. Western complacency has not yet been eroded. There is still a lingering notion among the linear-active countries that their systems of governance, their concepts of justice, their attitude to human rights, their intellectually vibrant societies, cocktail of work and leisure, their right to lead and advise others, their business methods and ability to maintain levels of production and high living standards are viable for the future.

However, there are other points of view. Around 2011–2012 statistics indicated that the GDP of the non-linear peoples of the world (multi-active and reactives combined) overtook that of the linear-actives. After all, there are more than 6 billion who are non-linear and the rapid development of the Chinese economy would suggest that the ratio of the West's contribution to world production will decline indefinitely. Predictions indicate that the Chinese economy will overtake that of the United States and that hungry India will become the world's biggest market (forecasted population by 2030 is 1,500 million). Other burgeoning populations will create demanding markets in Indonesia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Brazil, Bangladesh, Mexico and Ethiopia, in that order.

Whither the West?

The demographics cited above are somewhat gloomy seen from a western perspective and Robert Samuelson in his article “The Grand Illusion” questions the dominance of the West in the 21st century. He cites the dangers of nuclear proliferation, anti-Western terrorism, recessions, swings in financial markets and technological sabotage.

But it can be a mistake to write off the West. We must remember what happened in two World Wars when Western

civilisation was threatened. Next time, it is likely that Germany will be on the team. The durability of a balanced West resides not only in its military and economic strengths, formidable though these still are, but in the matured resilience of Western values. These values were forged in the crucible of the Greek city-states and were tempered through the centuries by the Reformation and the Renaissance, by embracing democracy, by vanquishing the bogeys of Nazism and Communism. An advantage of the West, in addition to these core values, is a plethora of social and semi-political institutions. They number in the thousands – between the bedrock of the family and the authority of the state. In many societies there is a social vacuum between home and job. In Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian countries in particular, but also in Europe, clubs, societies, associations, activities, sports, courses and hobbies of all types keep people busy. This is the dense fabric of Western society – active, throbbing, inventive, in every sense self-perpetuating and indomitable, with a momentum all of its own. If such social vibrancy is Western in essence, it is epitomised in the United States; as Hamish McRae wrote as he watched Americans rise phoenix-like from the ashes and rubble of Ground Zero, *the future starts here*.

Asianisation

The overwhelming victory of the Allies in 1945 led to main European (and other) nations accepting a strong dose of Americanisation, imitating US business techniques in production, accounting, marketing and sales. It did not kill their cultures, and the material benefits outweighed the misgivings and disadvantages. Later, however, the negative effects of Americanisation began to be experienced in the gradual erosion or dilution of (European) values, as impressionable youth embraced many aspects of American lifestyle.

American business and management techniques began to lose ground in the 1970s and 1980s, as the Asian Tigers adopted the successful Japanese model. In the 1990s, significantly, the West frequently demonstrated that it was ill-equipped to deal with Asian sensitivity.

Westerners need to establish a new *modus operandi* for the new century if they wish to be successful in globalizing their business and exports. Linear-active (Western) societies have everything to gain by developing empathy with reactive and multi-active ones. Technology has now made East and West intensely aware of each other; some synthesis of progress and cooperative coexistence will eventually emerge. The size of Asian populations and markets suggests their eventual dominance. Just as there were obvious benefits to be obtained from Americanisation in 1945, there are now advantages to be gained from an *Asianisation* policy in the 21st century. Both Europeans and Americans would do well to consider this. Acceptance of a certain degree of *Asianisation* would facilitate better understanding of Asian mentalities, and perhaps pre-empt future Chinese hegemony in the commercial and political spheres.

The West should study Asian values, as well as patterns of communication and organisation, and learn from these. There are visible benefits in Asian systems. They should also study the “Asian mind” and how it perceives concepts such as leadership, status, decision-making, negotiating, face, views of morality, confucian tenets and so forth.

Fortunately, the rise of *feminine* values in the West at cross-century smooths the way for a degree of *Asianisation*, as many of these values coincide with Asian values. Just as the Americanisation (of Europe) progressed from influencing business practice to permeating the social scene, a similar phenomenon may well occur with *Asianisation*. That is to say, Westerners can be influenced by and adopt aspects of Asian lifestyles that will have a lasting effect on their own behaviour.

The implication of such a shift in Western thinking and comportment are mind-boggling, if not cataclysmic. Societies, such as the French, American, Swedish, and possibly the British and German, are successful in their own right and may be less inclined to modify their cultures in an Asian direction than are less powerful nations. The Americans currently find little wrong with their economic model, nor do the French, with their cultural one. Nevertheless, a degree of feminisation has already taken place in most Western countries, and the growing distaste of the younger generation for the hard-nosed exploitation of people and natural resources will make *Asianisation* an attractive policy. After all, business is business, and there are billions of customers out there.

No description or assessment of the contours of political, economic or world cultural development in the 21st century would be complete without a mention of two countries alongside the major players of China, India, Russia and the West. These are Japan and Canada. Japan’s influence on world events has been underestimated in the past and her record of economic stagnation over the last 20 years has cast a shadow over her current profile. However, in 2018 she ranks an easy third in world GDP. Her world role in the future is likely to be linked to her manner of alignment. Will she balance the scales, siding with East or West?

Canada is more of a dark-horse. With a land area of 10 million square kilometres, her territory is second only to Russia. While much of this consists of frozen wastes, the rapid warming of the Arctic Ocean in the second half of the century will transform Canadian agriculture and resource exploitation, not least the vast reserves of Arctic oil fields which she will share with Russia and Norway. Canada is already tenth in world GDP and with a rapidly-growing population aided by a wise immigration policy is poised to become more active in world affairs. Her easy access to the huge US market is a unique advantage.

Finally, Religion

The four largest religious groups in the world, ranked in order of adherents (2015), are Christianity (2.38 billion), Islam (1.8 billion), Hinduism (1.1 billion), and Buddhism (0.5 billion). Historically, conflicts and confrontation between religions have led to numerous wars throughout the centuries from the times of the Crusades, the Muslim “occupation” of Spain from the 8th century to 1492 and the dominance of the Ottoman Empire, which ruled large parts of Europe and the Middle East for 650 years.

Religious disputes have waxed and waned in different ages, and though Hindus and Buddhists have figured in prolonged struggles with Islam for centuries, the modern era has been characterized by the fiercely intensified confrontation between *Christianity and Islam* culminating in the 9/11 disaster, the subsequent American invasion of Afghanistan

and Iraq, and the rise of ISIS (Daesh), affecting the lives of millions of people in Syria and elsewhere. The present-day antagonism of the two major religions contrasts sharply with the idyllic coexistence of Islam, Christianity and Judaism when Al-Andalus society enjoyed its "golden age" of religious tolerance. Can we hope for reconciliation again between Muslims and Christians?

As Jerzy Wiatr points out in his paper "Towards a New World Order in the 21st Century", ideological conflicts are harder to resolve than those of opposing national interests. While skilful diplomacy can create acceptable compromise over a border issue or a trade war, it is extremely difficult or even impossible, for zealots to abandon an entire philosophy or cherished creed.

If I may allow myself one final note of optimism with regard to religious or ideological altercation, I will take the liberty of referring to a factor I deem important, but seemingly overlooked, by political commentators and futurologists. Of the much-discussed, almost two-billion-strong multitude of Muslims in the world, about *one billion of them are women*. There are strong indications to suggest that the twenty-first century will witness a period of rapidly-rising female influence and empowerment, from which Muslim women cannot be indefinitely excluded.

I am of the opinion that gender-liberation issues will be higher on these women's agenda than lending continuing support to the supposed destruction of the West, whose

way of life embodies the social qualities and advantages they must ultimately seek.

References

1. Huntington S. P. The Clash of Civilizations. – N. Y. : Simon & Schuster, 1996.
2. Samuelson R. The Grand Illusion // Newsweek. – 1999–2000. – Dec.–Febr. – Vol. 134.
3. Wiatr J. Toward a New World Order of the 21st Century // Global World: System Shifts, Challenges and Contours of the Future : The 17th International Likhachov Scientific Conference. – SPb. : SPbUHSS, 2017.
4. Lewis R. D. When Cultures Collide. – L. : Nicholas Brealey Publishing, 1996.
5. Lewis R. D. The Cultural Imperative. – Yarmouth, ME : Intellectual Press, 2003.
6. Hammerich K. Fish Can't See Water. – John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
7. Hall E. Beyond Culture. – N. Y. : Anchor Books, 1976.
8. Hall E. The Hidden Dimension. – Garden City, N. Y. : Doubleday, 1966.
9. Hall E. The Silent Language. – N. Y. : Fawcett, 1968.
10. Hofstede G. Culture's Consequences. – Beverly Hills : Sage Publications, 1980.
11. Fukuyama F. The End of History and the Last Man. – N.Y. : Free Press, 1992.
12. Yakovenko A. Pragmatism and Messiahship in World Politics // Global World: System Shifts, Challenges and Contours of the Future : The 17th International Likhachov Scientific Conference. – SPb. : SPbUHSS, 2017.

A. G. Lisitsyn-Svetlanov¹

CULTURE AS FACTOR INFLUENCING DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL LEGAL SYSTEMS AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

To place the law in the system of public values, the following definition can be used: "Law is a reflection of existing philosophical views, moral principles and cultural traditions of the society". With all the unconditional independence of these categories, on the one hand, and their natural interaction, on the other, the law has two distinctive features. First, unlike philosophical views, moral foundations or cultural traditions, the law emerges as a product of state will and provides a different view of imperativeness as compared to aforementioned views, foundations and traditions. Secondly, these categories can spread around the world freely, or

be imposed by force, that is, exist outside the state's will. The law, meanwhile, initially emerges within the boundaries of a specific sovereign authority and on a certain territory and is legitimately spread throughout the world solely through coordination of the will of sovereigns, forming the body of international law.

Having arisen as a reflection of existing views, foundations and traditions, the law acquires precisely defined forms and begins to act not only through the people's obedience to the law, but also through the system of state and international law enforcement. The formation and operation of law gives an impulse to the reverse process, namely, the impact of the law itself on the views, foundations and traditions of society.

All these interrelated processes shape the philosophy of law and the legal culture.

The interaction between law and culture is a dynamic process. The historical experience of each state demonstrates existence of development cycles, involving fundamental institutions of law and cultural traditions in all their manifestations. A relative exception to this rule was Jewish law – Halakhah. Today appeals to its norms or refusal to apply them is being practiced by courts in Israel and abroad. Resolution of many conflicts is based on the process of applying ancient Jewish norms that are interpreted in modern ways through analogy, generalization and other methods.²

¹ Chief Researcher fellow of the Institute of State and Law of the RAS, academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Law), Professor. Author of more than 120 publications, including: monograph "International Civil Procedure: Modern Tendencies"; articles "Application Of The Law Of The Russian Federation 'On Cultural Values Displaced in the USSR as a Result of the Second World War and Located on the Territory of the Russian Federation': Judicial Perspective", "Modern Tendencies In The Development Of Legislation Of Intellectual Property", "Development of Russian and International Law in the Aspect of its Influence on Ensuring the National Interests of the Russian Federation", "Personality and Respect for the Law: Problems and New Realities", "The Role of Law in the Dialogue of Cultures", "Modern International Private Law in the Regulation of International Trade", "Interaction of National Systems of Private International Law", "National law in the context of globalization", "White Spots in Modern International Law" and others. Chairman of "State and Law" journal and "Proceedings of The Institute of State and Law" journal editorial boards. Member of the Bureau of the Department of Social Sciences under the RAS, of the Scientific Advisory Council of the Federation Committee on Science and Education, of the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation. He is awarded with the Order of Friendship, the Order of Leopold II (Belgium), the Order of St. Sergius of Radonezh of the Russian Orthodox Church.

² Каневский А. А. Место Галахи (иудейского права) в национальных правовых системах. М., 2016. С. 18–40.

A radically different role is now assigned to the Roman law. Having lost its role as a source of law, it, as Czech lawyer Milan Bartosek notes, has been transformed into an element of private law philosophy and has been regarded as the principle methodology of codified legislation. The experience of the French legal system can serve as an example of such a transformation.¹

Changes in laws of any state depend on many factors. These include various historical events: revolutions, wars, alliances of states forming and falling apart, as well as various natural and human-made phenomena. In addition to these factors, the objective process of interaction between various legal systems is of no small importance for the development of law. Such an interaction serves as an indispensable condition for implementing a variety of international relations. And, finally, this is the result of certain social transformations associated with the development of political and economic ideas or religious views.

A list of these factors can be shortened or lengthened, but it is highly unlikely that any universal matrix can be created in order to predict or design any legal system models of any state. The validity of such a conclusion has been confirmed by centuries of experience in development of legal systems across the globe.

The legal systems of states belonging to a single cultural and civilizational community not only share some similar features; they also display significant differences. Any attempts to create uniform rules were quite limited. Even such a form of creating a single legal regulation as private law was not particularly successful. For example, the Civil Code of Napoleon was accepted by Belgium; the Swiss Law on obligations was reciprocated by Turkey, but the practice of applying these normative acts in each country had its own peculiarities.²

In the sphere of public law, of special significance is the historical experience of Japan. After the Second World War, the constitution of Japan was formulated under the influence of the United States. However, it would be an exaggeration to say that the Japanese supreme law was based on American ideas. Subsequently, the Constitution of Japan had considerable influence on development of legislation and law enforcement practice.

No less remarkable is Russia's experience in reforming private law. In the early 1990s, when creating a model of the new Civil Code, acceptable for regulating market relations, the Russian legislators had used Dutch sources, in particular, the new Code of the Netherlands. They used it for the structure of the Russian Code, some definitions and terms. However, it would be a mistake to consider the Civil Code of the Russian Federation a copy of the Dutch code. Moreover, the changes and amendments to the Russian Code which were adopted subsequently, were based not on Dutch, but Russian experience of judicial practice.

What factors then influence the deviations from the selected legal model and the interpretations of own formulas of borrowed legal norms? Among the full range of various factors the national and cultural characteristics inherent to the population of each country stand apart most prominently. "Culture, Academician Likhachev used to say, is a com-

plex multi-layered notion. Culture permeates all aspects of the country's life: it affects people's behavior in the street, and the way they preserve and study cultural values, and the nation's attitude to the sciences, especially the fundamental sciences, and the level of quality of television broadcasts, and – naturally – literature and art".³ This list of various facets of life can be continued, and may include law and the legal relations formed in the society. It would be naive to look for a common citizen, or a person in power, who would be free from the cultural traditions in which they grew up. Moreover, the law of any country provides for special institutions referred to as "public order" and "moral foundations", which each state interprets in its unique way. The great multitude of life situations that judicial practitioners face legal systems has led to emergence in every legal system of a new institution known as "judicial discretion". The essence of this institution is that for the court, or rather, the judge, the right and duty to make decisions is based on his or her personal views, personal values, formed in the national cultural environment of which he or she is a part.

A vivid example of the influence cultural traditions have on law in Russia and abroad is the current situation with the corporate law. One of the main goals in the process of regulating corporate relations is to determine organizational and legal forms of the enterprise and to regulate relations between its participants accordingly. This is a behavior code of sorts for entrepreneurs in a given business community. In conditions of internationalization of economic ties, the rules of behavior of entrepreneurs would be unified or at least very similar across the globe. And indeed the legal community is working in this direction. There have appeared corresponding directions of research, and international conferences on corporate subjects are being regularly held. However, the goal of achieving universal or at least regional harmony is still far off. During the legal reforms of the 1990s the Russian law had not fully accepted any of the models of Western European countries.

A no less peculiar situation can be found in the European Union as well. It would be logical to assume that building a unified community must start with a uniform view on the status of business entities and on the rules of their behavior. However, after quite a few years, the EU has not yet come up with a unified version of corporate law. The factor of entrepreneurship culture, which distinguishes an entrepreneur of Hamburg from an entrepreneur of Milan or Marcel, has played a significant role in this process.

Integration in other spheres of life is as far off. Despite the fact that the national culture permeates all areas of life, and international cooperation has been used to promote integration of national cultures and legal institutions, integration in the field of human rights, in the area of statehood, as well as in the legal setup of the state's political system is also far from being achieved.

The problem of human rights has become one of the most hotly debated topics. This problem is not only political or social in nature, it also has an important religious and cultural dimension. The perception of the Islamic world that follows its own civilizational code could not accept the Western way of life; and this fact has led to forced imposition of western values on the Islamic world, and the de-

¹ Бартошек М. Римское право. Понятия, термины, определения. М., 1989. С. 8–9.

² Лисицын-Светланов А. Г. Взаимодействие национальных правовых систем международного частного права // Современное международное частное право в России и Евросоюзе. М., 2013. Кн. 1. С. 71.

³ Лихачев Д. С. Великая культура примирительна по своей сути // Международные Лихачевские научные чтения. Глобализация и диалог культуры. Избранные доклады (1995–2015). СПб.: СПбГУП, 2015. С. 23.

mand to adhere to the western standard of human rights, as the only possible option. A deviation from these standards was in some cases declared a gross violation of the norms of international law, permitting use of unauthorized force.

The international practice in its historical retrospect offers many other, more positive examples. Of considerable interest is the experience of interaction between other civilizational systems. China and Japan represent a particularly interesting combination.

China, after being the main civilization development vehicle for millennia, chose a new, communist ideology, in 1949 and that had a tremendous impact on the culture of this country. Initially, its legal and cultural policies were guided by the experience of the USSR, but in the period of the cultural revolution the law-abiding development of the country ceased to exist. Nevertheless in 1978 the country proceeded to adopt the policy of reforms and built a socialist legal state with consideration of some specifics of the Chinese experience, in particular, taking into account the Chinese cultural traditions.¹

With the start of the Meiji restoration in 1868, Japan abandoned its policy of absolute isolationism and changed its attitude to foreign culture. Now the country viewed foreign influences positively and even entered into interaction with foreign legal systems.² Ever since Japan has adhered to the principle of reasonable conservatism according to its long-standing cultural traditions, however, research shows, the country has clearly chosen to follow Western legal models. Eremin, in his analysis of Japan's legal system, agrees with the point of view of Japanese legal scholars that "law was a cultural product of the historical society, and therefore it should corresponds to each of such societies".³

Preservation of Japanese cultural tradition and the issues of legal regulation of what is permissible and unacceptable in art can be illustrated by the attitudes towards erotica in Japan. Article 175 of Japan's Criminal Code, adopted in 1907, to this day forbids production or sale of any pornographic products. However, all issues related to the film industry are being regulated by voluntary organizations that are authorized to decide whether to allow or prohibit the showing of certain films. The Japanese also seem to understand very differently from European countries, what constitutes erotica and pornography. The civilizational differences of Japan can be explained by the centuries-long isolation of the country from the outside world, as well as by peculiarities of the Japanese national mentality that was historically shaped as the homogeneous nation under the influence of religious ideas, ethnopsychology and the country's cultural traditions.⁴ These peculiar features are associated with the nation's ways of behavior, their self-expression and appearance, which constitute a part of the unique cultural code of the nation.

The appearance of an individual within a certain culture has traditionally been shaped by the national, religious, and cultural traditions of the said nation or ethnos. Moreover,

the person's appearance has traditionally reflected the social status of that individual. The legal system viewed these circumstances as publicly significant and incorporated them into the law. In our present-day conditions, when choosing your lifestyle, and the guarantee of your freedom and privacy are one's top priority, the problem becomes to consider how all these rights are implemented or could potentially be implemented in everyday life, how the appearance of an individual corresponds to the national traditions and the forms of expressing the nation's national code.⁵

In conditions of globalization this seemingly legitimized side of life found itself showing signs of crisis. Changes in the ethnic, national and cultural makeup of the country's population can lead to changes in the national legislation. Today, we are witnessing the influence that the new wave of migrants has on Western and Central Europe. The waves of immigrants destroy not only the moral foundations of tolerance. They have also led to adoption of regulatory frameworks, which maintain a differentiated approach to main groups of migrants.

The conflicts that emerged in the European society due to the influx of migrants were related not so much to economic problems as to the fact that the local population was not ready to accept representatives of other culture, other behavior patterns. The practice shows that organizational measures taken to assimilate the migrants and the legal instruments of influence on them are not enough to normalize the situation. Any legal system is always challenged by the practice of applying the law, where the central role belongs to a human being, carrier of national, always unique, culture.

We are forced to conclude that we cannot change the national mentality, based on religious and cultural values by applying law-based methods. Possibly, in the current situation the issue of legal regulation must rest not so much in the sphere of social support for migrants who wish to adapt to the host culture, and not so much in providing or depriving them of citizenship, as in admissibility of migration as a fact of life. The legal foundation for resolving these problems must lie on the migrants' rights as a provided privilege, not as a natural right.

The national cultural code objectively limits the possibilities for informational law; at the same time, it plays a positive role by providing a balance to find agreements between the will of the states as a foundation of international law. The very existence of the multipolar world depends on the consideration of fundamental cultural values of each nation in all their diversity. Ignoring these values leads the candidate to the role of the global hegemon being forced to establish economic, political or military dictatorship.

While we do honor the existing principles of interaction between the national culture and the law and the existing international law practice, we need to become aware of the radically new challenges. Their essence lies in that human beings have extended the boundaries of their being and entered a cyber space where their own culture is formed; it is this culture that will possibly create the new philosophy of law and new mechanisms of legal regulations, which would (from the very start) be based not on national but on supranational principles.

¹ Ли Цзинцзе. Заимствование западной культуры: нельзя допускать отклонений как "влево", так и "вправо" // Международные Лихачевские научные чтения. Глобализация и диалог культур. Избранные доклады (1995–2015). СПб.: СПбГУП, 2015. С. 143–148; Трошинский П. В. Правовая система Китая. М., 2016. С. 14–15.

² Еремин В. Н. Традиция в политике и праве Японии: взгляд из России // Япония-2000: консерватизм и традиционализм. М., 2000. С. 39–55.

³ Ibid. P. 52.

⁴ Катасонова Е. Л. Заметки о японском кино: все оттенки розового // Японские исследования. 2016. № 3. С. 57–70 (www.ifes-ras.ru/js).

⁵ For more information, see: Шебанова Н. А. Модное право. М., 2018. С. 5–77.

INFORMATION WARS AND GLOBAL CULTURAL CHANGE: A SEGMENTED INTERNET?

Introduction

The development of smart phones has meant that even in countries with very limited electricity supplies, social media and global news sources are accessible almost anywhere. Eight years ago it became clear that cattle rustling operations in remote parts of Kenya were being coordinated using smart phones. Optimistic claims about the democratising effects of this information revolution have had to confront the reality that threats to vested political and economic interests can induce responses that include arbitrary arrest, intimidation, beatings and assassinations. Such human rights violations can be found all over the world and may be occurring on an increased scale, although it may simply be the case that the internet makes us all more aware of it. In addition, computerised language translation has facilitated communication, but also opened up a greater space for contestation and thus provided a motive for cyber 'warfare'.

Such contestation does not only take place between different countries, but can become quite acute within countries. An important example is that of the USA where the development of the internet has greatly exacerbated 'cultural wars' within the country. These have now reached the level that major companies can lose huge amounts of revenue as customers offended by some public stance of that company decide to boycott it. Opinion polls show that the divisions within American society are now greater than they were before the onset of the Civil War of 1860–65. [Even the name of that conflict is now contested, with some calling it the 'War of Northern Aggression'.] Increasingly on the American right, discussions can be found of civil conflict and how to prepare for it.

Such cultural divisions, which were largely ignored by the US mainstream media at least in terms of their serious nature, partly explain the election of President Trump, who was able to articulate the grievances of those who felt that they had long been marginalised by the US media and political establishment. One result has been that American TV viewing figures have declined dramatically as people turn to the internet for sources of information that they feel that they can trust. A similar trend underlies the Brexit vote in the UK, and there the decline in viewing figures for broadcast TV can be seen in the fact that the average age of BBC TV viewers is now 72, and this figure is rising faster than the passage of chronological time. In other words, it is not only the young who are switching off, but a high and rising proportion of the entire population.

Thus cultural changes associated with the internet and smart phones do not simply manifest themselves as a 'clash of civilisations' and hence cannot be resolved entirely by international dialogue, but perhaps need to be addressed by a more sophisticated understanding of cultural influence-

es that are at times spontaneous and at times manipulated. The latter aspect has now become manifest with the allegedly illicit use of users' data on social media such as Facebook, and by false claims of computer hacking coupled with attempts to suppress leaks of information that are in the public interest. Such phenomena are almost certainly global, although those in the most technologically advanced economies tend to attract most attention.

Angolan Cultural Changes

In commenting on Angola, I must admit that in the past I have simultaneously been an active member of the Mozambique Angola Committee (a British solidarity organisation) and an expert witness in court cases of Angolans seeking asylum in the UK, where I usually supported the asylum seekers' claims. This apparently paradoxical position arose because I was fully aware of the kinds of human rights abuses that can arise during civil wars. Such wars are themselves frequently disguised forms of foreign destabilisation, and my support for the Angolan government in the face of such strategies did not blind me to the abuses on both sides, as people became brutalised by the experience of long-term conflict. Although there has now been a period of 16 years in which psychological wounds may have healed somewhat, I am well aware that even domestic violence can increase in the aftermath of such civil conflicts. In that sense, Angolan culture still bears the scars of a long-term traumatic conflict. Many post-war problems remain unresolved, including clearance of landmines and pension payments to those who served in the armed forces.

Nevertheless, it is clear that Angolan culture is developing and changing, partly owing to the impact of the internet. Angola has already implemented plans to link Provincial capital cities by fibre optic cable along the coast, and the more expensive process of linking up inland Provincial capital cities (giving a total of 18) is under way. Unfortunate problems with the launch of Angola's national satellite (Angosat) have delayed the national integration of communications, but a trans-Atlantic cable to Brazil has been completed. Even before this, Brazilian culture was probably the main source of foreign influence on Angolan culture (rather than, say, the influence of other Portuguese-speaking African countries). For this reason, in musical terms, Brazilian music mixed with some elements of Congolese music is important in popular culture. This includes forms of rap music that perhaps inevitably contain elements of satirical political commentary, albeit partially disguised to avoid official complaints. In addition, like all Portuguese-speaking countries in Africa, Brazilian soap operas attract a huge audience.

Despite the 'resource curse' of oil which has tended to focus investment on the industry that has long provided the largest source of government revenue, there are now signs that Angola is developing an economic strategy that encompasses other sectors of industry. Agricultural development is still hampered by the widespread presence of landmines in what was once one of the world's top three mine-affected countries. That is a constraint on growth

¹ Economist, sociologist (Great Britain). Author of several academic publications including: "A Sociology of the Soviet Union", "Kritsman and the Agrarian Marxists" (co-author), "Endre Sik and the development of African studies in the USSR" (co-author), "The Crisis of Perestroika", "New BRICS countries counter-strategy", etc. Was a member of the editorial boards of the journals "Economy and Society", "Review of African Political Economy", "Journal of Southern African Studies", "Não Vamos Esquecer". Member of International Scientific conferences on economics and social sciences of the USSR, Eastern Europe and Africa.

since Angola has historically been capable of producing a wide range of tropical and temperate agricultural products. Recent political changes since the resignation of José Eduardo dos Santos as President suggest that economic policy will now be more clearly focussed in specific areas, including participation in the Belt and Road Initiative. The resulting changes in the occupational structure of Angola suggest that major cultural changes could emerge in what has been a very poor largely urban population, as living standards rise. What this suggests is that while Angola is not an especially innovative country influencing world culture, this could change as the social and economic structure changes.

Turbulent Times

One of main areas of contestation in global culture is that between globalists and nationalists. This has arisen owing to growing opposition to the apparent global homogenisation of culture under the hegemony of American mass media. While globalists have welcomed such developments, nationalists have contended that a healthy global culture can only arise from the vitality of lively national and regional cultures. Rather than a melting pot, nationalists argue cultural diversity should be celebrated as enriching the developing global cultural space. Along with such sentiments there are attempts to cherish and nourish declining languages, while accepting that some languages have almost lost all living speakers. It is probable that these attempts will unfortunately have only a limited impact, because there are about 6,000 languages worldwide, and only about 10 or 12 of them have a major impact on global culture. Among the 1,000 languages in Africa only Arabic, Swahili, French, Portuguese, Afrikaans and English have any serious influence.

On the internet, it is acknowledged that the number of speakers affects the influence of some languages, with the 'big five' being Mandarin Chinese, Hindi, Arabic, English and Spanish. Yet other languages continue to have an influence far greater than the number of speakers, owing to their contribution to science, art, music and literature. A notable example is Russian, which contributes about 11 percent of all scientific publications, and whose art, music and literature remain of global significance. I would expect this to continue because despite an acknowledged decline in the quality of education in recent years, the Russian population remains among the best educated in the world. In any case, other countries, including the UK and the USA, have also experienced a decline in the quality of their education in recent decades.

The USA has the most expensive educational system in the world, yet has some of the worst educational outcomes, as measured by the PISA and other surveys. Changes in the school curriculum have in some respects resulted in a 'race to the bottom' with declining educational standards, despite very high teacher salaries. In UK 30 years of constant politically-motivated reorganisation has produced no visible improvement: quite the contrary. This has been partly reflected in the PISA results, in the flight of school teachers from the profession, and in schools facing growing financial difficulties to the point where they often cannot afford basic teaching materials. The so-called 'marketisation' of universities, coupled with a strict regime of management targets that do not reflect the real nature of education, has

led to organisational instability within the system. It means that some universities could well collapse as students move to those universities with higher measured educational outcomes. This process has been exacerbated by the introduction of a student loan system that, as in the USA, is leading to an incipient, unsustainable crisis of student debt.

Yet in addition to the damage to education done by the globalists, the tension between globalists and nationalists operates at the political as well as the cultural level. That is why cultural divisions within the USA and UK have had a serious political impact recently. The globalists have been in denial about this while also fighting back with mass media campaigns that have a limited impact precisely because large sections of the population no longer trust or even watch the mass media. Such phenomena are accompanied by the decline in family life and a catastrophic demographic crash that is about to cause serious fiscal and wider economic problems for such societies. While policy makers in both China and Russia are aware of the importance of demographic issues and are each attempting to combat the decline in the birth rate, Russia is extremely rare in the global context in having some notable if limited success.

The Russian birth rate is slowly rising, and an increasing number of young people are getting married, in sharp contrast to most other societies. This seems to be linked to a growing influence of Christianity in Russia, although other ethnic and religious minorities are also experiencing a rising birth rate. An additional factor in Russia is almost certainly the fact the GDP per capita is now a lot higher than it was in 1999, and inflation has come down as Russia has absorbed the negative impact of sanctions through a process of economic reform and increased food production. It is noteworthy too that the rate of murder is declining in Russia, since Professor Vladimir Popov (New Economic School, Moscow) pointed out some years ago that such a decline can be treated as an index of the growing legitimacy of the government. In parts of the UK, most visibly in London, the murder rate is rising rapidly.

A major demographic crash such as is already happening in Japan can be considered as a form of cultural suicide. Yet this global phenomenon, together with the endemic failure of the global economic policies of the hegemonic 'Washington Consensus', are not the only reasons for concern. There are other reasons to expect future cultural and political turbulence. The fact that the hegemony of the West is being challenged from within has led to an intensification of cultural contestation, with competing narratives leading to greater acrimony within public political space in the West. It has also resulted in a series of psychological operations ('psyops') by the Western intelligence services in an attempt to undermine political dissent and divert the attention of the populations in these countries from the growing opposition that is emerging. A major feature of such attempts to maintain the legitimacy of the existing political and economic order has been the demonization of other countries. In the case of most NATO countries, this demonization has focussed on Russia, with accompanying propaganda that paints a picture that is completely out-of-date and misconceived. One result of this is that politicians can enact measures such as economic sanctions that fail to produce the intended effect, even though they do inflict some limited damage.

Some these attempts at punitive measures against Russia and other countries are in violation of international law, while claiming spurious legal justification such as 'humanitarian intervention'. They produce a greater danger of major war and of a major financial crisis as economic relations are disrupted at a time of very high public debt in the West. While Russia has succeeded in reducing its public debt following the financial crisis of 2007–2008, the West has greatly increased it, such that it now faces systemic instability. War may appear attractive to political leaders and the deep state in the West as a way of displacing the blame for this incipient financial crisis. The cultural impact of a major war or economic crisis would be considerable if not catastrophic. For this reason, the Westphalian system of international law must be upheld through the UN and other institutions, despite constant globalist violations.

Cyber Warfare and Democratic Accountability

While it is often Russia or North Korea that is accused in the West of cyber attacks, the Western media ignore such things as the cyber attack that took place during the recent Russian Presidential election. Despite the apparent hysteria in official circles in the West concerning cyber attacks, it is evident that very few measures have been taken to protect such vital but mundane infrastructure as power stations and hospitals. Many American power stations are still controlled by old computers running Windows NT. A recent cyber attack using 'ransomware' that was attributed to non-state actors caused massive disruption to the health service in the UK and to other large organisations, but little has been done to insulate large public and private organisations from such attacks. This is mainly owing to the 'organisational momentum' of existing working practices, and as the American computer security expert Bruce Schneier has noted, the main limitation on organisational computer security is human complacency and indifference. Even on social media, people have (at least until very recently) been willing to trade personal security for ease and convenience of use.

In the meantime, governments have been building a huge surveillance infrastructure to monitor their citizens' behaviour and opinions. Examples of vast government 'data warehouses' include the fairly new National Security Agency (NSA) facility a few kilometres south of Salt Lake City in the USA. International surveillance has been longstanding in the form of huge signals intelligence (SIGINT) bases such as Menwith Hill in the north of England, only about 10 kilometres from where I live. This is now complemented by huge private databases for 'micromarketing' by political and commercial bodies, using social media data. As I indicated at the Likhachev conference last year, such techniques migrated from the US intelligence services into the commercial arena about 20 years ago. Their recent use by a UK company called Cambridge Analytica has attracted a great deal of media attention in the US and UK, because of their possible impact on both the 2016 US Presidential election and the UK Brexit vote. Yet it seems that no one in the Western media has thought to comment on the fact that such techniques would probably have had a far greater impact than any 'Russian meddling' in US elections.

In the case of Russia, there have been threats from the West to take more drastic action than software cyber

attacks, presumably as a consequence of the relative failure of economic and other sanctions. I have noticed a recent threat in the UK press suggesting that the marine fibre optic cable in the Baltic Sea could be physically cut in order to slow down the internet connection from St. Petersburg to the West. That would be easier than might be imagined, since the USA has long had a dedicated submarine called the USS Jimmy Carter that can attach equipment to marine fibre optic cables in order to access the communications traffic. The existence of this submarine was mentioned on the Web about 10 years ago when it was blamed for the temporary disruption of Middle East internet communications after it apparently accidentally cut such a cable in the Eastern Mediterranean. This ability to 'listen in' to massive data flows in marine cables is one of the reasons why former US intelligence officials have debunked claims about Russian interference in US elections. For example, Ray McGovern, a former senior CIA official who co-founded Veteran Intelligence Professionals for Sanity (VIPS) has consistently criticised such claims about Russian interference. In addition, VIPS has demonstrated conclusively that the alleged leaks from the Democrat National Committee (DNC) servers were in fact a data transfer to a device that was physically connected to the DNC servers. The internet was not involved, and so the Wikileaks claim that the data had been handed personally to an intermediary in New York seems to be vindicated.

The opacity of claims about cyber attacks (since electorates and politicians tend to lack the expertise to evaluate such claims) implies a problem of democratic accountability. It makes demonization of other countries that much easier. Democratic oversight of such actions is inevitably limited, and the problem is compounded by the lack of relevant expertise among politicians. That issue was very clear in the recent US Senate hearing taking evidence from Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg. The questions asked of him demonstrated considerable naivety. In addition, it is evident that UK Parliamentary investigations are severely limited by an inability to use the internet to identify, evaluate and analyze relevant sources of information. For example, the UK Foreign Affairs Select Committee report of 2016 on the overthrow of the Gadaffi government in Libya failed to make use of internet sources, and so failed to identify the role of the USA in 'leading from behind' while placing the French President Sarkozy in the lead role publicly, with the UK playing a prominent supporting role. The fact that the 'humanitarian crisis' in Libya that was the pretext for the military intervention had been arranged by the USA in coordination with British intelligence was not discovered. Wikileaks was not registered as a source of information by that Committee.

Such failures are partly a result of information overload, but they can also be attributed to a failure to adapt to the rapid cultural changes induced by the internet and smart phones. Such information can in any case be a threat to governments, and the response can, as indicated above, be violent. To take one example, the assassination in 2015 in Mozambique of the human rights lawyer Giles Cistac was an apparent reaction to a mere proposal that attempted to mediate intractable political differences between the government and the opposition. In the last few weeks another human rights lawyer there was beaten and had both his legs broken. So unchanging authoritarian political cultures can

respond violently to dissenting voices. These problems have been exacerbated by the ease of access to information that is the major consequence of the information revolution.

Grand Solar Minimum and Magnetic Pole Reversal

It may seem strange to bring up the potential impact of natural phenomena on human culture, but there are many occasions whereby they can impose serious constraints upon cultural development, forcing a change of direction to adapt to new circumstances. A Grand Solar Minimum occurs roughly every 450 years, and that time has now passed since the last one, known as the Maunder Minimum. This precipitated the Little Ice Age in medieval times, resulting in a major reduction in living standards. While modern technology may make societies in the northern hemisphere more resilient this time, the implications for agriculture are clear. It implies that societies should probably start to make more use of cultivation under glass or indoors, with perhaps full spectrum electric lighting powered by natural gas or other power sources. Wind power will be less relevant away from coastal areas.

A Grand Solar Minimum (as opposed to the normal 11-year solar minimum) implies an even greater reduction in solar electrical activity including sun spots, solar flares and coronal mass ejection (CME) phenomena. There are other intermediate cycles in solar activity that have been recently discovered and which perhaps give a renewed relevance to Kondrat'iev's economic theory of the long cycle.

The growing signs of a global magnetic pole reversal imply much greater problems for contemporary human culture. The Magnetic North Pole has already moved quite a distance from the geographical North Pole, and is now in Siberia. The southern Magnetic Pole has left Antarctica. It looks as if they will meet at the Equator and for a while

the earth's magnetosphere, which is already weakening, could disappear altogether. This means that even though the electrical activity of the Sun is currently weakening as it moves towards a Grand Minimum, the Earth will be more vulnerable to its electrical activity. Not only will electronic equipment be vulnerable, but the electricity supply grid could have major blackouts. World communications could be seriously disrupted. These effects could be much greater than the geomagnetic storm known as the Carrington Event of 1859 when even electrical telegraph wires caught fire in the USA and massive forest fires were caused in South America.

In other words, human society is about to enter a period of increased vulnerability to incoming electrical phenomena that pose dangers to internet and electricity supplies more widely, with probable adverse consequences for human culture and wellbeing. The implications of the incipient Grand Minimum include a possible global cooling over the next 20 years, as predicted by various scientists associated with the Electric Universe movement. Recent research emanating from this group of scientists has also established the importance of solar electrical activity in inducing earthquakes. So these too might become more frequent and severe in these new circumstances.

Conclusion

The fact that some countries feel obliged to defend their internet while preserving as far as possible access to the global internet creates the unintended possibility that the internet might become increasingly segmented. This possibility will continue as long as the USA tries to retain control of domain name registration and threatens cyber warfare against other countries that do not conform to its ongoing hegemonic agenda.

V. L. Makarov¹

THE DIGITAL WORLD AND THE CONTOURS OF THE FUTURE: CREATIVE ACTIVITIES ARE CHANGING THEIR DIRECTION

There is a lot written about the role of governing laws and accidents in human development. It seems at first sight that the role of accidents should reduce when the humankind is growing up. Everything that is in line with the human na-

ture, everything that touches the heart, delights is analyzed and fitted into various theories.

However, we watch absolutely unexpected jumps, turns in life that do not fit into any theories. My explanation of this phenomenon is that the digital world engulfing us generates much more variants than before.

Human mind is constructed in such a way that variants, not fitting into the thinker's worldview, are automatically rejected in the process of thinking. Geniuses differ from common people exactly by reviewing the variants that seem senseless or fantastic.

Computers, robots join the thinking process in the digital world. They can deal with giant numbers of variants that a human head cannot hold. And the human role becomes different. There is the task to appraise the computer-generated variants as to their value for the humankind besides generation of variants and appraisal of a fairly small number of them. And organization of appraisal is a separate not simple task.

¹ Academic Advisor of Central Economic and Mathematical Institute of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dean of the Faculty of Economics of State Academic University for the Humanities, Director of Graduate School of Public Administration at Lomonosov MSU, President of Russian Economical School, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor. Author of more than 300 scientific publications, including: "Mathematical Theory of Economic Dynamics and Balance", "Valuation of Intangible Assets and Intellectual Property" (co-author), "Russian Science and High Technologies at the Turn of the Third Millennium", "Russia in a Globalizing World. Modernization of the Russian Economy", "Social Clusterism. The Russian Challenge". Chief Editor of the journal "Economics and Mathematical Methods". Member of the Editorial Boards of the journals: "Economics of Planning", "Social Sciences", "Cybernetics and System Analysis", "Economic Science of Modern Russia", "Scientology", "Optimization" and others. Awarded the Order of Friendship of Peoples, the Order of the Red Banner of Labour, the Order of the Badge of Honour, the Order "For Merit to the Fatherland" III and IV degrees. Award holder of the prize of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, of L. V. Kantorovich prize of the RAS, Demidov prize and others.

I'll give several examples to illustrate the presented thought.

Photos, cartoons, poems, statements, comments, jokes, etc. appear on social networking websites, some of them become popular with their consumers. And they are not always posted in pursuit of popularity. The flow (of variants) is great and they are chosen naturally by public "voting".

The second example looks fantastic because it has not been practically applied yet. But development of supercomputers will soon transform this fantasy into reality. I'm saying that a computer (software) calculates all possible sequences of letters of the Russian alphabet, plus a space, the length of which is, say, 100 symbols. If there are approximately 35 letters (symbols), there will be 35^{100} variants. After that selection of sequences consisting of words with a grammar sense takes place. After that sentences, or groups of sentences constructed correctly are selected from them. Texts with a sense (surely, various senses) are selected from them. And finally variants referring to literature (for example, poetry), culture, science, technology, etc. are selected at the final stages. In particular, available chef d'oeuvres from this or that field are revealed. For example, popular expressions or catchwords by comic writers or poems by Pushkin can be repeated.

Certain people make the choice at the final stage. And a lucky choice can be fixed as an individual decision with respective protection of copyrights.

It has been thought till now that chef d'oeuvres are generated by geniuses, they are unique, there are very few of them. Here everything is generated by computers, and the issue is only the choice from the giant mass of the generated. The role of appraisers, reviewers, critics grows.

The described process of word variants' generation also spreads to variants of images, for example, pictures. It's possible to review squares of various colours in the two-dimensional space. There are very many possible variants but they are not unlimited. At the same time, squares should be rather small but noticeable for human eyes to generate drawings and other pictures.

By the way, a certain process of picture generation is realized by Stephen Wolfram in his *A New Kind of Science*.¹ It's possible to find many various drawings generated by cellular automatons in this book. The author is especially interested in pictures occurring in nature: snowflakes, flowers, trees, pyramids, rings, spirals, etc.

By the way, there may be notes instead of pictures, and then the problem of selection of computer-generated melodies appears.

The third example is again related to the Internet. I'm speaking about the so-called fake news, invented forecasts and stories. Information about real events coming to mass media costs a lot. You have to go to the site, shoot, ask questions, etc. And any fakes can be generated in giant numbers, especially with the help of quickly advancing robots. Information consumers can't tell a fake from reality. As a result, another "fake" reality is generated, which becomes no less appreciable and important than the real one. A lot of people are shocked from time to time when facts, known to them during their whole lives, finally turn out to be myths. At the same time it should be emphasized that we are not speaking about the past only when, for example, absolutely different images of Ivan the Terrible can be presented. According to the rules accepted now, leaders are elected by general vote, and the images of these leaders are formed in virtual reality. And the virtual image may have nothing in common with the real one. It's well-known that it's much easier to generate sensations artificially than look for them in real life. Computers can calculate such variants, which the real world does not know.

I hope that I've managed to demonstrate the change of creative activities' direction in the environment of universal digitalization with the above examples. It became possible to order computers to generate variants. As a result, it's becoming more of them by many orders of magnitude, and the choice of the required by the society from them is becoming much more difficult. Because of that advancement of appraisal tools becomes urgent, in particular, rejection of variants. The structure of the creative people detachment will change in the direction of reduction of those generating variants and increase of those who appraise them.

As for the tools for variants appraisal, including their institutional support, here we should employ the experience in research of the problem of social norms' generation and evolution. Social norms as a social phenomenon have been studied in detail from the ancient times. See, e. g. the review by Victor Istratov.² There is a lot of useful information to be found, including for advancement of the institute for new knowledge generation as well as innovations in literature, culture and arts.

¹ Wolfram S. *A New Kind of Science*. Champaign : Wolfram Media, Inc., 2002.

² Истратов В. А. Моделирование формирования социальных норм в общественных науках // Экономика и математические методы. 2016. Т. 52, № 4.

J. A. March¹

MOVING FOR A NEW WORLD; FROM SUCCESS IN SCIENCES TO EFFICIENCY IN SOCIAL AND POLITICAL OPERATIONAL THINKING AT GLOBAL SCALE

One of the most impressive issues of modern times is the vertiginous speed at which we renovate knowledge in all fields. Progress in science is tremendous. At present it is estimated that every 18 years humanity doubles the whole knowledge we possess. It means that in 18 years we produce as much knowledge as humanity has produced in the last 50,000 years since we abandoned the stone era. Maybe in 10 years this time for doubling the knowledge will be even reduced to the half. It is clear that we are navigating at very high speed in our evolution as a specie.

The question that remains unresolved is: Where are we heading for?

Some scientist have thrown to the canvas the theory that we are going to accomplish a manifest destiny in the history of Universe. They say our position in Universe is going to be similar to the one of bees in the Nature. We are going to be the vector for pollinating with intelligent life the Universe.

Most of them believe that the propellor that will trigger our trip to the Universe will be the hostilities inside the Planet. The intrinsic unbalances in Planet Earth among human beings will induce humanity to establish new settlements in the outer space. Need is the only irresistible force, and the desire of Human beings to explore the outer space will be driven by the feeling of insecurity in its own Planet. Up to now, Planet Earth has been the nursing cave for the humans.

Humans, we have moved from primitive to intelligent life but although showing notorious incapacity for organizing public life under collective harmonious patterns. Our planet is a world of tensions and dreadful menaces, all of them acting as propellers for initiating the outer space adventure. And by reaching superior standards of intelligence including artificial intelligence we are prepared to migrate from planet to planet in the outer Space, starting our task as the great pollinator of the Universe. Under this theory, little can be done to scape to our destiny as we are part of a major game of which we ignore everything. We are not the inventors nor the autonomous players but the captive pions moved by a dynamic of which we ignore how, when, by whom and for which purpose was created.

If destiny can not be changed, let's think at least that maybe the timing and the fuel can be change. So recognizing that the first part of the theorem is right, we are head-

ing for being the disseminators of superior intelligent life in the Universe-, lets try to change the propellor of the process. Lets be able to do it as a success not as a failure of our capacity to organize ourselves in the right way in the origine of our existence, in our homeland, Planet Earth. Lets then start by minimizing the risks of instability in Planet Earth to make the scape less imperious. Let's at least be a little bit rebel vis a vis a destiny that has been imposed, a manifest destiny that places us not as masters but as useful carriers. We should be able to go to the Universe not because of a "run away" but because we have developed an harmonic system of collective life that can make the whole Universe a grandiose homeland of Intelligence life.

It is true that up to now we are not showing great intelligence in organizing our planet under sound structures of peace. If we, human beings, are showing a remarkable performance on physical architecture and everyday we build up top new buildings that are astonishing evidences of our superior capacity, we are showing a low performance as political architects of human interaction. We fail as organizers of the public space for harmonic global development. Positive interaction between countries, between civilizations, between different peoples is not our paramount. A clear priority in this 21st century should be to show ourselves how capable we are to organize our life in common under harmonious and sustainable patterns.

If in the 20th century we conquered the moon, in the 21st century we have to discover and implement Tyler good pattern for organizing our homeland. We have to move from success in Science to success in social and Political thinking. We have to go back to our roots for the good: We have to implement in our homeland, Planet Earth, the pattern of harmonic global civilization. In the 20th century we had to prove to ourselves that science could transcend our historic boundaries, that we were intelligent because of our scientifically capacity. In the 21st century we have to prove that we are intelligent because we can overcome for first timer in our history and evolution the conflicts among human groups. We need to use our conceptual capacity too develop an harmonic model of civilization. Before going out we have to demonstrate that we are able to put our house in order. How we treat our world we will be judged in history. There are two ways to head for the outer space adventure: Either as a result of our "huida" from Planet Earth or either as a result of having accomplished a successful global organization of our homeland that enables us to be a positive seed of intelligent life for the whole Universe. We confront here one of the most crucial issues for the value of humanity as such: Will we act as a intelligent polinator animals of Universe, as a force of good, or will we be the defective pollinator exporting a conflictual nature to the Universe as a whole!. Although being difficult, I think we have to put all efforts in reeducating ourselves before leaving Planet Earth. We should be the carriers of an harmonious project of life.

The great revolution in this 21st century is to move the central axe of our evolution from groups to the individual. The citizen as human being, as individual not as part

¹ Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Kingdom of Spain to the Russian Federation (2008–2011). In 1989–1993 he worked as a permanent Representative of the European Commission under the Committee on support of the Organization for cooperation and economic development. He served as a Director General of the Institute of IberoAmerican Cooperation of Spanish Agency for International Cooperation, an adviser of the Embassy of Spain in the United Kingdom (1996–2001) and Mexico (2001–2004). He was an Ambassador – a Permanent Representative of Spain to the United Nations and international organizations in Geneva (2004–2008). He is an author of the book "Wait for me in Havana", "Key Strategic Issues in Global World", a series of publications about problems of contemporary international relations, including: "Contemporary Global Challenges and National Interests. A World between Conflict and Creativity", "The World is no Longer the Same: the Big Changes Ahead", "The Challenge of the Persistence of Different Stages of Competitiveness in the Process of Globalization", etc.

of any collective project – nation, civilizations etc., is now the great engine of progress. We have to overpass the horizon of Nations to extend it to the world, heading for a Planetary political environment. We have to abandon all efforts for the preeminence of one civilization or culture over any other. Attention must focus on the positive capacity of each individual in all parts of the world. The French Revolution was based on the concept of Citizen, fighting for its freedom vis a vis a Feudal system. The conceptual progress this Revolution implied, had its limits in the Concept of Nation and in the Concept of State. It was already a great achievement to substitute a very fragmented public space, the land of the Feudal Lord, by a very large new public space; the State. Men and Women at the end of the XVIII century were able to make this formidable step forward. Today we should be able to move to a new pattern of collective life heading for the globe as the frame and the individuals as the great assets of the Human Specie. The strength of the human specie should be its capacity to let each individual to deliver the maximum of his/her capacities and to be able to collect this flow of billions of inputs of energy, innovation and creativity under an interactive harmonious model. Any breakthrough in this issue will lead humanity to great success in this 21st century.

We can not ignore that the 21st century is going to be a very different century from any other previous period of Human History. It was Shimon Peres, the former President of Israel (2007–2014), who gave the clue in the ceremony that invested him as Doctor Honoris Causa by the Lomonosov University of Moscow in 2010. When asked by the audience which in his opinion was going to be the key issue of the 21st century, he replied: “Up to now human beings we have used the brain for understanding the outside world and by that inventing useful things for humanity. We have observed horses running and we have invented trains and cars, we have observed birds flying and we have created planes. But the 21st century is going to mark the difference: We, human beings, we are going to investigate seriously on our brain and we are going to discover how we really are and how we function. We will discover and manage all our potential and this will mark a new era in Human existence”.

In this line the key revolution of the 21st century is to move from a world where human beings were a work force to a world where each human being is a source of creativity and innovation. Whereas in 1900 there were large factories with 5,000 workers repeating a mechanic task and only 20 people working in the intelligent area of the industry (directing the work, creating new products, addressing the market etc.) in the 21st century the trend is to have millions of enterprises with few workers and nearly all of them in commanding positions. In 1900, in the factories, there was only 0.5% of the total staff delivering an action that could not be mechanized. Today the percentage is close to 90% in the most advanced countries that are leading the trend. The situation has changed dramatically. Human beings we have invented artificial intelligence to replace us in executing the mechanical tasks and little by little we will be replaced in the execution of sophisticated tasks. The future of mankind is a future heading for the intelligent behavior. Each human being has to be counted as a precious element. How far we are from the world where human beings were primitive elements of production, animal work force! Nevertheless our weakness remains in our incapacity

to organize well how all individuals in the world interact in full exploit of their capacities. We are heading for a future dominated by intelligence but we are still in a very deficient present that combines brilliant elements of the future with many unnecessary attitudes and patterns of the brutal past.

And we have to overcome these elements of the past, as they block natural evolution and constitute the dangers of unnecessary destruction. We must say it loudly. The new world, the world of the future, is the world of the citizens not the world of the groups or the nations. The same that we were able to overcome the tribal stage and much later the feudal organization, we have now to overcome the organizational structures that we created in the 19th and 20th century to articulate our societies and put on the right track the development. These structures were the empires, then the national states. During the first part of the 20th century the humanity started its way to structure globally its collective life. The destruction caused by the two World Wars led to two essays in the creation of an international order further to the existing one of the balances of the States, a superior order of global collective organization. This led in 1920 to the creation of the League of Nations and in 1945 to the United Nations. But in both cases the base were the Nations, the States. Science had not yet progressed in the way it has done in the 21st century to make of the millions of individuals the strength of the humanity by its independence, its mobility, its creativity. Once again the Human intuition is decrypting the future and it is not by chance that the only new collective body created in this 21st century has been the UN Council of Human Rights. Although this body works still with the imperfect basis of the states as members, it is already a symbolism of the main trend of our century: The individual, its dignity, its freedom, its capacity to act and to do, is the central pillar of the modern world architecture.

In the meanwhile, unfortunately, conflicts of the past persist. But the really big danger is that vacuum tends always to be filled and the delay in giving birth to a new world order based in the protection of the individual citizens at a global scale, provokes that the existing nations continue to compete under tribal parameters. The vertiginous rhythm of transformation of our lives as a result of the technological new devices, provokes at the same time an increased insecurity in many people that take shelter in the old collective structures. We are confronting a crucial pathway. Definitely we are progressing towards a more individual world but at the same time the fragility of the less well prepared groups in every society is propelling a defensive attitude that looks back at the past as a shield of protection. Under these circumstances the expenditure in military equipment continue to grow and tensions persist. We need then, to create and put quickly in motion the New structures of a New World Order if we want to avoid the black clouds of conflicts, destruction and regression.

What are the main immediate tasks to develop for a better global capacity for neutralizing conflicts, guarantying peace, and consolidate the world open perspectives for the individuals?

The priority is in my opinion, while someone invents something that really could work and act more effectively, to consolidate the potential power of the *United Nations*, the *World Trade Organization* and the *Disarmament Conference*. We could anchor rational behavior at global scale

by giving a more real power to these three global institutional engines for piloting global development. Everybody in International politics is aware of the underperformance of the United Nations. The machine is slow, bureaucratic and lacking of real power. However it is our only global political organization with incipient capacity in the key subject of human interlinkage: War and Peace. We can not substitute it without going into the danger of sinking it and losing a vital global engine. Better let's play safe and concentrate in giving more power to its existing instruments.

As far as improvement is concerned, two are in my view the areas of priority work at the UN.

The first one is the *Security Council*. It needs reform in the line that although guaranteeing permanent seat for the existing 5 central states we should eliminate its veto power. Then at least 5 very solid states representing a group of great influencers in the world or representing a continent, should be added to the previous category. In my view Japon, India, Germany and one representative (that could rotate) for Africa and another for Latin America should join the group. This group of 10n Nations would dilute the concept of individual States deciding and would mean a step ahead in the feeling of global governance. The Security Council could then have 15 non permanent members as individual States that would rotate every three years, adding the involvement of States of all Nature and size to the daily work of the Security Council. Then, more capacity should be given to the Security Council to stop conflicts and to boost development. Although still being an imperfect machine, these reforms would secure better capacity for real action to our only collective body for the preservation of peace in the world.

The second one is the *Human Rights Council*. We need to reinforce its capacity. This UN body has to gain in prestige and independence. It has to make of the Declarations of Human Rights approved in 1948 its inalienable foundation of its activity and has to become the guardian of the freedom and capacity of all individuals, being superior to any intimidating power or action of any state. This body has to be the security guard of all citizens on the 21st century.

Then we have the crucial role of the *World Trade Organization*. Human economic interaction is the multiplier of growth and progress. Today this multiplier is more powerful than ever because it exists at some degree at global level. Progress is still needed in some areas, activities and places but it is undeniable that open trade of goods and services is more a reality than ever. The World Trade Organization is the guarantor of the existence of open global regulations. Its protection and consolidation is key for the security of an open global economic environment. The more powers this Organization gets the more the human initiative at global scale will be preserved and individual creative initiatives at global scale will flourish.

And last but not least we have the central role that we should give to the *Disarmament Conference* to limit the scope of arms conflict and progressing towards disarmament in crucial areas. The first area to secure is the outer space. We have to limit all potential arms race to Planet Earth. The outer Space can not be a new stage in our arms' development or it will not be possible to contend by any means the destructive nature of Humanity. This should be the top priority, the red line. Not to go further than the boundaries of our planet in arms issues. Once this is definitively achieved, then we can try to control the scope of the arms race inside our world.

To sum up, we have to keep always in mind that the desire of one nation or one group of people to become dominant will always exist in the human nature. However we have now reached a stadium of intelligence and development that should allow us to create the solid regulations to counteract any abuse of power, to neutralize any potential individual or collective madness. We should be able to use the present stage of peace to create the necessary political global architecture that could guaranty a world of free citizens at global scale, a world of enormous progress, increasing richness, marvelous diversity and stunning creativity. This, more than colonizing Mars or reaching the limits of the Universe is our challenge in this century. Let's be a success in Planet Earth first, to be a success later in the infinite unknown world of the Galaxies and the Universe.

POST-CAPITALIST FUTURE: HOPES AND CONCERNS

The Western modernism project, which had dominated the global scene for 300 years and was all-pervasive and unrivaled, is now entering the its final stage. The technogenic civilization, which was built on the achievements of fundamental science, has exhausted the capabilities of extensive development, and reached a critical phase at which it enters the stage of “malignant transformation”.² The inevitable arrival of a new civilizational paradigm is manifested in a broad spectrum of global crises – geopolitical, cultural, anthropological and ecological in nature (depletion of energy sources, climate change, growing violence, increasing risks of technogenic disasters, achievements of genetic engineering that put the human habitat and the biological nature of human beings at risk). All these developments result in the challenges to the model of progress applicable to the previous stage of technogenic development. The neo-liberal model of capitalism, based on the principles of absolute freedom of entrepreneurship and maximizing profits at any cost, domineering financial speculation and consumerism as the preferred way of life, has contributed to destruction of all living things.³ Growing global competition, increasing confrontation between the Western civilization and the Muslim world, fierce informational and hybrid warfare, exhaustion of non-renewable natural resources that fuel reproduction of the capitalist model – all these factors now present a threat to the very existence of humankind.

The global community is starting to understand the adverse effects of the capitalist model, which today stands in contradiction not only with the ethical base of world cultures but with the very aspiration of the humankind to survive. The leading scholars of the world today agree that the capitalism of today has been debilitated in the long term, even in the sense of its economic feasibility. Faced with social, economic, political, and geoclimatic catastrophes, the world today needs to dismantle the capitalist system and create a new one in its place. Its parameters, as of yet, are hard to predict.⁴ The classical capitalism model, which constitutes the essence of the Western view of the civilization, has exhausted its adaptational potential. It no longer provides for proactive reflection on problems and no longer allows to develop transformation scenarios in accordance with key challenges of our time. As a result, the world has approached a “red line”, and the humankind now finds itself in transit to a new world order.

“The global transfer” of the civilization into the post-capitalist phase is related to the advancement of the *fourth industrial revolution* (which replaces the current third, informational revolution, which followed the agrarian and industrial revolutions of earlier eras). As a result, the humankind will inevitably transfer to the *Sixth Wave of Innovations*. The infrastructure of the new wave of innovations will be comprised of: total automation of production processes, increasing production effectiveness by many times and practically excluding human beings as workers; nanotechnologies which will create new technological chains for main types of industry; biotechnologies, which are based on achievements of molecular biology and genetic engineering; integrated high-speed transport systems. Rapidly growing expansion of cybernetic technologies (artificial intelligence, robot technologies, global information networks, additive 3D printers and cognitive technologies) will render comprehensive influences on the world as we know it today. A complex system of self-regulating production that reduces the area of human participation, modifies the main spheres of human activity and the key institutions of the modern society. The Cybernetic Revolution not only modifies significantly the institution of production and distribution but also leads to a revolution in the system of humanitarian (or anthropocentric) technologies. Already existing today are self-controlled systems of monitoring human behavior in the society and managing social processes. Smart technologies are getting more and more sophisticated, and their functional and communicative component is becoming more humanized (uses language, voice, gestures). Systems and analysis programs have been developed for managing large amounts of data. These modules are capable of not only analyzing the data but enter into independent interactive communication, created targeted specialized and personalized information.

The Fourth Industrial Revolution will inevitably transform the traditional capitalist model (with its greediness, relentless competition, the repressive character of relations with human beings, nature and culture) into a *post-capitalist system*. It signifies the beginning of the modern civilization’s transfer to the new type of civilizational development, the contours of which are hardly visible today. “We are on the edge of a new evolutionary leap beyond the borders of capitalism”.⁵

The new wave of innovations will radically change the structure of capitalist economy, deform its institutional base and destroy the “human factor” of business.

1. The energy system of the economy to come, which will have “zero reliance on hydrocarbons” and production technologies with “zero costs” will destroy the market infrastructure, deforming the traditional institutions of capitalist economy. The practice of measuring profits will be considerably changed as well: already today the information component of products is becoming more expensive than physical things of which they were made. The market is becoming “deeply uncapitalistic”, with the cost of as-

¹ Professor of the Department of Philosophy and Cultural Studies at the St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Dr. Sc. (Pedagogy), Merited Man of Science of the Russian Federation. Author of 150 papers, including: “Home Culture as a Subject of Cultural Studies”, “Spiritual Experience of Russia as a National and Cultural Identity Resource (Axiological and Anthropological Aspects)”, “Designing Marketing Communications: Advertizing Technologies. Public Relations. Sponsorship”, “Formation of Culturological Paradigm”, “Culture-Centrist Model of Higher Education” (co-authorship), “Information Warfare Era and Issues of Ensuring Society’s Spiritual Safety” (co-authorship), “National Idea as the Essence and Fate of ‘Russian Civilization’” and others. Professor Emeritus of SPbUHSS.

² Жутиков М. А. Демонтаж цивилизации? // Наш современник. 2009. № 9. С. 213.

³ Гранин Ю. Д. Столкновение и кризис идентичностей в глобализирующемся мире: XVI Междунар. Лихачевские науч. чтения, 19–21 мая 2016 г. СПб.: СПбГУП, 2016. С. 387.

⁴ Фурсов А. Конец эпохи. URL: <http://www.razumei.ru/lib/article/1698>

⁵ Пол Мейсон: Конец капитализма уже начался. Что дальше? URL: <http://left.by/archives/6825>

sets and the value of market exchange replacing the consumer value (usability of products and services). A dramatic increase in labor efficiency and elimination of traditional forms of competition will lower the importance of classical marketing strategies, making the marketing system useless in the long run. In essence, capitalism has been destroying the institution of private property, which has evolved over many centuries, and in the future is doomed to oblivion. The process of replacement of private property with alternative models will inevitably lead to changes in morals, which had been based on principles of capitalist production and the corresponding way of life.

2. The change of the technological paradigm will come with the changes in forms and flows of financing. The investment strategies traditional for capitalist model will be replaced with new forms of joint "popular" investments, which will allow to lower economic dependence on state finances that had been the foundation of the golden age of the former technological wave.¹

3. The expansion of information technologies that provides for the transition into the post-capitalist era will stimulate the process of forming the "joint-use economics", alternative to capitalist economics, that denies the logic of the traditional capitalist market. The parallel world of "joint use economy" will become an alternative to the Sixth wave of innovation, that promises to reduce considerably the space of human participation in the production process. The new sources and resources of post-capitalist wealth (the currency of post-capitalism) will be ownership of information, which does not belong to anyone; free time, free things and network activities of the population, and peer-to-peer computer networks, in which all the participants will be equal. Network interaction will generate a new type of welfare, which will be founded on issues beyond the classical production and the market.

The transfer of the modern civilization to its post-capitalist phase will be inevitably accompanied with dubious consequences.

1. The new model of economy, which will dramatically decrease human participation in the process, will change the human role in public production. The Sixth wave of innovation will rid human beings not only of their producer status but of the consumer status as well – in its present understanding. The human civilization will move into the trans-modern epoch, incompatible with the world of today, the time of the so-called singular transfer of reality, into a different post-human state.²

2. The technological revolution in main spheres of production will inevitably destroy the current social structure of the society due to large-scale unemployment and considerable narrowing of the middle class, which will get dissolved in the crowds of "state dependents" who will be surviving on fixed state base payments, which will guarantee decent living conditions without any obligations or requirements, independent of whether someone will be employed or not. As labor will move away from the center of human activity, and human beings will become fully free of any such obligations, their life strategies will change dramati-

cally and lead to social unrest in the future.³ The new model of the civilization based on the Sixth wave of innovations will squeeze out the traditional mechanisms of solidarity and mutual assistance, give up on traditional basic values and moral principles that regulate the life of the society.

3. A side effect of the cybernetic revolution will be the intellectual degradation of most people – saving technologies, on the one hand, will squeeze large numbers of unskilled workers from the world market, and, on the other hand, make the system of large-scale vocational education irrational and excessive. A very narrow segment of highly qualified specialists will be left to service the production sector.

Russia has every chance to take a leading role in the post-capitalist world. Firstly, this is due to the fact that Russians are genetically repulsed by the greedy and anti-humane spirit of capitalism. Capitalism that was born of the European civilization was not so much an "economic" as a "cultural fact". The capitalist model required a significant revision of the basic notions of Christian anthropology. The deeply rooted contradiction between the Western civilization and Russian culture is obvious: Ever since the Renaissance European culture has been shifting towards a pagan version of anthropology, affirming strength, power, wealth, pleasure, autonomy, and success as top priorities in life. The worldview matrix of the Russian civilization is diametrically opposite to that of capitalism. It has traditionally relied on a thoroughly non-capitalist value system: social justice here serves as the single most important condition for social solidarity; other factors include universalism and supra-ethnic identity; passionate service and the desire for universal unity.

Secondly, Russia is capable of becoming one of the leading economies of the world due to the global character of the *fourth industrial revolution*, which changes the composition of leading companies, countries and regions, assuring competitiveness of countries capable of overtaking others along the trajectory of the new wave of innovations, and invest in the components of production at earlier stages of its development. And, conversely, due to non-linearity of the process of distribution of new technologies, those who are late to join the process will have to pay more and more with every passing year to gain access, which will be closed as the new wave of innovation reaches the phase of maturity".⁴ The key condition for Russia's transfer to the "economy of leadership" in the current situation is the ideology of fast innovative development, which can activate the nation's efforts and guarantee consolidated participation of all socially responsible classes of the society in this process.

Russia today is at the stage of crisis: the bifurcation point that may lead to either the country's demise or a chance at survival, transformation (from the Ancient Greek *κρίσις* – solution, a turning point). The crisis situation is extremely sensitive to constructive ideas and creati-

¹ Перес К. Технологические революции и финансовый капитал: динамика пузырей и периодов процветания : пер. с англ. М. : Дело, 2011. С. 49.

² Кутырев В. А. Отдадим все машинам!.. И себя тоже? // Глобальный мир: системные сдвиги, вызовы и контуры будущего : XVII Междунар. Лихачевские науч. чтения, 18–20 мая 2017 г. СПб. : СПбГУП, 2017.

³ This future may become a significant factor in consolidated global protests in the future. On the one hand, millions of people will get to understand that they were sold a dream which is unrealistic. And they respond with anger and move back to national forms of capitalism, which will tear the world to pieces. On the other hand, after creating "millions of networked people, information-based capitalism has triggered the engine of historic changes: an educated and networked human being" (Paul Mason).

⁴ Глазьев С. Какие инновации обеспечат опережающее развитие российской экономики. URL: <https://izborsk-club.ru/14936>

vity, it is ready to require innovative projects that will guarantee an economic breakthrough. The extreme instability of the system in this situation will lower the significance of impact and increase the role of concentrated and targeted “injection”, which will transfer the system into a new qual-

ity. This injection in our circumstances will need to focus on the human capital of Russia; investing into and protecting the human capital will be not only a major task but also a “rescue mission of the state and all progressive forces in the society”.

R. Matthews¹

RE-THINKING MACROECONOMIC POLICY AND THE COMING OF SINGULARITY: BEYOND THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD

Introduction

Many publications have appeared in recent years, devoted to re-thinking macroeconomics and macroeconomic policy. Their number has accelerated since the Great Recession that depressed much of the global economy and depressed the profession that failed to anticipate it.

There are many strands to rethinking macroeconomics. As the strands are woven together, a differentiated version is emerging, which the paper attempts to summarize. The main theme is about re-thinking current re-thinking, because, at least in this author’s view, rethinking up to now, amounts to patching up a deeply compulsive paradigm: so deep that, with some justice, it can be described as a basin of attraction (an attractor). Two attractors are described in the paper: Attractor 1, as conceived by current rethinking and Attractor 2, conceived as a Singularity. Attractors and Singularity are defined below.

Attractors

Two attractors are distinguished. Attractor 1 concerned with theory. Attractor 2 concerned with events, accelerating change and Singularity.

An attractor is a set of values that a dynamic system tends towards, even though it is occasionally shifted by shocks from one path to another. A variety of themes are involved in rethinking macroeconomic theory and policy. The basin of attraction contains connected sub-sets: The (Post) Washington Consensus, Neo-Conservatism, Neo Liberalism and Modern Capitalism. Their intersection consists of faith: faith in property rights, faith in competition and the market system as organizing principles that converges towards equilibria within the attractor. There are many possible paths because shocks shift the dynamical system from one to another.

Singularity

Singularity is used here to describe the outcome of accelerating growth of ideas, technology and intelligence, that enables the creation of machines that can create generation

upon generation of ideas, technologies and intelligences so powerful that human beings are unable to comprehend them and so powerful that they are beyond human control.

We can only indicate the nature of new theory that will emerge. Maybe, we might surmise, the new theory will correspond to a version of the Uncertainty Principle. Maybe the characteristic mindset required of the new theory of Attractor 2, is truly scientific in the sense in recognizing the necessary search for understanding and explaining reality alongside recognizing the existence of the ineffable.

The second section concerns Attractor 1.

A. Rethinking views the macroeconomy as a complex adaptive system operating far from equilibrium. So current notions based on equilibrium should be abandoned when constructing models on which policies are based.

B. Further, the macroeconomy is an open system, interacting with other open complex subsystems, including technology, politics, religions, nations, the biosphere, cultures and religions. As part of opening the macro economy to other systems, it should extend the disciplines it draws upon.

The third section concerns Attractor 2.

C. Accelerating change in ideas, technologies and events, means that for better or worse staring into the face of Singularity.

Attractor 1

Re-thinking amounts to patching up contemporary economics, with a variety of concepts, perhaps, in themselves, capable of exploding the fundamental themes underlying Attractor 1, into a Singularity. They include complex adaptive systems, emergence, disequilibria, self-ordered criticality, the fractal structure of organizations, percolation and contagion. But it is asserted that there is “a universal convergence,” and a “common core of wisdom embraced by all serious economists” and those who don’t concur are designated “cranks”, a prejudice, hard wired into economic thinking that makes Attractor 1 a prison.

Attractor 1, in spite of hard wiring, is flexible enough to allow considerable diversity among contributors rethinking macroeconomics theory and policy. But their contributions, perhaps only for the moment, are connected subsets of a grand narrative based on acquisitiveness and attachment to property ownership, competition, rivalry, self-interest and the primacy of the market as an automatic control mechanism that is faulty in detail, but the best that is available.

Attractor 1 is made up of connected sub-sets. Contemporary rethinking is diverse, but its diversity is contained, allowing revisions that seem ‘*all of a piece*’; part of a co-

¹ President of the International League of Strategic Management, Assessment and Accounting, Professor Emeritus at the Kingston University (Great Britain). Professor at the Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences. Author of a big number of research papers, including “The Methodology of Strategic Matrix” (co-author), “The Eurozone as a Koan”, “The New Matrix, or the Logic of Strategic Supremacy”, “Organizational Grammar”, “What Russia Should Know about the Great Recession”, “Interdependence: It Is Impossible to Be an Island” and others. Member of the editorial board of the Economic Strategies journal. Honorary Doctor at the Russian Academy of National Economy and Public Administration under the President of the Russian Federation (Moscow).

herent paradigm, *built on sand*, contained within a grand narrative, made up of connected sets: The Post Washington Consensus, Neo-Conservatism, Modern Capitalism and Neo-liberalism. Thinking of the set of ideas within each theme, their intersection consists of dogma: too much faith in property rights, faith in competition and the market system as organizing principles that converges towards equilibria within the attractor.

There are many possible paths because shocks shift the dynamical system from one to another. Occasionally paths within the diverge into outliers. The Bush administration, for example, believing the USA to be the pillar of democracy, sought to impose Neo Liberalism via Regime Change.

The behavioural motivation of private property rights is amended to embrace the management of common property. Decentralized allocation of resources is amended by the need for judicious tweaking by governments, which in a global economy brings problems of co-ordination.

That the deterministic principle of Attractor 1 as containing equilibria is being conceptualized as a balance of probabilities is perhaps the most promising shift of focus, it embraces the Entropy Law. Equilibrium in is cast in as a balance equation; a balance between the probability of inflows into and the probability of outflows from, the macroeconomy...

The macroeconomy as a Complex Adaptive Subsystem

The simplest measure of the complexity of a system is the length of its description, the length (words or number of zeros and ones) of the string necessary to specify the system precisely. An open system is just as it says, open to the other systems it interacts with.

The macroeconomy has long been recognized as a complex adaptive system. But policies are still founded on equilibria. Textbooks expound aggregate supply and demand, where systems deviate from equilibrium due to external shocks, or failures to adjust through wage or price rigidity. Business cycles are portrayed deviations from a long run equilibrium trend which is either self-correcting or modifiable by fiscal and monetary policy. Hence financial crises that the most casual observation shows them to be endemic come as a surprise because they are assumed to be tail events in the behaviour of variables such as asset prices, unemployment and deviations from growth paths that are normally distributed.

Contrary to the irreducibility of complex systems to their parts, macroeconomic systems are modelled upon the building blocks of micro-economic optimising behaviour households and firms. Alternatively, DSGE (Dynamic Stochastic General Equilibrium) models which are the foundation of macroeconomic policy are based on the behaviour of *representative agents* which is rather like analysing systems made up of particles in random motion as if the behaviour (momentum) of individual particles were the same or that we can learn about the macrosystem from their average behaviour.

Critics point out forcibly that adopting such models is in denial of the most casual observation that individuals differ in so many respects; education, skills, mobility, personality and so on. It also underplays the influence of risk, luck and chance in determining peoples' status, wealth and opportu-

nity. Adopting *bad* assumptions that people are behave alike or have characteristics that are alike, that is as if they were homogeneous leads to *bad* policy

From the outside, experts in the subject are distrusted as are experts generally, but economists are distrusted more so. Macroeconomics is a complex sub-system of a bigger complex system state that includes international politics, foreign relations, ecological, technological and a host of other subsystems including global business. All of them are subsystems that are open to one another and even the grandest system which they are part of is also an open system. And projecting into probable future scenarios, the contemporary state hovers at the edge of singularity.

Black Swans Fractals and Criticality

As a complex system, the macroeconomy hovers at the edge of chaos, far from equilibrium, self-organizing to a critical point where change on all scales is possible. It is a scale free system, suggesting it has a fractal structure that enables local effects to contaminate (percolate through) the entire system and through to other systems. It is open to probabilistically abnormally not normally distributed events, described by a fat tailed or Black Swan PDF's. The macroeconomic system is sensitive to the initial conditions of the state of the macroeconomy and other subsystems, so that the path of macroeconomic variables within its customary attractor is unpredictable and capable of jumping from its customary attractor to an inconceivable other second attractor: Attractor 2.

Attractor 2

This section considers the implications Attractor 2; "Accelerating change in ideas, technologies and events, that mean, for better or worse, staring into the face of Singularity". This involves more than patching up frivolous assumptions.

A complex system cannot be reduced to its individual parts. Reductionism is futile. Emergence means the emergence of novelty and consequences that cannot be predicted even probabilistically. More likely, before the event, they cannot even be imagined. Emergence complexity and singularity are connected.

The macroeconomy is self-organizing to the brink of Singularity, Singularity being a new state, where to borrow from the Irish poet William Butler Yeats, who anticipated the idea, "*All [is] changed, changed utterly: And a terrible beauty is born*". Later he anticipates a future, in which, "*Things fall apart, the centre cannot hold; Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world...*" He goes on to ask; "*...And what rough beast, its hour come round at last, Slouches towards Bethlehem to be born?*"

There are many aspects to Singularity. Yeats, captures Singularity in the excerpts from his poems above. He sees it as immanent, incomprehensible change, for the better or the worse, or both, a slouching beast, born of darkness, bringing both redemption and terror of impermanence. Singularity in science is a situation in which a huge mass is contained in an infinitesimally small point where the laws central to physics and mathematics no longer hold. Examples are phase transitions, the state of the universe at the Big Bang and the prospect of the Sixth Great Extinction.

Concluding Remarks

Failure to predict the Great Recession was traumatic. But traumas are a kind of singularity, perhaps opening up new economics. Technological singularity has a millenarian flavour which is more explicit in Yeats poems above. A future is envisaged in which “*technological change is so rapid and its impact so profound, that life will be irreversibly transformed*”.

Equilibrium is probabilistic state, that can be understood in terms of entropy. And low entropy as richness of information and consciousness.

Predicting the nature of Singularity and perhaps even dating it is futile. Speculating on the new Attractor 2, perhaps, if humans abandon the notion that they are the most exquisite pattern detecting beings, other aspects may emerge: unity of being, correspondence between systems, the ineffable as a principle and empathy.

References

1. Andriani P., McKelvey B. From Gaussian to Paretian Thinking: Causes and Implications of Power Laws in Organizations // *Organization Science*. – 2009. – № 20 (6). – P. 1053–1071.
2. Battiston S. et al. Default Cascades: When Does Risk Diversification Increase Stability? // *SSRN : Electronic Journal*. – 2011.

3. Blanchard O. On the future of macroeconomic models // *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*. – 2018. – № 34 (1–2). – P. 43–54.
4. Chalmers D. J. The Singularity // *Science Fiction and Philosophy*. – 2016. – P. 171–224.
5. Chatterjee S., Yilmaz M. R. Chaos, Fractals and Statistics // *Statistical Science*. – 1992. – № 7 (1). – P. 49–68.
6. Haldane A., Turrell A. An Interdisciplinary Model for Macroeconomics // *SSRN : Electronic Journal*. – 2017.
7. Harvey D. Neo-Liberalism as Creative Destruction // *Swedish Society for Anthropology and Geography*. – 2006. – № 88 (2). – P. 145–158.
8. Kurzweil R. The singularity is near: when humans transcend biology. – L. : Duckworth, 2016.
9. Lybeck E. R. The black swan: the impact of the highly improbable. – L. : Taylor and Francis, 2017.
10. Mattson M. P. Superior pattern processing is the essence of the evolved human brain // *Frontiers in Neuroscience*. – 2014. – № 8. – P. 265.
11. Taleb N. The black swan: the impact of the highly improbable. – L. : Allen Lane, 2011.
12. Tononi G. Consciousness as Integrated Information: a Provisional Manifesto // *The Biological Bulletin*. – 2008. – № 215 (3). – P. 216–242.
13. Vines D., Wills S. The rebuilding macroeconomic theory project: an analytical assessment // *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*. – 2018. – № 34 (1–2). – P. 1–42.
14. Wren-Lewis S. Ending the microfoundations hegemony // *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*. – 2018. – № 34 (1–2). P. 55–69.

A. M. Melikhov¹

ACADEMICIAN LIKHACHOV AS A MIRROR OF RUSSIAN PATRIOTISM

Walter Laqueur is an eminent historian and journalist, the author of many books, director of this and that, professor here and there, and his book *Black Hundred: The Rise of the Extreme Right in Russia* (Moscow: Text, 1994) was in its time read greedily and excitedly as advent of Russian Fascism in the near future seemed fairly possible at that time.

It seems to me that the psychological basis of Fascism is yearning for simplicity, unwillingness to acknowledge the tragic nature of social being, in which not a lie but another truth opposes every truth. And as most people are always striving to have a simple and clear answer to questions, in principle not allowing such answers, the danger of Fascism also always stays irremovable. But if we are speaking about physical terror of common people, definitely knowing “how it should be”, we have escaped the material realization of Fascism for the time being, if we don’t listen to hysterical persons, ready to call any constraint of their wishes Fascism. Because of that *Origination of Russian Fascism* (the title of the book in Russian) can be re-read fairly coolly as affairs of comparatively far gone days.

¹ Deputy Chief Editor of the journal “Neva” (Saint Petersburg), writer, publicist, literary critic, Cand. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics). Author of literary-publicistic pieces and prose books including: “Humpbacked Atlantes or the New Don Quixote”, “An Affair with Prostatitis”, “Love the Killer”, “The Whole World for Us is Outland”, “The Plague”, “In the Valley of Blissful”, “Love for Fatherly Coffins”, “The Internationale of Fools”, “The Drifting Idols”, “Cloud Armor”, “Thorny Triangle”, “Immortal Valka”, “Stony Brotherhood”, “There is no Requital for Them”, “A Date with Quasimodo”, “The Days of Yore and Books” and others including 60 mathematical papers. Winner of the Nabokov Prize, the Literature Prize of N. V. Gogol, laureate of the Award of the Government of Saint Petersburg.

So, it was published with the support of the Open Society Foundations (Soros Foundations), New York, the translation of the book was kindly provided by the Problems of Eastern Europe Publishing House (Washington). It’s interesting that there is no word “Fascism” in the original title: *Black Hundred: The Rise of the Extreme Right in Russia*. Fascism and derivatives from it flash in the book all the time: “While working on the book, I didn’t think that Fascist movement would appear on the Russian political scene so soon and with such a support by electors. The Russian edition of the book should be accompanied by a short explanation. There is no need to say that this book is not about Zhirinovsky. I’m speaking about the historical environment and movement of political constellations that made Zhirinovsky possible”.

A quarter of a century later it was found out that even if Zhirinovsky was not the father of Russian democracy, he was in any case one of the main “sinkers” of Russian Fascism: using extremist slogans for buffoonery and shocking behaviour, he made them funny, and caricature kills more reliably than pathos elevating your enemy. Zhirinovsky was the first to discover that a democratic leader was not obliged to lead anywhere – it’s enough for him to shock and entertain. (An accompanying question: wasn’t the horrible Union of Russian People such a semi-decorative organization as the LDPR (Liberal Democratic Party of Russia)? In 1917 and later these savers of the Motherland didn’t show themselves in any way.) But at the moment Zhirinovsky appeared on the scene, W. Laqueur seriously thought what exactly had elevated him. It turned

out that it was “Russian inclination to radicalism and extremism, to boundless, far exceeding the limits of common sense following an idea and an ideal”. So to speak, socialism in other countries led to democracy and social security, and the Russians turned it into a horror. So, how monstrous Russian nationalism will be if it is “explosive power” in case of more moderate people?!

At the same time, Laqueur “understands well the indignation and humility, which many Russians feel at this critical period”: “Here there can’t be considerable disagreements between Russian right-wing and left-wing patriots. There is no moral or historical law prescribing nations or societies to commit suicide”. “Secessionists can be included in the list of democracy’s grave-diggers, those who use the newly acquired freedom not for reconciliation and compromises but for attacks at each other and Russia and who in the twinkling of an eye turned from the suppressed into suppressors”.

At the same time, “Russian nationalists are fairly eloquent when they express their dissatisfaction with capitalism or complain on it, however, they did not offer any alternative – only general trite reflections and discussions of national interests and national solidarity”. Vladimir Solovyev wrote about that: “Our nationalism wishes to destroy Turkey and Austria, divide Germany, annex Constantinople and, if there is an opportunity, even India. If we are asked what we can offer the mankind as a compensation for the destroyed and the annexed, what contribution in the form of cultural or spiritual principles we made to the world history, we have to either keep silent or escape with phrases meaning nothing”.

And “there was a roundtable held in Moscow in 1991, where the reasons of limited attractiveness of patriotic movement were discussed. Yu. D. Rechkalov (I have no idea who he is, but he surely knows his business. – A. M.), who took part in the discussion, supposed that the reason for that is the Orthodoxy of patriots and their biased yearning to look at the Russian history through the spectacles of mythology: only the Russian Orthodox are the true Russians; market and democracy are a priori evil; the last tsar is obligatory mentioned only in sugar-coated tones; the adepts of the movement see Stolypin as a fundamentalist, protector of autocracy, who racked his brains every moment of his life as to how to strengthen his absolute power”.

I have nothing against inspiring daydreams – if they don’t close the ways to development and success. Laqueur names academician Likhachov as nearly the only outstanding figure, whose patriotism does not come down to settlement of accounts with enemies: “Likhachov, for example, said many times that there is a key difference between patriotism, love for one’s country, and nationalism, hatred to other countries”; “conscientious love for one’s nation cannot be combined with hatred to other nations”.

It would be wonderful but only love for one’s nation not only can but is without fail combined with hatred to everything that threatens the object of love. And as all competing nations are a threat to each other in some respect, the inevitable consequence of international competition is international hostility or dislike – only its intensity may vary. As only the highest intensity turns patriotism into nationalism – into a secular religion, idolizing the nation. Because of that nationalists can’t come to an agreement – compromises are impossible when we are speaking about sacred things. Na-

tionalism did not accidentally come to the historical scene together with religion’s weakening – it provided an alternative form of existential protection for humans, protection from feeling ephemeral and defenseless, which anyone with enough imagination can’t fail to feel.

However, Likhachov’s views cannot be evaluated by a couple of may be accidental quotations. Happily, now we have his detailed spiritual biography at our disposal, written by Vladislav Zubok, Professor of the London School of Economics and Political Science, – *Dmitry Likhachov: Life and Century* (St. Petersburg: Vita Nova, 2016).

So, since early childhood Mitya reached out for “everything referring to ‘Holy Russia’”. ...In 1992, Likhachov wrote: “The words ‘Holy Russia’ were often heard in pre-revolutionary Russia. They were pronounced when people went, drove or took a boat on a pilgrimage, and that was done often: they went to bow their heads to an icon, relics, just went to some holy place. They were remembered when people heard bad news from the frontline or news about a poor harvest, natural calamity, they prayed and believed: ‘God will not allow Holy Russia die’. The images of Holy Russia were a spiritual counterweight of the state, these holy symbols eloquently spoke about the other Russia, existing as if outside the troubles, cruelties and despotism that took place every day”.

His parents – his father was a successful engineer – “supported liberal initiatives but on the whole stayed rather conservative. The family roots nourished patriotism – the feeling of belonging to Russian history and love for Russian literature”. The idea of origin of “the all-Russian self-consciousness based on ‘national culture’” was spread at approximately the same time, and “formation of the big” was to start from love to “small motherland”, and St. Petersburg became such a small motherland for young Mitya. He admired magnificent St. Petersburg but at the same time “was choking from pity” to peasants, who came to the city “to do exhausting work”. Only Tolstoy among the Russian geniuses had courage to say aloud: “People are not moaning anywhere, that was thought up by liberals”.

“Mitya’s naïve patriotic views were pitilessly corrected by the life when the Soviets were in power. And still the echoes of that ideology, saturated with sincere compassion and love for ‘common Russian people’, will not die even when Likhachov becomes a part of the Soviet academic elite and a well-known public figure” (even in his declining years he dreamed about the union of some “peasant” and urban intelligentsia). The narodnik movement with its anti-statehood and actually anti-culture could not in any way form a common imperial self-consciousness, capable to provide a more powerful existential protection than nationalist fantasies; Russian nationalists’ striving to identify the imperial with the Russian gave an especially powerful trump card to all national secessionists. Notwithstanding the fact that “St. Petersburg elite of the Silver Age determined its identity in cultural and imperial and not ethnic and national categories”, the empire disintegrated, and only the Bolsheviks managed to restore it with iron and blood, and they at first saw “the Russian dream” as the main rival of their international fairytale. Likhachov’s trip to the Russian North in 1921 generated a dream “to combine St. Petersburg culture of the Silver Age with medieval culture, popular culture, passed over from one generation to the other. Likhachov’s academic

work and his public activities will be tied in future with this idea”.

After the horrors on the Solovetsky Islands and frights of the Leningrad siege, Likhachov worked on his doctoral thesis without taking off his sheepskin jacket from the Solovki, in the non-heated library of the Kazan University, it was titled “National Self-consciousness of Old Russia”: “Likhachov writes about ‘the feeling of love for the Motherland as a live creature’”, – and it seems to me that no other love exists – we’re capable to love only some anthropomorphic image. “O, my Russia! My wife!”...

Though Messianic dreams were alien to him: “In Likhachov’s opinion, the idea of ‘the Third Rome’ was a spiritual dream of some ideologists of the Church, and the Moscow state wanted recognition and a worthy place ‘in a difficult environment of the European civilization’. Russia is a European country: that was Peter’s I and Catherine’s II cultural and political program – Likhachov was always sticking to this point of view”.

At first sight, this point of view is fairly sensible: where else to look for a place for oneself if not in the most powerful and developed not only materially but also scientifically, culturally civilization? And if someone doubts a possibility to divide cultures into more or less developed, the word “developed” can be replaced by “influential”. So, a striving to join the civilization of the strongest and the most influential is more than natural. But is the so-called civilization choice possible unilaterally? One of the most important features of the club of cultures, claiming to be called a unified civilization, is an open or implied agreement on their joint feeling of being the chosen, and if one of the applicants to join them is not perceived by old members as a worthy partner, if that applicant in their opinion does not conform to their idealized image of themselves, they cannot perceive that party as a co-member enjoying equal rights, even if they wanted that for some reasons.

In 1946, when Stalin finally put an end to the international chimera and staked on an even more crazy national one, and started transforming the multinational empire into a mononational state, Likhachov had enough courage to present as an example to the contemporary time the best representatives of Russian nobility of the 19th century in the course of a radio talk, their patriotism “was inseparably connected with romantic individualism and Greek and Roman cultural heritage”.

And in 1962, Likhachov was invited to take part in the discussion on Russian culture, most likely he was recommended by the well-known Russian Orthodox theologian

and Professor of the Harvard University Father Georges Florovsky. Florovsky was tormented by the issue of the reason of the so-called “intellectual silence” of Old Russia. “Why didn’t Old Russian culture generate anything outstanding and original in philosophical ideas, science and secular culture?” Florovsky supposed that the reason for that as well as the reason of state catastrophes was the Russian society’s being charmed by readymade solutions of all its problems, “first of all borrowed from Byzantium and then from the ‘Latin’ West”, i. e. the trouble was the same kowtowing to the West. Billington, a student of Florovsky, thought that the reasons of “intellectual silence” were the hard climate, despotic rule and long distance geographically from the European civilization and later self-isolation from it. And Likhachov thought that there was no “silence”, just the philosophical and social thoughts in Old Russia were expressed in the form of arts and not academic treatises – however, this most likely looked traditional Russian myth-formation in the eyes of Western specialists in Slavic studies.

Well, and what if that was really so? Nations will be always governed not by the academic history but fictional, inspiring history, and if it motivates to creativity and cooperation and not hostility, praise to the crazy that will start evoking this elevating deceit. Likhachov wrote in May, 1992 that “Democracy built on the debris of culture will not do. It’s a pity that the current leaders of Russia do not understand the simple truth: the only chance for Russia to find a worthy place in the world... is our national culture”. “Likhachov said that only cultural heritage and world-level culture could give the Russian Federation a membership in the Western countries club. In the opinion of Dmitry Sergeyevich, Russia without them would have stayed an alien country of occupants and barbarians in Western eyes”.

And it should be said that the only factor that does not allow to include us unconditionally in the club of barbarians managing to master modern weapons, is our geniuses. They are Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, Chekhov, Musorgsky, Tchaikovsky, Shostakovich, Prokofyev, Stravinsky, Mendeleyev, Lyapunov, Kolmogorov, Pontryagin, Landau, Kapitsa, and so on. And we should go on in the same way in future – stake on the most gifted and romantic. The “production of geniuses” national project – the widest network of schools for especially gifted young people – does not require special investments: nothing costs as cheap and is valued as high as national geniuses. However, this project can seriously interest not a liberal democratic party but only a liberal aristocratic party.

G. Mettan¹

AN EMPIRE BUILDING, NOT A PEACEFUL WORLD

Since roughly 20 years, we have entered into an era of post-modernity. Since a few years, we are in an era of post-truth and post-democracy. On the international level, we are supposed to leave the era of post-hegemony in order to enter into a multipolar world. Maybe! That's possible that the scholars who are inventing words to describe our new realities are right. But for me, this is only new words concealing old realities behind a cloud of dust.

And the sad reality of our times, despite all we can say about IT revolution, new industrial transformation, economy 4.0, digitalization and robotizing, the only crude reality is that we are entering in a new merciless competition for the world domination. The planet is limited, its resources are limited, markets for international corporations are limited, climate is changing, underdeveloped peoples as well as more powerful nations aspire to be ruled by themselves. The Western hegemony under the US leadership is under pressure. In that context, the tensions and conflicts between peoples, religions, ethnic groups, social classes can only grow on the long term. Culture and information become more and more instruments of power, they are embedded in the global fight for world dominance.

To understand the current state of the world, the notion of a new Cold War is not the best one. This concept sounds very well to our ears but it is confusing and leads to a misunderstanding. To understand what is happening nowadays, we have not to look in the recent history but in the deep past, in the long history, when the Roman Republic was decaying and transforming itself into a world empire.

In my view, we are indeed in a period of transition between what we could name the "United States imperial Republic" and the "New American Empire". The terms are important because the goals, ambitions and resources of an imperial republic are quite different than the goals of an empire.

The goals of an imperial republic are unlimited, unrestricted. An imperial republic is aimed at a total hegemony over the world. It pretends to impose its moral and political values to the entire humankind which has not the chance to share its generous views. It was the case of the Soviet Union, which wanted to bring its communist values to the rest of the world as it was the case of the United States liberal democracy which wanted also to impose the supposed benefits of its own system to the world suffering under the communist rule. This was the ancient times of the Cold War, which was the confrontation of two imperial republics.

After the self-collapse of Soviet Union, the US liberal republic has known a brief decade of complete hegemony. The neoconservatives and liberal democrats in Washington have briefly thought that they had won the Cold War and imposed the liberal democracy and free market to the entire

rest of the world, as Francis Fukuyama wrote in his book on the end of the History and the triumph of the liberal democracy values.

President Bush the First and Bush the Second, President Clinton the Husband and would-be President Clinton the Wife as well as president Obama were the interpreters of this imperial hegemony will. For them, Russia was a stone in their shoes and they always looked to break it – as suggested by Zbigniew Brzezinski Great Chessboard in 1996. But as it was not successful, they tried to submit it or transform it, by force like today with economic sanctions, but especially by tricky softpower means, into a western liberal democracy and free market economy dominated by United States multinationals and ruled by representatives of a globalist oligarchy.

In that view, the European Union, dominated by good willing Angel Merkel Germany and a new anti-Gaullist, Sarkozist and Hollandist France which wanted urgently to join NATO commandment and play the role of the loyal supporters of US interests against their traditional enemies like Kadhafi's Libya and Assad's Syria, the European Union has been transformed into the proxy relay of the western values, liberal democracy and free market economy in Europe and Ukraine but also in the rest of the world, and in Africa and Middle East especially.

But the election of President Trump has broken this project and well-oiled narrative. That's the reason why Trump is so contested in America and why the US russophobia is so high nowadays. Trump's election has announced a big shift in the American policy and the renunciation of the goals of the imperial republic, i. e. a total hegemony on the world, for a more pragmatic and convenient domination on a limited portion of this world. Trump – as Obama did more soberly before him – has recognized the rising of China and the reemergence of Russia as given facts. He shares the view that present United States must focus itself on its core territory (whose infrastructures and lower social classes are in despair) and its zone of influence, in rough words, Europe, Latin America, Israel and Pacific vassal states like Japan, South Korea or Thailand. That is this point which hurts the neoconservatives like John McCain and the liberal democrats like the Clintons. They cannot accept this renunciation to world hegemony and they have to make the mourning of their dreams. That's the reason why they cannot pardon to Trump, who has broken their Game Boy.

But let me explain what are the characteristics of an empire and what does it mean for Russia. The biggest difference between an imperial republic and an empire is stability. Empires look for stability while imperial republics look for conquests, new territories, adventures, revolutions. Instability is their motto and their reason to live. Imperial republics are always subjected to frustration, their aspiration for power is never finished while empires can admit their own limits if they are not threatened inside their core territory. The democratic confrontation of people, political parties, cultural differences, religious divides inside an imperial republic maintain the pot in a permanent boiling state: the cap can always explode and the conquest of new spa-

¹ President of the United Chamber of Industry and Commerce "Switzerland – Russia and CIS States", Executive Director of the Swiss Press Club (Geneva). Deputy of the Grand Council (Parliament) of the canton of Geneva from the Christian Democratic People's Party of Switzerland. Author of several books on socio-political subjects and international relations, including "Russie-Occident: une guerre de mille ans" (The West vs Russia: a Thousand Year Long War), "A Western View: Russophobia from Charlemagne to the Last Olympic Games in Rio", and others.

ces is a condition of their existence, it doesn't matter what it is: cultural achievements, religious beliefs or physical territories.

If you look the history, the roman conquests have been done by republican generals and oligarchs and not by emperors. The Roman Empire created by Augustus has abandoned the idea to conquer new territories and to submit new peoples in order to keep the existing state of things and was quite happy to administrate it and manage it in the boundaries established by the old Republic.

In that perspective, we can consider Trump as a visionary pioneer of the new emerging American empire. The history of the coming years will tell us if he will be seen as a successful genius like Emperor Augustus, who was able to put an end to the imperial republic and to create a long term empire. Or if he will be a new Julius Caesar, who wanted to create a new monarchy but was finally killed by the last partisans of the decaying Republic.

To ensure stability, empires need to fulfill two basic conditions: prosperity and security. In order to keep the people quiet and in a permanent state of moderate social temperature, empires must be able to provide to its peoples a minimum standard of living and comfort. In Roman times, this capacity was named *panem and circenses*. In other terms, as long as they can provide bread and games, food and entertainment, the empires can survive during centuries: their legitimacy is not in question.

The second condition is security. Within the empire, the citizens – citizens don't exist anymore in an empire because they are not allowed to participate to the governance of the empire but it is very important to keep alive the fiction of democracy as Augustus perfectly did – must enjoy a reasonable level of personal safety. Domestic police must be strong and efficient: pirates, thieves, fraudulent speculators and social troublemakers must be condemned or publicly crucified like Jesus Christ or Spartacus. They also can be given to lions in order to ensure a good spectacle for the joy and the edification of the masses: everybody can applaud and see what he has to expect if he violates the imperial order. Former Presidents Milosevic, Saddam Hussein and Muammar Kadhafi have played this role with a great success on the international arena these last years. They deserve our gratitude because they died with the honors of the fight and gave to western masses a great and entertaining spectacle. President Assad was also requested to play such a big role but he was more resilient or luckier because he was rescued by an unexpected strongman called Vladimir Putin. Let see if King Jong-Un will agree to be the next candidate to be sacrificed in the great circus of the American empire under the unanimous applauds of the western media. As the show must go on, we can be sure that other candidates will be selected one day or another one.

As you I can understand with these examples, in order to keep domestic peace, empires often need to wage wars outside their borders. In order to keep a low degree of violence inside the domestic area, empires have the necessity to expel their violence outside their walls. That's the reason why an empire is never in peace with its neighbors for a long time. It must wage a war at least at each human generation, every 20 or 25 years, but not more. During the imperial republic time, the necessity to wage wars is much higher: if you look the 230 years of American history, you can observe America has waged a war every 3–4 years.

The good news, if we can say, is that the more United States will change into an empire, the less they will be tempted to wage frequent wars. If Trump is successful to manage to transform America into an empire, the risk of wars will be reduced by 3 or 4. But it will not disappear at all. As they are intrinsically authoritarian, empires need strong military forces as they need strong police forces. The bad news is that these wars, if less frequent, will never end as we can see in the NATO commitment in Afghanistan. An empire can only win a war. If it loses the war, the empire would disappear.

In that case, it has only two deadly solutions: be invaded by the winner of the war or being overthrown by a revolution like in Russia in 1917. Empires can only lose battles but not wars. The Roman Empire has lost many and many battles but not a single war until it was fully conquered after seven centuries of existence. Same for the Byzantine Empire, which was able to survive during one thousand years. The genius of Greek emperors consisted to avoid losing wars and, if it happened, to be able to transform this unfortunate defeat into an honorable peace agreement thanks to a skillful propaganda.

Empire also means:

- the domination goals on a more delimited territory with growing vassalization of its members. In fact (but not in words), an empire doesn't recognize allies or friends, but only vassal states. That's what is now in course in Latin America and Europe with the end of South American leftist governments and the full submissiveness of European Union to American policies;

- a slow but regular decay of democracy. We are entering in a phase of post-democracy and the establishment of an oligarchic state with a democracy limited to local level, i. e. municipalities and regional governments;

- an astute management of violence. As an empire is less and less democratic and more and more authoritarian, it has a problem in the management of violence. In order to keep domestic peace inside its borders, it has to expel its own violence outside its borders, in the outskirts of its territories, for instance in the Muslim countries and Arab world. In order to keep its internal stability, it has to manage the instability in the outskirts, actually the Arab world. This special exportation of violence has been theorized by a Muslim thinker Ibn Khaldun who has tried to explain the success and failure of the Muslim caliphs. Ibn Khaldun has showed that the legitimacy of an empire relays on its capacity to bring prosperity and security to its population. For achieving it, it has to encourage internal exchanges of goods and services and to expel insecurity outside. In other terms, an empire needs permanent wars outside of its territory: that's the deep meaning of the actual War on Terror or wars against supposed Rogue States driven by United States;

- an empire, by definition, is not national. A nation could give birth to an empire, that's a fact. But as soon a national republic transformed itself into an empire, it cannot be anymore a nation. An empire is an addition of different nations, religions, cultures and so on. An empire is cosmopolitan by essence, by definition. It could be a melting pot or an open market to migrations, which obliged it to be authoritarian in order to manage xenophobic reactions;

- a new organization of labor with the creation of a new type of serfdom. In the new imperial order, which is deeply oligarchic, the economy tends to become more and

more concentrated into the hands of a small group of entrepreneurs which are becoming richer and richer. That is exactly what happened after colonial wars of the Roman Republic: the distribution of land to the citizens-soldiers and small farms have been replaced by a concentration of land and the appearance of big landowners, called the *latifundia*.

In that sense, equality and middle classes are disappearing in order to be replaced by only two classes: the big owners and oligarchic class at one side and the popular masses reduced into a vulnerable and available working class, or even unemployed class like in the Roman Empire, when the lower classes were supported by public distribution of bread and grains.

This new economic order is also promoting a privatization of the State. Public services and usual state responsibilities are step by step privatized or delegated to private hands as it was the case under the Roman Empire or the French monarchy. Armies are actually privatized through the so-

called professional armies with paid soldiers. The citizen-soldier and mass conscription are disappearing. And soon, in the next decades, the fiscal services will also be privatized under the pretext of a better efficiency of the private sector;

– an empire is more stable and more predictable than a Republic but also more dangerous. For Russia, it means that if Trump is successful, it will bring a temporary respite for her, but only temporary. In the long term, the dangers of a direct war and direct confrontation are bigger with an empire than with a Republic.

In that kind of world, the true culture can only decay. There is no more the room for creativity, independence and breakthroughs. It can only use old patterns or new trivial and socially insignificant novelties. Mass culture is predominant and spectacular but the true culture is limited to small circles of thinkers or artists who keep the lamp lighted but only for limited audiences.

V. V. Mironov¹

MARX AND RUSSIA

Any individual living in Russia cannot ignore the image of Marx and the Marxist theory, and that refers not only to professional research of it by philosophers, economists or lawyers, because it was tried to realize Marxism in one of its guises at the level of real political practice and the mainstream ideology of our country. There is hardly any other social theory honoured with such attention and spreading in thinkers' minds. At the same time, fluctuations in understanding and interpretation of Marxism in our country were probably one of the biggest. Even Marx as a person is either a hero image or an evil trickster for the Russian consciousness.

This can be to a large extent explained by domineering ideocratic consciousness in the Russian society that was very long ago presented by F. Tyutchev's in his high-capacity formula according to which "it's impossible to understand Russia with your mind, you can only believe in it", which sinks into the consciousness of our people already

during the growing-up period at school. The ideocratic consciousness is based on belief in the idea as such, and because of that a perceived philosophical theory here also acquires a fetishist character. It is treated not as a conceptual model but as some God-given system of recipes for restructuring the social order. It's necessary to fall in love with such model nearly sensually. The Marxist theory and Marx as a person experienced that to a great extent.

It's not surprising that the atheist theory of Marxism was a kind of religion for many of its supporters in Russia, it was rejected as a state ideology but it is seen exactly in this guise today by many of its followers. The leaders of the Communist Party of our country regularly emphasize the closeness of the Communist system of values and the Russian Orthodox system of values,² ignoring the principally atheistic contents of both Marxism and Marxism-Leninism as the main theoretical sources of the theory of scientific Communism.

The ideocratic consciousness deforms the real perception of people's behaviour in practice, no matter if in the spheres of politics or economy, which were always evaluated first of all from the ideological positions or were just a projection of this or that ideological pattern. "Bringing Marx's ideas into life" in our country became a kind of a fairly original interpretation of Marxism and "made in the USSR state system corresponded to Marx's model of socialism no more than the society of ancient Mesopotamia. Really, the variant of the described by Marx "Asiatic mode of production" was realized in our country under the banner of socialism".³ Many fundamental Marx's provisions

¹ Dean of the Faculty of Philosophy, Head of the Department of Ontology and Theory of Knowledge of Lomonosov Moscow State University, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Honorary Worker of Higher Professional Education of the Russian Federation. Author of more than 300 scientific publications, including monographs and instructional brochures: "Unity of Diversity. Diversity of Unity", "Philosophy: Introduction to Metaphysics and Ontology" (as co-author), "Philosophy: A Textbook for Universities" (as co-author), "Reflections on the Reform of Russian Education", "Modern Transformations in Culture", "Human Being as Subject and Object of Media Psychology" (as co-author), "Samples of Science in Modern Culture and Philosophy", "Philosophy and Metamorphoses of Culture", "University Lectures on Metaphysics" (as co-author); articles: "Communication Space as Factor in Transformation of Modern Culture and Philosophy", "Contradictory Reforms of Russian Education", "Transformation of Economy, Politics and Law in the Globalized World", "Why Do We Need Philosophy Today?", "On Features of Philosophical Reflection and the Semantic Space of Philosophy" and other works. Chairman of the Grand Doctor of Science Dissertation Council in Philosophy, Lomonosov Moscow State University, in the following majors: "Ontology and Theory of Knowledge", "Philosophy of Science and Technology". Vice-President of the Russian Philosophical Society. Editor-in-Chief of "Moscow University Bulletin. Series 7. Philosophy", member of the editorial board of the following journals: "Issues of Philosophy", "Bulletin of the Russian Philosophical Society", "Philosophical Sciences". Awarded the medal of the Order of Merit Class I and II, winner of the Lomonosov Prize.

² For example, it is said about that in the major policy article by G. Zyuganov "Communism and Orthodoxy". "The sacred duty of Communists and the Russian Orthodox Church is to unite our multi-national people on the basis of common traditional values of kindness, justice, collectivism, mutual help and high spirituality". (See: <http://newsland.com/community/5392/content/sviatoi-dolg-kommunistov-i-russkoi-pravoslavnoi-tserkvi/5772752>)

³ Мамоджян К. Х. Социальная философия. Деятельностный подход к анализу человека, общества, истории. М.: Изд-во Моск. ун-та 2013. Ч. 1. С. 22.

as if used by their adepts, were in practice realized the other way round: social being according to Marx was to determine social consciousness but it turned out to be the realization of ideas themselves and society building according to some ideological pattern, in which "Marx's basis and superstructure change places in a sense – it's not the power that is the function of ownership, but on the contrary, ownership is the function of power. The consequence of such arrangement is a hypertrophic statehood, identical to the lack of a civil society".¹ This always stayed the ground for stating the special messianic role of Russia, for which it was possible to sacrifice the present, for the happy future, and that served the basis of the official ideology. Such ideocratic consciousness is convenient for politicians as manipulating means.

The ideocratic society in the sense of the state structure always strives for politarism, when state structures bring to heel the civil society. And it's fairly natural that the interpretation of power proceeding from it is the power that is necessarily tied with the leader as its personification.²

It's surprising that the image of Marx got into Russia as a hero image, when Marx's attitude to our country was, to say the least, controversial and even, more likely, negative. This was hardly the product of primitive Russophobia (as it is sometimes thought) but the manifestation of the social and class approach, following which allowed to come to conclusions about the reactionary monarchical system in the Russian Empire in the middle of the 19th century. And these conclusions often acquired a personal character affecting the Russians, who crossed with Marx in this or that way.

Marx writes in one of his letters to Kugelmann: "This is the irony of fate: the Russians with whom I incessantly fought for 25 years in my speeches not only in German but also in French and in English, have always been my 'benefactors'..."³ At the same time, Marx was the secretary of the Russian section of the International, he learnt the Russian language, quoted Pushkin, there were very many various representatives of Russian intelligentsia among people with whom Marx dialogued. In the last years of his life Marx especially and very carefully worked at the problem of a possibility of movement to socialism for not the most advanced economically countries, Russia in particular.

The list of people, to whom Marx was not indifferent, included great and well-known people, including in Europe. For example, Marx was acquainted with M. A. Bakunin since 1844. Here is how Bakunin remembers that: "However, we were never fully frank with each other. Our temperaments did not stand each other. He called me a sentimental idealist, and he was right; I called him a perfidious and secretive vain main; and I was also right".⁴ Relations of Marx and Gertsen were no less important; Marx also appraised him negatively and critically in many cases, calling "a Socialist in words only". We have to give him his

due: Gertsen did not leave the favour unanswered either, calling Marx followers "Marxides",⁵ in which a Russian word meaning "nits", which is a swear-word in Russian, is recognized. At the same time, Marx sympathized with many Russian revolutionary democrats (let's name Lavrov, Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov, Zasulich). Lopatin was honoured with the biggest sympathy, Marx writes about him: "He is the only "imposing" Russian among all those I have met till now, and I'll soon knock out national prejudices from him".⁶

Relation to Marx in Russia was also somewhat original. The authorities of the Imperial Russia entered Marx's name in the list of those who were to be immediately arrested if they came to Russia, starting from 1844. Starting from the same time, the authorities regularly ordered to fight against Communist ideas in every possible way. At the same time, some theoretical works by Marx and, first of all *Capital*, were allowed by censors (most likely because of their ignorance) and were legally published. *The Poverty of Philosophy* was published in Russia in 1848 and the translated *Capital* was published in 1873. And announcements about publication of translations were placed in governmental newspapers.

Thus, we see that Marxism and its founder were often perceived in Russia via fascination brought up to "falling in love", which is on the whole very typical for Russian intelligentsia. However, exactly that is the source of nearly sensual disappointment. The rather simplified and originally interpreted version of Marxism was turned into an inviolable canon in the Soviet period and became not only the thrust upon from the top attribute of any social scientific research or a textbook but also the basis for official ideology.

The ideology, brought to the level of universal, requires its own symbols and rituals, acting in essence as mythology coupled with artful colouring of the symbols it pronounces. In case of most people it requires not knowledge but belief in it. Marx was turned into one of the main symbols of the said ideology, which was elaborated depending on the time and section of the public consciousness.

It's possible to give a lot of variants of such mythological constructions but it's enough to remember the myth about two Marxes. On the one hand, *official Marx*, whose ideas were widely promoted and taught at schools and higher educational establishments. On the other hand, *unread and unknown Marx*, who did not fit in the Marxist-Leninist ideology. The philosophy of that period is recognized to be relatively "immature", overfilled with humanistic and existential motives. The myth separating two Marxes was very popular in the circles of teachers and students. Knowledge of "the second Marx" became a kind of sign of intellectual freedom; *this Marx was loved in the circles of humanitarian intelligentsia*.

These sentiments with positive attitude to Marx were keenly felt by Yu. V. Andropov in his time, when he became the General Secretary in the environment when there was some danger to lose control over the ideology, to be more exact the part of intelligentsia that was to support it theoretically. The main conceptual thesis in the popular then policy essay in the *Communist* magazine was the appeal to

¹ Момджян К. Х. Антропологический аспект российской самобытности // Этнос, нация, ценности: Социально-философские исследования / науч. ред. К. Х. Момджян, А. Ю. Антоновский. М.: Канон+, 2015. С. 145–146.

² Момджян К. Х. Введение в социальную философию. М.: Высш. шк.: КД "Университет", 1997. С. 27.

³ Маркс – Людвигу Кугельману, 12 октября 1868 года // Маркс К., Энгельс Ф. Соч. 2-е изд. М., 1964. Т. 32. С. 472.

⁴ Муриков Г. Парадоксы Бакунина (К 200-летию М. А. Бакунина). URL: <http://www.topos.ru/article/ontologicheskie-progulki/paradoksy-bakunina-k-200-letiyu-ma-bakunina-0>

⁵ See: Герцен А. И. Былое и думы: в 3 т. М.; Л.: Гос. изд-во худ. лит., 1931. Т. 2. С. 399.

⁶ Маркс – Энгельсу, 3 августа 1870 года // Маркс К., Энгельс Ф. Соч. 2-е изд. М., 1964. Т. 33. С. 24.

“return” to the true scientific social theory. It was acknowledged that the theoretical basis of the preceding ideology did not fully correspond to “the true Marx”. And it was hinted at the same time that fairly intelligent people had come to power, and they know the true Marx. Marxism later becomes the ideological basis for launching reforms in the initial period of the Perestroika (restructuring), when they started speaking about socialism with a human face.

It became clear *from the beginning of the 1990s* that building the society “with a human face” was delayed and the life of people was worsening more and more. It was required to find a person of authority, who could be blamed for all sins and misfortunes. There was just no more convenient figure than Marx, and yesterday’s Prometheus becomes ideological Frankenstein. There is a switch from love to hatred. The contents of educational courses at universities and even schools change, departments are closed, teachers are retrained. One of the most amazing phenomena of the early 1990s is nearly momentarily (taking place over several years and sometimes months) transformation of adepts of Marxist philosophy, political economy, etc. into scholars and teachers developing ideas, which are rather far from Marxism, and in some cases also actively rejecting Marxism. And what is more, the thesis of Marx’s and Marxism’s responsibility for all failures of Russian economy and problems in social life becomes nearly universal.

Today we are having another round of “returning to Marx”.

First, it turned out that Marx suits exactly to characterize the capitalism realized in Russia as he was right in a lot of things. Russia as if brought back the image of early capitalism to the international arena, with all its flaws, exposed by Marx. Its characteristics are growth of material inequality, which in the environment of specific Russian oligarchic capitalism reached fantastic sizes.

Second, the Marx’s theory actualized in the West as well, as after the collapse of socialism there was a kind of peculiar return to the patterns of classical capitalism, no matter that it is now tied with the latest technologies, about which Marx had no idea.

Third, failures of neoliberal economic policy became the basis for revival of interest to Marxism. “Radical democracy” of the European type does not work properly in Russia. People are tired of social experiments according to the “Chicago boys” models, i. e. the real contradictions of socioeconomic life started creating prerequisites for revival of creatively reconsidered Marxism.

When objectively appraising the Marx’s theory, it’s necessary to remember that it is not only an economic and

social concept, but also a philosophical one. It means that it can’t be judged by the standards of only certain scientific theories, the semantic space of which is set forth by the subject frames. A philosophical concept includes not only components of rational understanding of the world but it is also associated with value judgments about it. Here the notion of truth is not domineering and the philosophical approach itself is in essence reflection over the ultimate grounds of being, including social being. And the Marx’s theory in this respect is one of the deepest reflections relating to the society, humans, culture as a whole. At the same time, it is the product of its era, i. e. it fixed self-consciousness in itself at a certain stage of culture’s development.

The Marx’s concept as a certain scientific theory is a priori idealized model, i. e. gnosiological interpretation of being, the world, real relations. It has a giant number of true conclusions. But as the Newton’s theory did not use the notion of spatial-temporal continuum or a possibility of the ultimate characteristic of the speed of light, the classical Marxist theory has a number of limitations and works within the framework of certain gnosiological prerequisites. But if it does not come to our mind to accuse the Newton’s theory of being false because something is differently explained in the Einstein’s theory, this becomes common in case of the Marx’s theoretical model. This is the fate of all social theories as their conclusions in case of practical realization refer to the society and certain people.

Marxism goes on developing as a social theory. It answers scientific criteria in a lot of aspects but as any theory it requires corrections and supplements, it has its merits and flaws, it contains false statements together with true, historically verified statements. The Marx’s concept gradually becomes a part of the general integral social theory, being a relatively united thematic space, and scientific hypotheses by E. Durkheim, M. Weber, P. Sorokin, T. Parsons, etc. can serve the borders of it, interacting and supplementing each other.

It is possible to single out a number of Marx’s ideas, which can get impulses for their development today. First of all, this is the complex of philosophical and anthropological ideas related to understanding humans as creatures transforming the world. The idea of the future integrated mankind outlined by Marx, and this is the idea deduced from the course of the society’s development and the necessity for it to behave as a united mankind for its self-preservation. Marx’s ideas about the special value of an individual, whose interests can be higher than other, including class interests, are worth looking at.

M. A. Moratinos Cuyaube¹

GLOBAL WORLD: SYSTEMIC CHANGES, CHALLENGES AND PROFILES OF THE FUTURE

Turns of the century are always times of deep complexity and turmoil. Leaving the past behind, having to face an uncertain future and *building* something new always triggers some spine-tingling and anguished feeling towards the unknown.

In those times of transition, we imagine the future and break away from old habits and practices to adapt our thinking and action to a new way of life.² Those are always difficult times. In this context, the Chinese proverb according to which *every crisis is an opportunity* comes out as the first challenge to be faced. If *crisis is opportunity, long live the crisis!*, provided that the new opportunities unveiled by these critical times are identified and expanded.

The answer to the question of where the world is heading for is not a simple one, given that we are living in a global, uncertain and complex world. History has already told its end and is following course. It leads us to a change of era that many call a new paradigm, that will undoubtedly bring forward new values and ways of living, understanding and organising the world. The decadence of 20th century traditional systems and the emergence of new realities and world challenges not only call for a global governance, but for a deep review of our political, ideological, social and economic approaches, as well as for the recognition of a new political subject-object that claims for freedom and equality in a participatory manner and advocates for a sustainable planet.

Currently, the lack of new ideas and the persistence of the obsolete ones,³ together with the lack of leadership, are distorting the emergence of a new era which, as history tells us, should bring ideas, lines of thought and political action. Liberalism and social democracy are at crisis, while inequality is advancing unopposed and triggers asymmetrical systems that wear democracies and liberties away and impose veiled interests and suffering to the citizens of many States, some of them failed ones.

Tensions between power concentration and fragmentation, along with the nation-state crisis and the international institutional system necessary reform, trigger the discontent in globalisation,⁴ which has surged and expanded through the social networks that give rise to climates of opinion and social mobilisations. The emergence of the so-called populist movements is a consequence of this situation. The Great Recession has increased tensions between the new and the old, between the world that is emerging and the world

to which we bid farewell, sweeping away millions of jobs and the incorporation of millions of citizens to the middle classes, a fact that points to a renewal of the class struggle. The divorce not yet solved between the financial economy and the real economy and the increase of inequalities and mistrust put in the open the tensions marking the transition to a new era, termed by many authors as a systemic crisis or value crisis. The geopolitics of coming years⁵ and the construction of a new era will depend on the interactions among these fields.

The World in the Face of Changes

The history of the world's evolution tells us how major scientific discoveries have radically changed the evolution of humanity. *Science* has always been at the root of the main historical changes, especially when it has left the laboratories and become applied. The acceleration of changes is even larger and more evident in the societies in which it grows and evolves. In this sense, as indicated by H. Morgenthau, "belief in science has been one of the main expressions of this way of thinking in the 19th and 20th centuries. This belief in science is one of the intellectual features that distinguish our age from previous periods. In spite of the differences existing in philosophical, economic and political thought, a certain unity can be observed around the idea that science is able, at least potentially, to solve all human problems..."⁶

The debate between science and philosophy is not new, but in our times, the former, supported by the accelerated emergence of a whole new series of technological advances, has managed to give pre-eminence to the scientific and technical advances that seek to replace the human being's role, that would be confined in its action to a mere observer-consumer of a reality controlled and directed by a few.

The sense of a deep acceleration of life and events, as well as interdependence and *reductionism* of the space in which the citizen's existence takes place, lead us to feel that today everything is lived faster and in a more variable and reduced space. Nothing happening thousands of kilometres away is alien to us. Any incident, however small or far away from our environment, will affect us sooner or later.

The new industrial revolution announced by Jeremy Rifkin, the third one, unfolds through new sources of energy and new means of communication, which have changed and will change the way of organising this century's economic, social and political ecosystem. And all those changes occur in a world in which demographic pressure continues, since the most significant element of population growth is its pace and intensity. We all know that, as pointed out by Jeffrey Sachs in his book *The age of sustainable development*,⁷ just as the per capita income, world popula-

¹ Diplomat, lawyer and politician, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Spain (2004–2010), Dr. Author of a number of publications, including: "Crisis in the Middle East", "The World in the Era of Sustainable Development", "Contemporary Global Challenges and National Interests", and others. He was awarded with the orders of the Serbian flag of the 1st degree (Serbia), of the Cross of Terra Mariana of the 1st class (Estonia), Royal order of Charles III (Spain). Grand Officer of the order of the Three Stars (Latvia), Knight of the Royal Order of Isabella the Catholic, Knight of the Order of Civil Merit etc. Honorary Doctor of the universities of Granada, Malta, Ben-Gurion and Al-Quds. Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS.

² Hernández E. El fin de la clase media. Madrid : Clave Intelectual, 2014. P. 38. We must be aware that the struggle between the old and the new takes place, first and foremost, inside ourselves.

³ Paul Krugman calls them zombie ideas.

⁴ Stiglitz E. J. El malestar en la globalización. [Globalization and its Discontents]. Madrid : Taurus, 2002.

⁵ Sapiro R. J. 2020: Un nuevo paradigma. Cómo los retos del futuro cambiarán nuestra forma de vivir y trabajar. Barcelona : Ediciones Urano, 2009. Tendencias. P. 15. These changes and their combinations and interactions will have profound effects on the course to be followed by the main societies and their people's daily life, and no nation or person will be able to avoid their consequences.

⁶ Morgenthau H. J. Essay on international politics.

⁷ Columbia University Press, New York.

tion changed very little through History, remaining around 1,000 million people over the last centuries until the beginning of the industrial revolution. Similarly to economy, population undergone an exponential growth, which has not yet come to an end, thus going from 1,000 million inhabitants in 1820 to over 7,000 million nowadays. The most significant fact is that the last 1,000 million inhabitants were added to the 6,000 million of 1999 within 12 years. All forecasts say that we will reach the figure of 8,000 millions around 2025 and surpass 9,000 millions as from 2040. These figures are telling and illustrative enough to consider that demographic pressure is one of the key variables to be considered concerning the limits of natural resources, what Sachs calls planetary boundaries.

Planet sustainability will not so much depend on whether the world population rate reaches 9,000 million people, since it might well reach 10,000 million, but on the fact that a demographic expansion stabilisation occurs around mid-century.

Science in the Face of the New Century

I believe History is marching towards higher and better levels of progress and well-being, and that these are mainly achieved thanks to new scientific discoveries. In this sense, last century brought us some inventions which actually altered behaviour and social action. Just as in the past, transportation and communication were essential in the generation of changes. It is increasingly evident that a new world is opening up in space. Jacques Attali, in the book he wrote along with Shimon Peres, considers that *space seems to me one of the fields in which world governance can still progress.*¹ With over 2,500 artificial satellites navigating around the Earth and plans to orbit 1,100 before 2020, space can become a means of protection for the Earth or offer new boundaries to overcome our limits and obtain mineral resources, habitats or energy sources. Thus, the conquest of space could well be the next stage of humankind's control or domination. Attali considers that space could be the new boundary for humankind.

Time, movement, travel have ceased to have their own meaning and we all can experience them naturally.

Along with that, the aeronautic revolution itself makes us break the distance barriers, and through airplanes or high-speed trains, places or spaces come extraordinarily closer to us.

Together with communication and transportation, medicine and biology are other fields in which progress made has been extraordinary. Penicillin and its antibiotic capacities discovered by Alexander Fleming in 1928 entailed the development of medicines and a drastic mortality rate reduction. The 18th of August 1960 was also a memorable date, since the birth-control pill was launched. Its effect on society still persists and, for the first time in history, women could plan their maternity, which allowed their massive incorporation to higher education and the labour market, thus becoming masters of their sexuality and radically changing their role in society.² Today, research on cancer and HIV offers a hope of a future solution for these diseases, to be reached without a doubt in coming decades.

Along with medicine, progress in biology, the knowledge of genetics and the discovery of the DNA structure

are milestones. We are only at the beginning of many works linked to these disciplines, and we now know our genetic code just as that of many other living beings, plants and foodstuffs. This progress allows us to protect our health and have knowledge of the structure of organisms. Therefore, it has not only been achieved to extend human beings' longevity, but also to regard our own existence differently as to the others.

Former President of Israel, Shimon Peres, considered that the 21st century is *the century of the brain*, since until now our relationship to it had projected outwardly. Plato's allegory of the Cave and its preconceived images fed our thinking and our action for centuries, while, until very recently, the brain was an unknown and hazardous realm. Apart from some attempts by Renaissance medicine to perform trepanations, neurophysiologists only agreed in ascertaining their own limitations when it came to knowing and exploring the complexity of that soft and viscous mass. However, today, thanks to the new three-dimensional radiology techniques, functions and reactions are beginning to be discovered which will alter people's habits and practices. We will become more individual, more introverted, we will increasingly look inwards and the surrounding reality will be, as Ortega y Gasset would say, our *circumstance*.

All of this confirms, as Shimon Peres said, that *the brain is the most amazing organ in the whole universe and that research on it deserves that no effort be spared*. It has the key for a better control of ourselves and even has many answers to the universal challenges that have escaped human understanding until now. The research of the Brain Research Through Advancing Innovative Neurotechnologies has been aimed at mapping the brain's activity before year 2023. With its 85,000 to 100,000 million neurons, the brain is still not well known.

Technological changes and advancements are interrelated and allow for progress that was unconceivable only a decade ago. Our whole existence and reality are modified by nanotechnology, biotechnology, synthetic biology, 3D printers, the Internet of things, robotics and artificial intelligence.

Along with these advancements, we must not leave out synthetic biology, with its twofold positive and negative impact potential in humanity's development. With his great tenacity, Craig Venter represents confidence in the possibility to unravel human genome and create the first synthetic organism. This *digital life* can reproduce an organism's DNA or alter its shape. Biobricks could be created to give rise to new forms of life. Synbio, this new research field, could have a massive impact in the world, with unimaginable consequences.

Along with the field of transportation, health and education, the invention that has recently transfigured human behaviour the most is linked to information and communication. The move from landline telephone to mobile telephone and from the library-archive to the Internet have been the major technological revolutions that have changed the global citizenship's way of life and perception.

The speed of these changes, since Google was created only 20 years ago, makes it even harder to assess the practical and psychological consequences of these media made available to citizens. It is not only the ability to communicate from anywhere in the planet, neither the fact that information travels instantly and everything is known at once,

¹ Avec nous, après nous. Editions Bakerstreet Fayard.

² Redacción última 18 agosto 2014.

but the fact that knowledge accumulated, and collective memory can be immediately and automatically retrieved without any intellectual or physical effort. The whole knowledge of humanity is filed and made available to any citizen without charge. It is the world of big data.

We all have access to huge amounts of information and data without having to be experts or specialists; everything is in full view of everyone and *privacy* is a snobbery of the past. New generations do not have the same issues concerning *intimacy*, they even enjoy showing it to others (Facebook, Twitter, etc.). These changes are those which affect our societies' individual and collective behaviour the most. Along with the enormous advantages offered by technology, the risks and hazards deriving from a lack of national and international regulation of protocols and procedures must be considered.

However, the digital world has not managed either to overcome inequality between societies, and the *digital divide* is significantly widening. Paradoxically, information technologies should assist in breaking many of the oligarchy's differences and advantages, but it has not been the case until now. The gap between the rich and the poor can also be observed in the digital world. There has always been a delay in access to new technologies by our societies' most underprivileged and their peripheries. Inequality is also a constant in digital society. However, there are some glimpses of hope, such as the widespread use of mobile telephones in African countries extending to all economic and social activities. In particular, it has contributed to the *mobile banking* revolution, which, as in Kenya, means a breakthrough in financial transactions.

The *network society* brings other challenges, as evidenced by the US *cyber-spying* crisis and the revelations that Google, Facebook, Yahoo, Microsoft, Apple allowed the FBI and the NSA access to their users' details, thanks to the sophisticated system *Prism*. This awkward situation for the American administration has evidenced the impunity existing.

Eric Sadin denounces that these practices endanger private life and points out that *the cyber-spying that is being implemented anytime, anywhere and under different forms, and sometimes promoted by our own consent, is allowing the "trivialisation of contemporaneous vigilance"*, that is, making real George Orwell's omen concerning *big brother* made in his book 1984.

Recent discoveries have undoubtedly deepened this anthropologic rupture, particularly the most relevant ones linked to physics. In this discipline, progress has been very considerable, from the *big bang* theory to progress in CERN laboratories concerning the speed of light and the *Higgs boson*, although the discovery by the American Nobel Prize winner Murray Gell-Mann concerning the *elemental particles* theories and *quarks* is worth a special mention. Beyond the smallest there can still be something even more reduced. *Quarks* are the particles hadrons are made of. Thus, quarks and antiquarks and gluons were set forth as the elemental subterranean objects of hadrons' structures. The most significant part of this description is not the discovery of the simplest, the smallest, but the interactions of the particles among them, which led to the development of the *complexity* theory. In *The quark and the jaguar. Adventures in the simple and the complex*, this theory is explained in an educational manner. For Gell-Mann, the world

of *quarks* has a lot to do with jaguar's circular movement during the night.

This is the great paradox of the 21st century: the *complexity* of reality, which paralyses us in the face of the abyss of the almost infinite network of information and knowledge, and hinders the simplification of realities and facts necessary to implement measures accurately and efficiently in their various dimensions. This is without a doubt a major challenge which society is facing in this start of the century. Thus, Edgar Morin sets *complexity* and *uncertainty* as the essential elements of prospective politics, although these psychological barriers do not prevent him from glimpsing a better future. Political action can change the destination of the improbable and, through on-going efforts, though some may prove unrewarding, create a better world.¹

Scientific changes and their impact on societies are at the core of the new behaviours and aspirations of the citizens of our world. The sooner we shape the sense of our form of sociability, the quicker we will be able to organise politically, both nationally and internationally.

The New World Governance

It is difficult to reflect on the realities affecting the international community without mentioning the processes of the so-called globalisation. Nobody questions that the term *globalisation* is one of the concepts that are repeated the most currently. Most of the definitions and the most delicate issues go along with the adjective *global* and, logically, the term cannot be left out when dealing with "world governance".

Globalisation is thus a fact, and it is necessary to highlight, as Guillermo de la Dehesa does, that "it is not a never-ending source of advantages for humanity as some preach, neither is it responsible for all perverse effects existing, as others say"; thus, it can be stated that neither *globalophilia* nor *globalophobia* are wholly justified.

Opposing globalisation is nonsense. It is here and will not go away. But there has been a significant critical debate, particularly in the wake of the recent economic and financial crisis, concerning a dehumanised globalisation. Globalisation has been accused of being the cause for the rise of populist movements. There are mainly protectionist reactions and rejection of free commerce, since the case for a regulated globalisation has not seen the light yet. Interdependence is a fact, connection and dependence among the various world areas are not questioned, and nobody will be able to gate-keep a world with no fences. The new formulas will not give fruit, whether they are real or fake, and will not prevent the expansion of trade, knowledge or information. The exchange of people, products or capital, or ideas cannot be stopped.

No matter how hard the different regimes try to protect their markets or identities, the current world and technology will end up subduing them.

Therefore, it is necessary to regulate globalisation as soon as possible.

Although the so-called economic globalisation does not seem to need a specific regulation, the outcomes and consequences of this unbridled globalisation have triggered an almost widespread rejection to it in most of the countries, including the most advanced ones.

¹ Où va le monde.

We should clarify the place occupied by globalisation processes in foreign policy governance. Long gone are the days in which *liberals* stated, just as Charles A. Beard said, that *foreign policy is a phase of domestic politics – an inescapable phase, and it is the latter that determinates the former. The foreign policy of a nation is a function of its internal policy, and war and peace depend on it. Thus, internal positions were simply transferred to the international scene. Democracy is peace, autocracy is war...*¹ *To-day everything has changed. It is international-scale movements that affect and alter national practices. Globalisation has invaded the political space and the major issues affecting the future of human safety have global dimensions: planet warming, energy crisis, food production, the struggle against climate change, international terrorism, emigration, natural catastrophes, pandemics... They not only make up the national policy agenda, but force nation-states to include these issues in their policies, while, until now, they had been relegated in the international policy agenda and only required attention from some international scientific meeting once in a while.*

If, as upheld by E. H. Carr, the League of Nations was an attempt to apply the principles of Lockean liberalism to the building of a machinery of international order, we are today faced with a new challenge, which is the global solidarity-oriented thought that demands and claims for the creation of a new international governance. It is no longer nation-states that solve major issues and protect international public goods belonging to all humanity, but other kinds of entities and bodies able to respond to these challenges. Therefore, any 21st century political stance must take into consideration all these new realities of the international agenda in order to respond as adequately as possible to the aspirations of each of the States and the citizenship.

The inadequacy of current organisation structures to deal with changes and challenges seems clear. Therefore, one of the main priorities should be carrying out radically and urgently a deep reform of international institutions. In this sense, it would be advisable that the United Nations should be in the spotlight.

New Gravitational Centres

What is most relevant in this turn of century is the deep transformation undergone by the system. The balance of forces has significantly changed and we are now faced with a world wholly different to that of the 20th century.

This century's first decade has witnessed the emergence and asymmetry of new international policy gravitational centres. The world is no longer ruled from Washington, Moscow, Paris or London. There is no longer one only centre of power, but a series of influence zones that show the multiplicity of actors and agents with relevance in the international community. Long gone are the bipolarity decades when the two superpowers split up the world. Long gone also are the days when the *American hyperpower* believed the end of history had come and its military, political, ideological, cultural and economic supremacy would extend to the whole world. The fall of New York's *World Trade Center* twin towers sufficed for the whole *American hegemony* architecture to collapse and for trust in the power of the empire to be questioned. We then started a new

phase in which the most noteworthy element is that no one knows who rules the world. It is no longer the United States of America. Neither is it China, for the time being. International organisations are decaying due to lack of credibility, and economic and financial actors, although they may seem ahead of political decisions, do not have the ability to guarantee their future. In fact all have a little influence, but no one rules alone. Co-responsibility in decision-taking is what makes the international reality even more complex.

Eurocentrism, and even Western influence in world governance, has lost weight and geopolitics have transferred from Europe and the United States to Asia and the Pacific, although Latin-American and African states demand a new place in the international order, where China has a prominent position.

China's emergence is one of the most remarkable events in the start of the 21st century. Although we lack the historical perspective to assess it, the huge transformation undergone by the Asian giant cannot be questioned. Such changes are still ongoing today, with an uncertain direction, and will undoubtedly be decisive both for the country's evolution and for Asia's and the world's future.

Asia has become – or is becoming again – the centre of economic movements and world geopolitics. Asia and the Pacific-Indian are the most important scenarios of world economy and international relationships at a global level. The irruption of China as a relevant power is being perceived in Asia and its surroundings. There is no shortage of potential conflicts in the region, and it will be necessary to carefully observe Beijing's Asian policy to gauge the trend of its global strategy.

This impressive economic evolution has entailed major social and cultural transformations. Currently in China there is an increasingly large and buoyant middle class, that shows off its purchasing power all over the world. This, together with the single-child phenomenon, who is pampered and who parents wish to reach success in their personal development, help understanding the deep sociological and economic changes involved by this policy. All *single children* will want to be the best in their fields, and their level of aggressiveness in the social scale will be greater than the current one existing in our Western societies.

In this context of economic progress, social development and relative attraction of the so-called *Chinese model*, the country burst into the regional and world scene, but it did so smoothly and harmoniously, so as to avoid offending sensibilities among its neighbours. Those were China's *golden years* in Asia, where it had become an economic power, but, far from encountering suspicion, its attitude surprised and instilled admiration.

Undoubtedly, the successive ups-and-downs of the Beijing exchange reflect the logical impact of the *financial markets'* pressure on the Chinese economy, unable to escape from economic and financial interdependence, just as any other country in the world. However, this *warning signal* of the Chinese economic system fragilities must not lead to hurried or misguided conclusions on the Asian giant's future potential. In this sense, and in spite of the logical contradictions that will arise in the future in a society immersed in a dynamic of change and progress such as the Chinese one, the advances and potentialities that the Chinese model brings to the international community cannot be ignored.

¹ Morgenthau.

Latin America has also come up with models and solutions to bypass the *Great Recession*, with varying degrees of success. The Latin-American area has managed to maintain stable growth around 5% per year, but most significantly, it has started to modernise its economy. There has been some slowdown in Latin-American economies owing to multiple factors, but the area's economic potential remains unquestioned. The economies of South America, Central America and the Caribbean must adapt to sustainability policies, particularly Brazil, and review their productive model, excessively linked to the raw-material extractive potential and the *Amazonia El Dorado*. The new relationship between Cuba and the United States also deserves a special mention as a factor of invigoration and economic impulse for the region.

We have the competitive advantage of knowing and respecting our Latin-American partners, and together we could build an economic area of innovative cooperation. There is a shortage of coordinated R&D&I institutions and facilities with central offices in both sides of the Atlantic. An Atlantic-South alliance, similar to that of the Pacific countries, would be the way to implement integral cooperation between our countries.

When speaking about Africa, it is appropriate to recall Federico Mayor Zaragoza's sentence, according to which *the African continent is not a poor continent, but an impoverished one*, and that *Africa is not an old continent, but a young one, dynamic, full of vitality and future promises*. Whether we speak about the future, raw materials, energy, migration movements, terrorist threats or health epidemics, the African continent has many of the keys that will open or close doors in coming decades.

A new relationship to Africa is inescapable. The time of Africa will come, as expressed by thinker Achilles Mbembe,¹ who defends the need to share a common world and set forth a different political partnership. This approach was analysed in *La Verticale (IPEMED): Africa-Mediterranean-Europe*, and could give sense to this strategic relationship.

New pages of the globalisation could be written after decades of despair in the continent, fostering Africa's take-off. Winds of optimism are blowing, in spite of obstacles and traumatic realities, and despite the fact that the continent is still unable to feed all its citizens, having unacceptable poverty indexes. However, and in spite of it all, Africa's awakening can be glimpsed, legitimately claiming for a place in the new international order. In spite of dramatic scenarios, the continent has experienced an economic growth over 6% as from 2013. This growth rate is being maintained and the commercial boom is increasing. Educated and entrepreneurial middle classes sum up almost 150 million people, and this number will duplicate within a generation. The takeoff can also be seen in health and education indexes. Also, banking services are rapidly expanding and include new tools such as mobile banking. There are positive signs that invite to hope.

The leading roles of Latin America and Africa enhance the trend of emergence of new gravitational centres. Along with them, another influence centre around the East cannot be ignored. It is therefore not surprising that international conferences, political and diplomatic meetings are no longer held in European or American capital cities but

rather in Doha, Dubai, Shanghai, Rio de Janeiro or Pretoria. Gulf countries have become a geopolitical centre between the East and the West, and their air transport networks and financial services attract millions of people, emulating the conferences held in Paris, London, Washington or Berlin in the 19th and 20th centuries. However, the ongoing crisis in the Gulf Cooperation Council concerning Qatar's confrontation with the Council's other members will delay the significant role that could be played by this world area. What is at stake is a model for the Arab family's political development, and the path chosen seems not to be backed neither by the leaders themselves nor by the citizens. The Near East will keep on seeking to draw its future within a geopolitical layout that does not manage to get away from its existentialist fatalism.

We all want a Near East living in peace and prosperity, but right now it seems hard, given the instability factors existing nowadays.

However, the new influence centres have not avoided the re-emergence of old ghosts. When we all believed that the *Cold War* was behind, attitudes and actions arise that bring us back to those grey years of bipolar confrontation. The Ukraine crisis was the trigger of that step backwards, and we cannot see clearly yet what will the outcome of the conflict be. Foreseeably, Europe and Russia will lose out with this old dynamic, in the face of USA's constant urge for firmness and Chinese discreet silence.

These new influential centres cannot logically ignore the USA's weight and leadership. This will be implemented differently, and although the American President will keep on discussing and claiming the need for a strengthening of American hyperpower, it will have to adapt to current times and new power centres. This does not mean that the EU should not consider the serious and rigorous negotiation of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) a priority. Its execution would be a guarantee to successfully uphold Europeans' future commercial interests in an increasingly competitive world that will need standards and patents where the European seal with its standards and criteria can be maintained.

However, mechanisms for international governance organisation, such as G8 and G20, have not been useful to solve specific crises, neither in the political and military fields nor in the economic and financial fields. And above all, they have proved unable to make progress towards a new international order. Until now, no foundational meeting has been held and a new international order for the 21st century has not been set forth, as was *Bretton Woods* for the 20th century. The United Nations long-awaited reform, and particularly its Security Council, remains stalled and the future configuration is still up in the air for the time being. The designation of Antonio Guterres as the new United Nations Secretary-General opens a window of hope that this process can be resumed more decisively.

In these circumstances, it has been evidenced that the world is in constant change and that there are international public goods, global challenges and an urgent need to adapt the governance structure to these new realities. It is obvious that, for the time being, only major actors or regional organisations can more or less organise their *modus vivendi*, pending a conflagration of dimensions difficult to foresee or some other world event that wakes them up from an irresponsible sleepwalking.

¹ Mbembe A. Le temps d'Afrique viendra, j'essaie d'en précipiter l'évènement.

D. V. Mosyakov¹

THE SOUTH CHINA SEA: TRANSFORMATION OF REGIONAL CONFLICT INTO GLOBAL CONFLICT

Currently, when studying conflicts that unfold in Asia, more and more attention is paid not only to political or economic factors but also to social and cultural factors. There are a lot of examples where exactly they predetermine to a large extent how and in what way this or that conflict will be resolved. The latest example is events on the Korean peninsula when both sides, the South and the North, all the time appeal to common Korean cultural values, common Korean legends and heroes to explain their actions for mutual reconciliation.

The conflict in the South China Sea is of a principally different nature but here social and cultural factors – traditional Chinese-Vietnamese cultural space with unwritten but fairly real rules and traditions – have also been important factors for a long time preventing the conflict's expansion and the start of war between the two neighbouring countries. However, now the importance of the said factors somewhat decreases and the reason for that is that the state of affairs in the South China Sea is considerably different from the one we had fairly recently. The conflict in this region was strictly regional and encompassed China and its neighbours in the South China Sea. But recently there were fairly radical changes in this conflict, certifying how indefinite contours of the future can be and how dangerous they can be for global security.

Two events, about which we'll tell below, changed everything cardinally – all analysts' forecasts about favourable prospects for peace and stability in this region, about a fairly probable compromise based on closeness of culture and mentality of the parties taking part in the conflict, turned out absolutely erroneous. The contours of the future were really different from what everyone supposed.

The first key event, the impact of which is felt now and as it seems will only strengthen in future, is the decisions of the Permanent Court of Arbitration in the Hague. As it's well-known, this Court that took its decisions in July, 2016, did not recognize China's legal right to 80% of the South China Sea water area, rejected the idea of the historical right as an argument in this dispute and ruled that the only way for the legal settlement of the conflict can be the way based to the contemporary international law. Though China and some other countries, including Russia, did not recognize the decisions of this Court, thinking them not fully objective, the legal grounding and the main principles worded by it as well as the well-known Convention on the Law of the Sea of 1982, currently stay the only foundation based on the international law for settlement of the conflict. In this

connection it can be said that the Court of Arbitration in the Hague actually announced that the conflict in the South China Sea would be resolved not in the Eastern but Western cultural space, without any pointing at the outstanding role of China in the history and culture of that region.

It is already clear that if the peaceful settlement process starts in future in the SCS, it will not be based on coordination of local traditions and legends as the key elements of the talks, i. e. the historical law. The ASEAN countries recognizing the decisions of the Court of Arbitration actually refused that way. They agreed that talks would be only based on the contemporary international law, and that at once, on the one hand, will noticeably simplify the process of the conflict's settlement, but on the other hand, it will make it more difficult as the giant cultural and historical layer will turn out to be outside the framework of arguments and reviewed space. China will naturally not agree to such an approach, and the legal process of the conflict's settling in the SCS in the way it is presented today, will inevitably get stuck for a long time and may be forever.

Nevertheless, the second key event can be even more important. Actual turning of the United States into the full-featured participant of the conflict led to qualitative changes of the whole political architecture of the conflict in the SCS. This did not happen at once, there was time, for example, at the first USA-ASEAN summit that took place in 2009, when American representatives communicated with the leaders of the member states of the bloc, speaking very strictly. They even pointed to them that they should not complain about Beijing to Washington, that political elites of the ASEAN states should themselves look for the compromise with China. Even before that there was a serious friction between the United States and ASEAN on the issue of the prospects for Burma to chair this international organization in 2006 in accordance the approved in it rotation order. In this connection, Washington presented some serious warnings bordering on direct threats, pointing that such a decision will seriously complicate the American approach to ASEAN. Confirming the formal warnings, the then US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice demonstratively boycotted the annual meeting of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) on Security in May, 2005. An open threat on the part of the Americans followed – if ASEAN insists and the military government of Burma still takes the chairman's position, Washington will refuse to provide economic assistance to ASEAN.²

But this tough approach of the American Administration to ASEAN changed when Obama became the President. The new US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton took part in the summit of the ASEAN Regional Forum on Security on the island of Phuket (Thailand). She decidedly said at the press conference that the United States had returned to Southeast Asia.³ It was announced about the inten-

¹ Head of the Center for Southeast Asia, Australia and Oceania Studies at the Institute of Oriental Studies of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor. Head of the Department of Regional Studies of the Moscow University for the Humanities. Author of more than 150 scientific publications, including monographs: "New and Recent History. Modernization and Globalization of Eastern Societies", "Socio-Political Development of Cambodia in the Twentieth Century. Village and Power", "The History of Southeast Asia", "Southeast Asia: The Problems of Formation of a Civilizational Community", "The History of Cambodia. 20th Century", "China's Policy in Southeast Asia in the Past and the Present", etc. Organizer of the project "Monitoring of Modern History of Southeast Asian Countries". Lectures at Kazan State University, Yale University (USA), Hosei University (Japan), etc. Member of the Editorial Board of the journal "Asia and Africa Today".

² <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/novoe-prishestvie-ssha-v-yugovostoch-nuyu-aziyu>

³ Availability at the ASEAN Summit. Clinton H. R. The United States is back in Southeast Asia. Phuket, Thailand, 22 July 2009. URL: <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2009a/july/126320.htm>

tions of the United States to open a permanent representative office attached to ASEAN with resident ambassador at the head. The first step to new American-ASEAN relations was made as a result of the meeting – the document about the United States joining the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia (TAC) was signed,¹ and that had always been an unspoken and necessarily rule for those who wanted to establish closer relations with ASEAN.

The main reason that made Americans change their attitude to ASEAN and transfer the members of this organization into their potential allies, was evident rise of China, when Beijing's policy became more and more independent from the United States and in a sense it became expansionist on the islands and the water area of the South China Sea. China announced approximately 80% of the water area of this sea its own territory and thus suddenly aggravated the state of affairs in this region as the position and interests and rights of other states turned out to be seriously violated. Most ASEAN member states turned to the United States for support to return the status quo and actually convinced the Americans to return to this region as their protectors from the growing threat to security on the part of China.

By now, the Americans most actively intervened in the conflict in the South China Sea within the framework of the policy of the United States returning to Asia, their ships sail in the areas of disputed islands announced by China closed to other vessels, thus putting the world under a threat of a direct clash with Chinese forces. The unfolding American-Chinese confrontation in the SCS turned the low-intensity conflict of neighbouring states that interested nearly no one in the world for a long time, into the confrontation of modern superpowers. And the interesting thing is that this conflict was aggravated in such a way as if the events were taken from a textbook on political science, when the conflict originates based on small antagonisms understood by very few and then, if it is not cut short, it starts growing, acquires its own logic and finally draws in new countries and nations. The conflict in the SCS passed the level of bilateral disputes and clashes between China and Vietnam because of the known to very few waterless tiny islets and reefs, then it reached the stage of the regional conflict, in which China and ASEAN states were drawn, first of all Vietnam, Malaysia, the Philippines, Brunei and later Indonesia. The conflict reached this level after the People's Republic of China, as we already said, announced 80% of the South China Sea its territory in 2009, completely ignoring the interests of its neighbours.

It should be noted that before the Americans appeared, even notwithstanding the general negative development of the conflict, many analysts in the region and outside it thought that mutual claims of the SEA countries and China would be gradually resolved. At the same time, the cultural factors played an important role in their arguments – closeness of basic views and vital stereotypes, tradition of mutual concessions connected with the opposing forces doing everything for no one to lose seriously and for everyone to “keep face” when coming to a compromise. Many people pointed at important cultural and political influence of local Chinese diasporas, deeply integrated into the political elite of the SEA countries that could also help to resolve the con-

flict. Thus, the contours of the future in the context of regional cultural space looked fairly positive.

The coming of the Americans with their energy, aggression, powerful cultural mythology actually shattered and changed all that. The alternative of Chinese political and cultural domineering activated various modernist forces in the SEA countries that started actively promoting the American cultural stereotype and thus preparing national communities to closer relations with the USA.

Today, when the Americans are dragged into regional confrontations, the conflict in the SCS stopped being regional. It turned into a global one, threatening stability and security in the SCS, in Asia and in the world. The matter is that any armed clash of Chinese and American forces may bring about a big war between the leading world powers. The threat of such development of events is appearing regularly as again and again either an American aircraft flies with Chinese anti-aircraft defense systems aimed at it in the zone announced forbidden by the People's Republic of China, or a United States destroyer sails with Chinese canons aimed at it in the area of artificial islands also announced forbidden by China. Any non-sanctioned or accidental shot can cardinal change the situation. And the state of affairs in security is only worsening after it was announced that the group of American men-of-war with the aircraft carrier USS *Carl Vinson* at the head started patrolling the SCS from February 18, 2017. The task of the American Navy's permanent presence in the SCS set then became just a prelude for another more dangerous for the world and stability in the region decision that American vessels would regularly enter the areas, which China announced forbidden for them. That means that the SEA region is actually doomed for constant nervousness and instability, expectation of conflict as it already happened not once, and the last time was on July 2, 2017, when the USS *Stethem* intentionally and demonstratively entered the disputed water area of the SCS, provoking the Chinese coastal artillery for a destructive answer.

And what is more, we can currently speak not only about the global nature of the conflict but also about a new spiral of cultural and political rivalry, when the great powers appeal to the countries of the region looking for support. And in this case we should say that American “soft power” based on the well-developed cultural creation of myths about the Messianic role of America in the world definitely wins over the Chinese mythologema as to historical and cultural community, ability to understand each other better than the others and deal with the existing contradictions peacefully. But the problem in this connection is also in the contours of the future seen as full of new conflicts, the atmosphere of mutual misunderstanding and tension in the environment of serious success of American myth creation. The reason for that is that American cultural stereotypes and dominants, taking root in political elites of the SEA countries, destroy the traditional cultural space of Big Eastern Asia, generating mutual distrust and misunderstanding. And the threat is that even if we imagine that the Americans will leave after some time, how can the SEA countries and China restore their common cultural and political space when there is a gap of cultural misunderstanding and deep mutual distrust between them?

Naturally, such a development of events does not give reasons for optimism as to a possibility to resolve the con-

¹ Remarks by Hillary R. Clinton from the Signing Ceremony of the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation Accession, Phuket, Thailand, 22 July 2009. URL: <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2009a/july/126334.htm>

flict. But if we just put aside all these well-known and very dangerous phenomena and events a little, and try to understand what actually changes in the new situation, when the conflict in the SCS acquired all features of a global conflict. The first thing you pay attention to at once is a completely new presentation of the events in the region in world mass media, and a completely new role and place in discussions at the biggest international forums and especially in the United Nations besides that. For example, I especially analyzed two important events that took place fairly recently. One of them is aggravation of Chinese-Indonesian relations in connection with the Natuna Islands, and the second is sailing of American destroyers, at first the USS *Stethem* and in this March the USS *Mustin* in the forbidden area by the artificial islands built by China. It was mostly reported about aggravation of the Chinese-Indonesian relations and Indonesian measures for strengthening of its presence on the Natuna Islands in the regional mass media of the ASEAN countries. There were just a few short pieces of information on the international scene. But the USS *Stethem*'s sailing became a hit in the world press. Naturally, all American newspapers wrote about that, CNN analysts discussed that to say nothing of regional mass media of the ASEAN countries. That is, the first news stayed regional to a large extent, that second became world-scale, underlining the global importance of the event.

But the meaning of the global character in case of the conflict in the SCS consists not only in the scales of covering, the more important is that the conflict's transfer to the global level cardinally changes all the political architecture in the situation formed in the SCS. Really, the conflict of China and Vietnam and the conflict of the ASEAN countries and China in the new environment as if go to the background. Naturally, they don't disappear but they make way for the global confrontation, they become inferior to it. Naturally, the main motives and the so-called "reference" points determining the character of the conflict change in connection with that. If Beijing's actions were undoubtedly expansionist to a certain extent in the environment of confrontation with Vietnam and the Philippines, these actions in the new environment get a somewhat different dimension – they can be viewed as formation of the defense line for Chinese security against the threat from the USA. The new quality of the conflict inevitable generates new foundations for old phenomena, and building artificial islands can be viewed not as a clearly unfriendly gesture in relation to the neighbours, but as an attempt to create an alternative for American aircraft carriers, turning the artificial islands into impregnable fortresses capable to control considerable water areas. As we see, the old conflict loses values and orientation points that seemed unshakeable before, in the new reality.

Besides, the ASEAN countries conflict with China in the new environment stops being the key for settlement of the conflict, and the precedence is taken by the relations of the USA and China. And what is more, ASEAN finds itself in a difficult geopolitical situation, when a lot of skills and will are required to preserve the freedom of actions and internal unity in the situation when the USA and the People's Republic of China stay the key and the most important partners in economy and politics. Currently the Americans, notwithstanding the change of the Administration in the White House, still on the whole go on with the so-called

"hedge policy" – the strategy directed at turning neighbours of China in its enemies and respectively in friends and allies of the United States. They expect to control the whole situation in the region in such a way and have levers of influence to have an impact on the ASEAN countries and via them China. Unfortunately, there is still no one single line still seen in American efforts. It's enough to compare the policy of equidistance with evident turn to China, carried out by the Philippines under the President Duterte's control, and more and more pro-American line of Vietnam that sees its security in bigger cooperation with the USA. It can be said rather definitely that Beijing and Washington rivalry creates a threat for the ASEAN unity, tears its bloc not only politically (when Cambodia, for example, turns into the mouthpiece of China in ASEAN, and Singapore into the main American ally in the region) but also undermines the foundations of the common cultural identity of the Southeast Asian countries. The matter is that a different political focus either on the People's Republic of China or the USA to a large extent determined different trajectories of cultural development and consequently, in connection with all that, absolutely undeterminable contours of the future for all that region.

At the same time, analyzing the current situation in Southeast Asia, there is a reason for a certain optimism as to possible compromises between China and its neighbours, together with worries and pessimism as to possibilities of coming to an agreement, understand each other and stop the rivalry of the People's Republic of China and the USA. Practically all analysts are used to stating that China's motives for expansion are expectations of big oil and gas deposits, control over the main sea trade routes through the SCS and the Strait of Malacca as well as fishing zones in one of the richest in fish seas. Now these expectations with global confrontation and absolutely new motives and threats as the background, can become the field for a compromise. The explanation of this phenomenon is that today not these issues but the issues of national security come to the forefront in China's expansion in the SCS. This region turns into an important place for development and promotion of Chinese forces and early nuclear attack warning means. According to American intelligence data, China placed the equipment for interferences in communications and radio location systems of American men-of-war and aircrafts on the new artificial islands. And it was placed fairly recently, within the last 90 days on Mischief (Meiji) Reef and Fiery Cross Reef.¹

China develops the marine component of its strategic nuclear forces on submarines, with the biggest naval base in the Yulin harbour on Hainan Island. The special features of the lay of the sea bottom make exactly the water area of the South China Sea the most logic place where China nuclear missile carriers can go out into the broad expanses of the ocean nearly unnoticeable for American satellites. If you follow the logic of Chinese commanders, control over the Spratly Islands and a considerable part of the SCS is necessary for the People's Republic of China not only to be protected against American missiles but also for it to be impossible for the USA and their allies to close vital sea economic arteries and stifle the country by economic blockade, about which it is all the time said in American mass media.

¹ РИА Новости. URL: <https://ria.ru/world/20180410/1518270568.htm>

At the same time, no matter the whole negative development of the situation in the SCS, it's possible to say that transfer of the conflict from the regional level to the global level pushed China and its regional rivals to a serious review of ideas that seemed established long ago, and in some sense opens new opportunities to look for a compromise between them. First, all participants of the old conflict have already completely different stakes that require maximally responsible approach to their actions. Second, if not only fish resources of this sea and not oil and gas prospects are the main drivers of the Chinese policy, it's evident that opportunities open for China to look for a compromise with the ASEAN states. It is even more important when Americans are trying to pull them to their side step-by-step. At the same time, their current aspirations and claims against China are rather concrete: they are striving for free fishing and an opportunity to exploit the SCS riches in their interests. Chinese authorities can fairly well meet them halfway in case of a global confrontation as they did recently with the Philippines, signing an agreement on joint exploration and use of mineral resources in the disputed water areas and announcing the South China Sea the sea of "amity and cooperation".¹ It's extremely important for China in the environment of the confrontation with the USA for the ASEAN countries not to find themselves in the American camp and for them not to turn into Washington puppets. By the way, China in this case can find support among the influential part of the ASEAN political elites, well-known representative of which already not once said about their wish to be outside the global confrontation of Beijing and Washington and preserve their freedom in selecting their foreign political partners.

The ASEAN members do not hide that they'd like to have constructive relations with the People's Republic of China, they are against becoming the American front line against China, with which they develop trade and economic relations fairly successfully within the common free trade zone. At the same time, they do not want to be a drive belt of American politics in the region. The matter is to what extent they will manage to attain this goal in the environment when traditional common Asian cultural space is being destroyed, and that is happening just in front of our eyes, when formation of the new, so to say "hybrid" Eastern-Western cultures only brings about new antagonisms and aggravates old ones.

The complexity and special feature of the current situation in the South China Sea is that even serious shifts in Beijing's relations with its neighbours absolutely do not guarantee relief of tension and can little help to evade a possible new war. We can only count on some relief of tension, but the conflict will not be resolved as global contradictions of modern superpowers China and the USA are deeper and encompass not only the disputed water areas of the South China Sea. There is bitterness in this statement that we did not manage to resolve the conflict in due time, when it was still at the regional stage, and there are concerns as to what extent we can find a solution after running against one of the most dangerous features of globalism, related to rivalry of great powers for domineering both in a separate region and the whole world. Because of that the contours of the future, no matter all possible concessions of regional states to one another, stay dangerously insurmountable for the states in Southeast Asia, like a black cloud just waiting for its hour to come to turn the surrounding world into an unmanageable and dangerous chaos.

V. V. Naumkin²

SPLIT BETWEEN THE WORLD OF BELIEVERS AND THE WORLD OF DISBELIEVERS: A GLOBAL MEGATREND?

A while ago, some analysts have come up with a thesis that the international community may in fact split into the World of believers and the World of disbelievers in the nearest future. Taken as a forecast, this binary separation of the global community is extremely provisional, as it doesn't take into account the inevitable existence of various transitional

and undecided countries. Nevertheless, potentially, the core of the World of believers are Islamic countries, while the World of disbelievers is centered in the secular Europe where religion has been squeezed out to the roadside of social life, let alone completely detached from the politics.

Prior to further discussion of this topic, there is a question that needs to be mentioned in direct relation to it: that of the current status of the globalization process. Without globalization there would be no megatrends common for the majority of the states. (In scope of a conference report we can, of course, only skim the themes raised herein).

Globalization Crisis

Only a few years ago globalization seemed to be an overwhelming megatrend, its vortex very nearly consuming most of the differences and borders between countries and civilizations. "Hyper globalization" was the phase which the world community of states entered, first of all, owing to the stunningly rapid advance of technological revolution in communications. However, the outcome isn't as conclusive

¹ ПНА Новости. April 10, 2018.

² Research Advisor of the Institute of Oriental Studies at the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor, Chief Editor of the *Vostok-ORIENS* Journal. Author of more than 500 scientific publications, including books: "The History of the Orient", "Islam and Muslims: Culture and Politics", "Middle East in the World's Politics and Culture", "Red Wolves of Yemen", "Radical Islam in Central Asia: between Pen and Rifle", "Arab World, Islam and Russia: Past and Future", "The Archipelago of Socotra: Expeditions of 1974-2010", "Conflicts and Wars of the 21st century: Middle East and Northern Africa" (co-author) and others. Chairman of the "Oriental Archive" editorial board, editorial board member for many journals. Was awarded the Russian Order of Friendship and many other foreign and public distinctions, including a Medal of Honor from Russia's Council of Muftis, an Order for the Beneficial Service to Motherland – Golden Cross, an Order of the Russian Nation, an Order of Friendship of Tajikistan, a Golden Order of Merit from the State of Palestine and others. Was awarded the V. Posuvalyuk Prize (by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs), the S. F. Oldenburg Prize of the RAS, and the Prize of Valdai International Discussion Club.

as it seems. Let us have a quick look at the three main globalization flows – capital, people and information.

Over the last years, the flow of capital has encountered powerful barriers, mostly due to the protectionist politics of the country which always claimed to be a leader of the “free world” – the US. Politics of President Trump was a severe shock to the international trade system. Analysis of the decisions to sanction governments “at fault” in America’s eyes, allegedly as a political leverage, shows that their purpose was to banish competitors of American companies from the market and ensure preferential conditions for the American business. EU countries played along with these decisions and fell second victim to the sanctioning policy. An increasing number of governments is unhappy with WTO activities; in fact, some of the experts believe that the organization has become irrelevant in view of the present conditions. Trade disputes between the US and the People’s Republic of China became at times rather heated; still, in the interests of national manufacturers of goods the two countries had come to the compromise. Fulfilment of integration agreements in the Eurasian Economic Union has also become problematic. In the recent EAEU summit of 14 May 2018, President of Belarus Aleksandr Lukashenko spoke critically of the Union as follows: “Global economical growth today largely depends on regional integrational associations. Unfortunately, instead of free trade, we close ourselves to one another. Moreover, we exchange mutual complaints, even in mass media, jeopardizing the international reputation of the Union. We neglect civilized methods of resolving trade disputes through Eurasian Economic Commission”.

Even more barriers now impede the free flow of people. Some of the European states regard migration as just about the gravest problem of all, and one of the key challenges to their national security. This attitude greatly influences national politics in EU countries, stirring xenophobia, populism, and emerging prevalence of nationalistic parties and movements. The problem is becoming even more acute with continuing migration to these countries, which will only increase in the foreseeable future, and with continent penetration by former insurgents – members of radical Islamic organizations disguised as refugees. At the same time, aging of population, a steady trend in Europe and some other regions of the world, will most probably only aggravate in the future and increase the need of European states for influx of workforce from abroad, which may result in growing anti-migrant sentiment among the citizens and further inflation of contradictions between the EU member states. To overcome the cultural dissonance resulting from massive relocation of the Middle-Eastern and African population to Europe, time and well-considered politics are in demand, and both are often lacking.

Information flows are difficult to cut off in the era of technological revolution. Still, they are also impacted by emerging limitations. Certain restrictions are necessary as they help control propagation of extremist ideas, calls for terrorism, violence, incitement of national and religious hatred, while other measures are not so well-founded. Some states limit access of their citizens to Internet and strongly filter content due to ideological reasons.

Nevertheless, globalization still continues. All societies increasingly avail themselves of its opportunities and counter the problems that it has caused. Despite the seem-

ingly convincing victory of secularism and even a certain expansion of the zone of atheism, overall, in many parts of the world and not only in its Islamic segment, some sort of a religious renaissance is ongoing, spurred by high-tech era induced pursuit of spirituality. Many people are looking for a spiritual alternative to the pervasive but unsatisfying cultural routines and behavioral stereotypes, especially in the deeply secularized societies. The Islamic world is partially dominated by the most radical, extremist understanding of its religion which gave birth to such organizations as DAISH, ISIS and the like, forbidden in Russia.

All world religions feel the need to somehow adapt to the new reality. This need can manifest in denial of globalization influence, resistance to modernization (which I will come back to), and in a “global product” of their own design. This product is simultaneously a response to the challenge of globalization, a part of globalization, and a manifestation of globalizing influence of religion. What are the forms that this product may assume? For the Islamic world, specifically, it is the universal transnational ummah (community, “nation” of Muslims) termed “imaginary” by French analyst of Islam Olivier Roy. It is imaginary because Muslims are, firstly, citizens of their nation states (and not only Muslim states, but also those where they constitute a minority and which we are currently discussing), and only secondly – solidary members of the universal Ummah. Nevertheless, this growing confessional minority has established its solidarity ties across Europe where some thirty million Muslims reside presently. Rapid growth of the minority is nourished by migration from Asian and African countries and higher birth rate, but also (less so) by some Europeans who adopt Islam.

Religion, Politics and Advance of Secularism

In many Muslim societies, mostly in the Middle East, globalization is only accepted as long as it does not contradict fortification of their civilizational identity, in which Islam is one of the signature features. It would be, however, only partially true to say that only Muslim (primarily the Middle East) societies get a chance to enter the World of believers, whereas the World of disbelievers is all the rest, primarily the Christians. Difference in relationship between religion and politics plays an important role here. Karen Armstrong, a well-known British author of popular books on religion, wrote about the early modern period when Protestant Christianity emerged: “At this time Europeans and Americans had begun to separate religion and politics, because they assumed, not altogether accurately, that the theological squabbles of the Reformation had been entirely responsible for the Thirty Years’ War. The conviction that religion must be rigorously excluded from political life has been called the charter myth of the sovereign nation-state. The philosophers and statesmen who pioneered this dogma believed that they were returning to a more satisfactory state of affairs that had existed before ambitious Catholic clerics had confused two utterly distinct realms”.

Armstrong is right when she says that “the habit of separating religion and politics is now so routine in the West that it is difficult for us to appreciate how thoroughly the two co-inherited in the past”. It is true that dissociating the inextricably connected religion and politics at that time “would have seemed like trying to extract the gin from

a cocktail". In premodern period many activities were experienced as deeply sacred (Armstrong names, e. g., "forest cleaning, hunting, football matches, dice games, astronomy, farming, state building, tugs-of-war, town planning, commerce, imbibing strong drink, and, most particularly, warfare"), which contemporary people would be probably unable to relate to faith.

Is it fair to assume, then, that the Muslims who closely associate religion and politics are just "stuck" in the early modern times? Or is it the Islamic inherent quality of its association with politics? It is probably impossible to provide a sound answer to this question in scope of this paper. However, it is common knowledge that Islam is historically more closely linked to the problem of power than any other religion: it was the dispute on this problem that provoked the initial split of the Muslims into Sunni and Shia.

Continuing secularization in societies which form the World of disbelievers is accompanied by erosion of religious values and general desacralization. This is a valid explanation of, for instance, use of abandoned churches as entertainment venues, e. g., in Germany. Crisis of religious institutes is ongoing. Traditional practices and rituals are becoming obsolete. Even in Russia, where religiousness is much higher than in most European states, and which cannot be considered a part of the World of disbelievers, all religious riots are only observed by maximum 3% of orthodox citizens of the country (whereas Russian Muslims score higher).

Political imperatives can erode the most deep-rooted religious and moral attitudes even in the self-proclaimed religion-based global actors. Yemeni rebels of Ansarullah group, referred to as Houthis due to the ancestry of most of its members, killed Yemen's Ex-President Ali Abdullah Saleh who severed connections with them. The murder occurred on 4 December 2017, however the rebels have been keeping his body in the fridge for several months now (at least, as of the time this is being written), whereas according to Islamic canon, he had to be buried on the next day with proper rituals. The body has become some sort of a merchandize; in the throes of the long-lasting civil war, even those who fight for return to the original values of Islam overstep its moral principles and fail to observe the customs. Those who subject the country to ruthless bombing are none the better.

Everything that has been said about the desacralization process can be considered in the context of modernization of the religion, while one of the approaches describes this process as "simplification". Such is the opinion of some Buddhism researchers who mention relaxation of requirements to the believers and reduction of the role of doctrine in the lives of most of them. To some extent, this is true. Possibly, a simplified version of religion is emerging as faith is loosing its reflective gravity yet becomes easier to adopt. In other words, religion is being stripped of its sublime sacredness, becoming more mundane and easier to comprehend. Numbers of religious people, subsequently, are not decreasing but growing, despite the fact that for most of the believers religion boils down to rituals and moral principles that are not strictly binding (in other words, "expansion-reduction" occurs). It is difficult to fathom, though, how regular Tibetan believers would have been able to fully study and integrate in their everyday lives such expansive religious texts as Kangyur (108 volumes of

Buddha's Word) and Tengyur (235 volumes of translated *shastras*). Indian authors A. Shukla and V. Dixit say that in the past, possession of these texts was regarded merely as a tool for maintenance of a certain social status. There is also little cause to believe that regular Muslims know all texts of the six "correct" volumes of Muhammad's Hadiths (however, learning the entire Quran by heart is a widely adhered practice in many societies in the Islamic territory). The rule still stands, though, that in all religions the teaching of religious texts to regular believers and especially their interpretation is entrusted to priests, religious mentors, scholars and theologians. Their number is replenished by religious education which currently undergoes transformation both in Buddhism and in Islam.

Still, it would be a simplification in itself to interpret modernization as merely simplification. The ongoing transformation of religion can rather be described as "becoming more mundane" or "desacralization". In Tibetan Buddhism the trend manifests in the fact that nuns who were previously forbidden to visit *monlam* (prayer festival for peace and prosperity in the first Tibetan month) were allowed to do it in 1994 by decision of Dalai Lama. To some extent, this phenomenon can be compared to the change of attitude to women in Muslim communities, where women are now allowed to perform activities which previously were considered men's only. It is in the sphere of attitude to women that one of the key collisions between Islamic archaic traditionalism and modernity (specifically, Western culture) lies. (Think of the still ongoing European disputes concerning wearing hijab and niqab/purdah). Mohammad Bin Salman Al Saud, Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia, is adopting a series of reforms for improvement of attitude to women and their rights in scope of liberalization, which is a notable step in our context.

As for lamas, their charisma is gradually waning now that they have moved to common villages, Shukla and Dixit say. In the past, when monasteries were located in hard-to-reach places, it was rare luck to get a blessing from a lama. "Lamas were forbidden to visit the market or go elsewhere, unless it was necessary for family business. Women were not allowed in the monasteries, and laymen were asked out after sunset. All these bans are now cancelled".

Elements of the old Tibetan *bon* religion (prevalent until 7th century) are conducive to ritualistic reduction of Tibetan Buddhism. These elements are known to be so thoroughly integrated in the local Buddhism that many scholars even consider *bon* to be one of the Buddhist schools. However, this religion, which can be described as animistic and shamanic, introduced decorative symbolism and material props to Buddhism, facilitating ritualization. According to A. V. Arakheri, "pre-Buddhist customs and related symbolism are still present in the Tibetan society... Walls of houses are decorated with intricate patterns and signs representing deities of the old religion. Symbols of the four elements – tiger, lion, eagle and dragon – are still being used in the Buddhist philosophy".

It is notable that the Islamic tradition for incorporation of elements of previous beliefs from the people who adopted Islam is manifested in Sufism. Sufi practice of *Dhikr* – rhythmic movements with chanting of religious phrases, which is to some extent similar to meditation – in certain countries has been reduced to a plain ritual devoid of true spiritual meaning.

Influence of western secular culture is one of the many reasons underlying this process. Let's not forget, though, that the role of religion as the marker of identity in the contemporary highly globalized world does not abate; instead, it helps many societies withstand civilizational onslaught of the West.

Resacralization as a Response

This "enclosing" imperative partially explain the process which is opposite to desacralization and modernization, namely the process of resacralization and archaization. Its ground in the Islamic world produces such ugly saplings of phenomena as extremism and terrorism, which also emerge in response to intrusion of the West in internal affairs of Islamic states – the politics which primarily served the purpose of replacement of undesirable governments and forceful instilment of extraneous rules. (This paper does not aim to discuss Islamic extremism and terrorism in detail.)

Islam is often seen as the most warlike religion due to the role of jihad. But jihad in Islamic doctrine is an effort of a Muslim believer to instill in himself the piousness and Islamic moral. Only sometimes it is used for protection of faith, life or property of the Muslims and requires to take up arms (greater and lesser jihad). Absolutization of jihad is often a response to aggressive secularism seen as a threat to the Muslim identity. Contemporary radical jihad adepts who understand jihad doctrine in an extremist way provoke wrong conclusions which should not be generalized and extrapolated to the doctrine as a whole. Elements of such doctrines are present in all religions: Christianity and Buddhism are no exception. For instance, Kalachakra Tantra textual tradition permits transformation of internal, spiritual struggle into external action in response to aggression.

Buddhism attributes lesser role to violence; however, there is evidence of political murder by monks in Shri Lanka and countries of South East Asia. Actually, the question is related to politization of the clergy which fluctuates in intensity over time. Think of the demonstrative self-immolation of monk Thich Quang Duc in Saigon, Vietnam in 1963.

Aum Shinrikyo was an exceptional phenomena for the Buddhist environment (and ideology of this sect has an admix of other religions). It was a grotesque combination of anti-globalism and social protest with elements of "blind terrorism" attacking innocent people similar to assaults of terrorists acting in the name of Islam in the Middle East and other regions.

Islam, Christianity and Buddhism treat secularism differently. In Islam, the anti-secular trend has been growing for several decades now. In the book of fatwas (rulings issued by Islamic scholars) distributed in Russia by Fatwa Council, Organization of Islamic Cooperation, in Russian translation, secularism is even called "enemy of Islam". Even in such a constitutionally secular country as Turkey (the only Middle East country where secularism is stipulated in the basic law), a slow process of re-islamization is ongoing under the rule of Recep Tayyip Erdoğan and his Justice and Development Party, while the social and political debates are increasingly pro-religious.

In Buddhism, anti-secular motifs are less pronounced than in the Abrahamic religions (in the opinion of Russian scholar Agadzhanian, this is due to the less distinct bound-

ary between the sacred and the secular in the Buddhist tradition).

There are also differences in terms of attitude to adherents of other faiths. Although initially the Islamic doctrine postulates positive attitude to representatives of other monotheist religions and tolerance towards followers of non-monotheistic religions, pagans and even atheists, in practice and in theological discourse of certain schools in later centuries the trend of exclusivism had emerged and developed. Buddhism in general is far from such attitudes, but sporadic manifestations of exclusivism and elements of intolerance have been noticed in certain groups and individuals in its territory of presence.

Under the effect of resacralization of certain concepts important for the doctrine, their initial meaning has been distorted. One of the instances is the concept of *Ummah* which is presently associated exclusively with Muslims in the Islamic world. But the concept of *Ummah* actually transcends people. The medieval dictionary by imam Ibn Manzur says: "*Ummah* – breed and type of all living things" [...]. In other words: "Every type of animal is *Ummah*". Quran says: "All animals on Earth and all birds flying on their wings are *Ummah*, just like you..." (Quran, 6, 38). One of the correct Hadiths is even more straightforward and descriptive: "If dogs (!) were not *Ummah*, like all the rest, I would command to kill them..." Also: "Ants are *Ummah* of *Ummahs*" (we left *Ummah* untranslated as it is difficult to find an adequate equivalent – "communion of communions", or perhaps "community of communities"?). Based on an array of studies of medieval Arabic lexicographers, author of the famous thesaurus English Arabic scholar Edward William Lane concludes that *Ummah* is "people to whom the prophet was sent down, both believers and disbelievers". And disbelievers! Telling this to modern fundamentalists would be a dangerous idea.

In conclusion, I would like to add some thoughts about the phenomenon of Islamic extremism and terrorism. Consider one of the scenarios suggested in the open report of the American National Intelligence Council "Mapping the Global Future: 2020 Project" developed by an extensive group of recognized experts from many countries, published in Russian in 2005. Authors of the report predicted the events in the Middle East in the nearest future. They wrote: "Over the next 15 years, religious identity is likely to become an increasingly important factor in how people define themselves". And further: "Radical Islam will have a significant global impact... rallying disparate ethnic and national groups and perhaps even creating an authority that transcends national boundaries". Of course, al-Qaeda had been active in the world back then, and such forecasts seemed to be self-evident. However, it was followed by a thesis of a fictional scenario of a "new Caliphate" (!) capable to "advance a powerful counter ideology that has widespread appeal". In a decade, some pro-conspiratorial Middle East analysts interpreted this prediction as a proof of participation of certain American circles in creation of ISIS (forbidden in Russia and far from defeated as of today).

Anyhow, in the book "The Wave: Man, God, and the Ballot Box in the Middle East" written in October 2010, i. e. before the Arab spring of 2011 (the book was published in early 2011) employee of the American Foundation for

Defense of Democracies Reuel Marc Gerecht¹ actually predicted the victory of Islamists in Egypt, adding that in this country the Islamists will “do well in any free vote”, and appointing a crucial date of 2011 for this event. At that time the majority of the Western expert community was overtly optimistic about the political program of the Muslim Brotherhood. Published in August 2007 by Egyptian newspaper Al-Masry Al-Youm, the program promised responsible leaders appointed by free will of people, reinforcement of democracy, and various independent civil society institutes. It said that the Brotherhood was certain that “democracy is the only legitimate political system for Egypt and the entire Islamic world”. Their victory would result, Ger-

echt speculated, for the first time since the times of “the rightly guided caliphs”, in a possibility of “organic, mutually trusting relationship” between the leaders and their societies in the Arab World.

Another prediction, or evidence of knowledge? Of course, the point is not that the Western states are directly involved in creation of terrorist networks in the Middle East which pose a threat to their own safety. Still, it is obvious that despite the depth of the above-mentioned civilizational split (into the World of believers and the World of disbelievers), some circles in the Western communities are still tempted to use radical Islamists as a means to their own geopolitical ends.

A. D. Nekipelov²

ON SOCIETY AS OBJECT OF THEORETICAL STUDIES AND THE CURRENT ECONOMIC THEORY CRISIS

It is not a secret that studying the society is a process of a very specific nature. Social sciences are often treated as “soft” in comparison with “solid” natural sciences. These characteristics must reflect the fact that precise cause-and-effect relationships are less important in social sciences than the intuitive description of the processes taking place, their general qualitative assessment with application of various criteria that may be interpreted in a number of ways.

The economic theory stands apart from other disciplines in this regard. The core of this theory centers around the topic of finding the best options for optimizing the use of limited resources, which predetermines the need for an extensive application of various mathematical tools. The emphasis on ongoing improvement of these tools, which has been constantly reinforced in mainstream economics throughout the 20th century, has borne fruit: many scholars of natural sciences have started viewing scholars in theoretical economics as colleagues, and their research as based on “authentically scientific methods”.

But then there is a problem, and it is that the science is said to be in crisis right now, and the voices saying this are heard louder and louder. To understand the essence of why things are that way, we need to look at what the “canon” economic theory says.

Since the days of J. M. Keynes, the economic theory has been subdivided into micro- and macroeconomics, the two parts that fit badly together, as I expect to show you.

The modern microeconomic theory is represented by a set of independent models (models of consumer choice, firm models, sectoral and general equilibrium models, etc.), which are comprised of hypotheses (axioms), deductive rea-

soning (in particular, mathematical transformations), and specific conclusions. Moreover, the conclusions made on the basis of each such model take forms that makes it possible to verify their compliance with the real state of affairs in economy. Compliance with this last requirement, according to representatives of mainstream economics helps turn this area of inquiry into a genuine empirical science, thereby bringing it closer to the standards of corresponding natural science disciplines.

One of the advantages of this approach lies in that it allows us to understand the nature of various functional dependencies that appear “on the surface” of economic life. But it also has two considerable shortcomings: a purely methodological one, and one related to content.

The former establishes an inconvenient requirement for the researcher: in the process of formulating any of the aforementioned models, it becomes necessary to incorporate into them the categories that had not been defined previously. For instance, in the consumer choice model such notions are market prices of products and consumer income, and in the model of a firm – prices, costs and interest rates. The problem with content here is that the results of the study center around the conclusions that relate to the economic system with strictly defined parameters characteristic for this model, first of all, perfect market economy. This in turn means that the modern microeconomic theory due to the peculiar features of its composition is characterized by its institutional static character.

It might seem that micro- and macroeconomics have simply split the field of economic research: while microeconomics deals only with relationships of separate economic entities (individual or group), macroeconomics deals with the functioning of economy as a whole. It appears to be not exactly the case. The problem is that these two sections of the present-day economic theory are based on different methodological foundations, and therefore represent two different kinds of sciences.³

The microeconomic theory excludes interpersonal comparisons of utility, and therefore considers as summation

¹ Gerecht was a student of Bernard Lewis, served as an executive officer in CIA, is known for his neoconservative and interventionist views. He was especially openly aggressive in his attitude to Iran (“The Iranians have terrorism in their DNA”).

² Director of the Moscow School of Economics at the Lomonosov Moscow State University, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor. Author of over 200 scientific publications, selected works: “Essays on the Economics of Post-Communism”, “Establishment and Functioning of Economic Institutions: from ‘Robinsonade’ to Market Economy Based on Individual Production”, “Central and Eastern Europe in the Second Half of the 20th century” and others. Member of the Scientific Council of the Russian Security Council. He is awarded the order of Honour, order “For Merits before Fatherland” (degree 4). Honorary Doctor of SpbUHSS.

³ In 1967 K. Arrow defined the gap between micro- and macroeconomics as a “major scandal” (Arrow K. J. Samuelson Collected // Journal of Political Economy. 1967. No 75. P. 730–737).

of individual incomes meaningless in the process of characterizing the welfare of the group. Meanwhile, in macroeconomics the gross domestic product (income) is seen as a key indicator of economic development. The general level of prices as a macroeconomic indicator is also meaningless from the point of view of microeconomics. Microeconomics considers only the price vector, and this has to do with the fact that their median level cannot be categorically defined: it depends on whether the structure of issue of a certain period is taken as a basic value. Similarly, from the point of view of microeconomics, there are no reasons to include into the analysis the production function of economy as a whole, with a multitude of production functions, each of which characterizes the totality of technically effective methodologies in various concrete spheres of activity. Meanwhile, it is this aggregated production function that lies in the foundation of contemporary economic growth theories.

The main peculiarity of classical macroeconomics lies in the fact that it as if flattens a complex vector reality into a simple scale representation. One should not hope that such microeconomic indicators could be considered within the realm of macroeconomics.¹ Since the problem of economic growth remains one of the central problems of macroeconomics, the methodological incompatibility of two subsections of the current theory will remain in place. If the problem of economic growth based on the dynamics of a single aggregated indicator is replaced with the problem of economic development microeconomics in its present form will simply disappear.

Some of the most obvious manifestations of a crisis in present-day economics are, on the one hand, its obvious failure to forecast important economic events, and, on the other, inefficiency of many recommendations offered on its behalf – time and time again. One of the most evident examples of the former was the grandiose financial and economic crisis of 2007–2009, which happened, ironically, after “mainstream” scholars were finally convinced they knew how to solve the problem of economic depressions.² The examples of the latter are more than multiple. Let me mention just the so-called Washington Consensus, universally recognized as ineffective, which has been forced upon the post-socialist countries.

The dissatisfaction with the answers that the mainstream economics gives to challenges of the world around us, has quickly led to the appearance of the so-called heterodoxical approaches to analyses of economic problems. Their proponents doubt the justifiability of the very effort to build the economic theory on the image and likeness of theoretical natural sciences, namely, on the axioms, with the support of logical conclusions, with broad application of mathematical techniques.³ Therefore, the simplicity of

such presuppositions (axioms) regarding peculiar nature of the human behavior on which economics as a science rests, has become the main object of criticism. Critical comments often regard the theoretical conceptions used by the current modern economic theory to characterize individual behavior and social goal-setting models.⁴ To this end, the attention is brought to the fact that the society consists of cognizant agents with own interests, whose understandings of reality may have a direct influence on it.⁵ One of the results of this predicament is the variability of the economic environment which leads to any models claiming completeness becoming quickly outdated. Finally, it underscores fallibility of ignoring non-economic factors behind economic development, cultural and political factors among them.

We cannot but accept the just criticism of many sides of “neoclassics” by representatives of heterodoxy in economic sciences. At the same time we need to understand that in its extreme form this approach inevitably leads to depriving social sciences overall of the right of existence, economic theory included in the bunch. In conditions when the possibility of scientific generalizations is rejected, only the general social analysis remains for solving practical problems. The latter is actually considered not as science but as an interdisciplinary tool that could be used to study particulars, the so-called case studies.⁶

Naturally, one of the most peculiar features of the society as an object of study lies in that conscious individuals that constitute the society interact within its structure and behave in ways that meet their own interests. Public (and economic) institutions serve as products of their activities. However, the conclusion that no stable regularities can be formed within such economic systems, and that such regularities cannot be studied in science, are not convincing at all.

The contemporary economic system is known to be fairly complex, permeated at every level with a multitude of interrelations between economic agents who act – to a large extent – independently from one another. The more

But he was undoubtedly in favor of the realistic economic science. “The realistic economy takes the opposite stand to this pure science; it is interested mostly on the world as we experience it, and in no way does it extend to studying the commercial dealings of communities of angels” (*Pigou A. C. The Economics of Welfare. L.: Macmillan and Co. 1932. P. 5–6*).

⁴ For instance, G. W. Kolodko, author of the concept of new pragmatism considers the following starting points of a standard theory too simplistic: the paradigm of maximizing wealth, the belief in rational behavior of economic agents, and their faith in that the market mechanism will guarantee effective management of economy (see: *Kolodko G. W. Truth, Errors, and Lies. Politics and Economics in a Volatile World. N. Y.: Columbia Univ. Press, 2011. P. 72*). He also criticizes the unidimensional approach that modern macroeconomics takes in discussing the problem of economic progress and identification of the same with the growth of GDP (see: *Kolodko G. W. Whither the World: The Political Economy of the Future. Palgrave Macmillan, 2014. P. 33*).

⁵ “...The conclusions drawn from economic theories become fairly quickly available to masses of economic agents and hence influence the formation of expectations. As soon as a researcher learns something about the laws of functioning of the stock market, agents immediately study these laws, and their knowledge of such laws influences their behavior. As a result the discovered laws fail to be maintained in practice” (*Полтерович В. Становление общего социального анализа // Выдающиеся экономисты современности: энциклопедия. М., 2013. С. 178*).

⁶ In the opinion of V. Polterovich, the subject matter of the general social analysis is the functioning and development of public institutions overall. The studies based on this scenario must rely on the unified database, and the common analytical tools must include statistical data processing methods (econometrics) and the game theory as an abstract discipline that explains formation of the norms of behavior (*Полтерович В. Op. cit. P. 184*).

¹ On its results see, e. g.: *Ромер Д. Высшая макроэкономика. М.: ВШЭ, 2014*.

² See: *Lucas R. Macroeconomic Priorities // American Economic Review. 2003. № 93 (1). P. 1–14*.

³ Doubts of this sort had been expressed before as well. A. Pigou, famous British economist of the first half of the 20th century conceded the possibility of existence of “pure economic theory”, but was quite ironic about the whole thing. He wrote that “...pure economic theory must study balances, and distortions of these balances among groups whose activity is called for by an indefinite variety of factors”. In addition to multiple other subdivisions, these may include the political economy of Adam Smith, where he holds in high regard the motives ascribed to the economic – or normal – man, and the Non-Smith political economy that corresponds to Lobachevsky’s geometry, which relies on hard work and hatred for gains”.

significant is the fact that despite this the market economy does not fall apart, instead showing the ability to provide a more or less orderly development. This event is enough to suggest that there exist some objective forces that guide the energies of independent participants of economic activities into some constructive course. We can assume that the existence of stable regularities in the economic sphere has something to do with the fact that different people are capable of sharing the same aspirations, and implementation of those into practice faces similar groups of limitations. Whatever we may think about it, the general economic theory is about 400 years old at least. Throughout these years many researchers came to a great multitude of useful and practical conclusions about how the market system functions.

We do not think that the above thesis of independent economic theory not having right to exist is convincing either; economic decisions in any case include value orientations, and, in many cases, political aspects as well. Undoubtedly, the human society is complex, with all its political, economic, social and cultural dimensions. But the subject of pure economic theory lies not in the isolated societal sphere but the society as a whole, albeit viewed under a special angle.

But, while the economic theory provides an economic view on the society, it cannot be fully detached from the events that are studied within other disciplines. These events, after all, had never been taken out of the subject area of economic theory. We can easily find that without referencing the system of expectations, and, consequently, the values of human beings, we cannot build the model of the consumer's choice. The main entity within the political system – the state – is not at all alien to economic theory. Neither the functioning of market economy (consider the formal factor in economic games), nor the fight against market failures, nor that the interests of separate members of the society do not match the interests of “the economic man” would be possible without the state. The attention that we pay in the theory of economics to the problem of public choice (including the part that pertains to just distribution of income), confirms convincingly that the theory in question also includes the social dimension.

This is why to get the current economic theory out of crisis, I am sure we should choose not to get rid of the deductive method based on a limited number of axioms but to overcome its institutional static character, and to define precisely its role in the system of economic, and speaking more broadly, social, sciences.

The methodological approach that combines genetical and functional analysis will help us find logic in the development of forms of economic life. It is a well-known fact that it was generally defined by Karl Marx, whose bicentennial we celebrate this year. In modern terms, the essence of this approach is the transition from a set of individual models that describe the superficial functional dependencies between the elements of the economic system, to a system of models that follow from each other and characterize the object under study at different levels of abstraction. It appears that this methodology allows us to arrive in a non-contradictory way it allows you not only to arrive at the same results as in the “neoclassical” model in terms of functional dependencies that appear on the surface of market economies, but also to reveal the main forces behind the institu-

tional dynamics that determine the formation of, and possible directions for, development of this economic system.¹

But here's something that is important to consider: Pure deductive economic theory can help the “intellectual model” of the economic system at best. I have said above that the economic theory cannot fully ignore values and political factors of public development. But these factors do not serve as subjects for special, deep study within the economic theory. They are introduced in it as axioms, in a simplified manner that can be conveniently operationalized. This is, of course, one of the reasons² why the economic theory cannot determine the precise values of parameters that characterize concrete economic systems in concrete circumstances. This is why it should be considered not as a precise reflection of an object under study but as its model only. In this lies the fundamental difference between the laws of economics and the laws of, say, mechanics. So the goal of the theory here is considerably more narrow: we need to define the coordination and interaction between the main elements of the economic system, and determine the nature and direction of institutional transformation.

Under no circumstances will the “pure economic theory” lead directly to practical recommendations that can help solve concrete problems that separate states, their integrative unions, or the global economy overall, face. The attempt to create a precise virtual copy of modern-day economy is doomed to fail, for two reasons at once.

The first reason is of purely technical character: all the efforts related to collection and processing of the information necessary for that purpose will extend beyond all imaginable limits. The second one is of principal significance, and has to do with human nature. This issue is that some of the parameters that reflect peculiar features of human behavior are in fact changeable, often unpredictably so. For instance, you cannot precisely define the character of economic expectations of members of the society, and therefore, their reactions to changing economic variables. The notion of what is optimal for the society is also ridden with ambiguity, and therefore it is impossible to predict the concrete mechanisms of group decision-making that members of the society can use to achieve whatever goals they place before themselves.

As a consequence, a certain “zone of uncertainty” is created between the model described by the pure economic theory and the real economics.³ This is what distinguishes economic theory as a social science from other natural sciences, such as, for instance, theoretical mechanics.

Therefore, there is no alternative to using simpler models based on aggregate, and, to a certain extent, heterogeneous information when it comes to adopting practical solutions. It is also fair to say that the instruments being used to this purpose cannot not have an eclectic character. It is

¹ The attempt to implement this approach was undertaken by me in: *Некипелов А. Становление и функционирование экономических институтов. От «робинзонады» до рыночной экономики, основанной на индивидуальном производстве. М.: Экономистъ, 2006; Idem. Общая теория рыночной экономики. М.: Магистр, 2017.*

² Precisely, “one of”. We cannot directly define, for instance, individual functions of utility, and the very number of variables in concrete economies is so great that it is impossible to gather all the data, let alone analyze such data.

³ See: *Nekipelov A. Nowy pragmatyzm Grzegorza W. Kolodki – alternatiwa czy uzupełnienie teorii ekonomii? // Ekonomia przyszłości. Wokół nowego pragmatyzmu Grzegorza Kolodko. Redakcja naukowa Maciej Baltowski. Warszawa: PWN, 2016.*

comprised of classical macroeconomic models, econometric developments and sociological studies. The search for optimal solutions, undoubtedly, requires considering cultural and socio-psychological peculiarities of the society, the character of political mechanisms active in this frame-

work. In other words, as we analyze concrete situations we cannot avoid using the tools of interdisciplinary analysis. Now, when it comes to the economic theory, it will play the part of a certain guiding light that helps a researcher organize his or her efforts accordingly.

R. I. Nigmatulin¹

RUSSIA AND GLOBAL CIVILIZATION

We should refuse "smuggled and barren natural philosophy"

Academician Ivan Pavlov

The Russian history was formed in extreme and unsustainable climatic conditions with the longest and the coldest winter. Self-development of the leading civilizations did not take place in a more severe environment. I remind you that because of the Gulf Stream closeness, winter in the sub-polar regions of Norway, Sweden and Finland near Oslo, Stockholm and Helsinki, where most of the population of these countries lives, is warmer than in Kiev. And the south of Canada, where most of the Canadian population lives, is on the latitude of the south of the Ukraine. The specific natural environment on the most part of the territory of Russia, sharp climatic contrasts create a kind of instability among the people. Everything is fine this year, everything is bad next year. If you are a talented master and owner (and the talented are always in the minority), you manage to survive and enjoy life, if you are not, you are a poor man and beggar.

Special conditions predetermine the "fluctuating" state of our people with a big amplitude. It seems to me that this in particular explains bitterness and cruelty in relations between people. These bitterness and cruelty have been preserved till now and are manifested, in particular, in interpretations of our history.

Russia borrowed a lot from Europe in the fields of culture, science and technologies. The first Russian scientist Lomonosov studied in Germany. But two centuries later Russia becomes a scientific and technological power, capable of the first space flight. The same takes place in culture. After listening to Italian opera, the Russians created great Russian opera. After seeing French ballet, the Russians created great Russian ballet. After seeing European sports, Russia became a sports power. Russia made a giant contribution into development of the global civilization in all fields.

Russia was the first to make an attempt to create a socialist state with free medicine and universal secondary edu-

cation, supported by state scholarships higher education and post-graduate courses. Soviet Russia built a powerful economy with powerful industry applying giant efforts and with great sacrifices, and became the second in gross output. It provided the overwhelming majority of internal consumption. The Soviet Union made a decisive contribution to defeat of Fascism. Notwithstanding the bloody state crimes in the 1920–1930s, tens of millions of people in many countries looked at the development of our country as the leader of socialism with great respect and voted for pro-Soviet Communist Parties. Even research leaders developing nuclear weapons in the United States unselfishly gave secrets to the Soviet intelligence.

Now, notwithstanding drawing nearer to European democracy and transfer to the capitalist (market) economy, the authority and influence of Russia on the development of the global civilization, in particular, productive forces, social guarantees (public health system, education), culture and science weakened greatly. And what is more, millions of people in various countries treat standards of "the Russian life" with contempt. And the matter is not only in anti-Russian propaganda. The world sees gross injustices in Russia, enormous incomes of the rich and poverty of millions, poor teachers, doctors and professors. The world sees that thousands of young citizens of Russia leave for the West to develop their talents not only because of low wages but also because of rundown and obsolete instruments and equipment. Endless and stupid reforms of education and science led to disastrous decrease of the education level and decrease of young people's intelligence together with it. More and more people are engaged not in creation or building but export of raw materials and trading in imported products – cars, smartphones, household appliances and electronics.

Russian production lost a lot of technologies for machine building, electronics, etc. We are not making machine tools. We bring from abroad nearly all high-tech products (aircrafts, cars, gas turbines, household appliances and electronics, clothing, etc.), sometimes consoling ourselves with "screwdriver plants", where all that is assembled from foreign component parts.

In connection with the difficult situation in Russia, I remind you that after the upheavals of 1917, the great academician Ivan Pavlov bitterly acknowledged in his Nobel Prize Winner speech that scientists did not have enough abilities "to look at themselves and the environment without *self-deceit*" and "present analysis of the reality ending with its *simple and clear* presentation".

¹ Research Advisor of P. P. Shirsov Institute of Oceanology RAS, member of the Presidium of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor. Author of more than 200 scientific publications, including 10 monographs: "Fundamentals of Mechanics of Heterogeneous Media", "Dynamics of Multiphase Media", "How to Equip Economy and the Power of Russia: The Analysis of the Engineer and the Mathematician" "The Crisis and the Modernization of Russia – Thirteen Theorems", "Mechanics of Continua. Kinematics. Dynamics. Thermodynamics. Statistical Dynamics" and others. Has 13 inventor's certificates. Chief Editor of the journal "Oceanology". Was awarded the Lenin Komsomol Prize, the USSR State Prize, laureate of the Award of the Government of the Russian Federation in the Field of Science and Technology. Was awarded the Order of Honor, the Order "For Merit to the Fatherland", IV degree.

Another Noble Prize Winner academician Petr Kapitza wrote in 1936 in his letter to Niels Bohr: “Scientists are mostly concerned with setting up conditions for their personal work and hate it when *wide-ranging questions are put*”.

The mentioned vices are still characteristic of the academic community. As in the beginning of the 20th century, it has not worded a *clear* and scholarly answer in figures to the question: What is to be done for the country to get out of the crisis? The question is very serious to be trusted to bureaucrats and party officials only. And the fate of the Russian Academy of Sciences should be discussed in this context, and the answer should be given by representatives of all sciences.

What should we do?

First, we should not feel hopeless. The outstanding creator of the economic miracle in post-war Germany Professor Ludwig Erhard said: “No economic situation can be so hopeless as to the decisive will and honest work of the whole nation not to be able to deal with it”.

Second, a lot should be corrected.

Some ideas about the required corrections are presented below as theses.

Economy

The current model has exhausted itself and will not allow to achieve growth.

*Assistant to the President
of the Russian Federation Andrey Belousov*

There are labour, production and raw resources in Russia to provide economic growth up to 8% per year.

Academician S. Yu. Glazyev

It's necessary to balance the economy according to macroscopic and inter-sectorial indicators for considerable economic growth (increase in efficiency of labour) and improvement of people's well-being.

Macroscopic balances are based on the balances of production costs, prices, wage fund and GDP.

Besides, it is required to balance GDP and national expenditures and social expenditures.

The only driver of the market economy (increase in efficiency of labour) is demand with paying capacity, determined by the wage fund of the 90% of working people in respect of GDP.

The salary of a Russian Professor is 10 times lower than the salary of a deputy to the Parliament. This is outrageous! The salaries and wages of only 7% of the Russian people are higher than RUB 70 thousand per month. And the salaries and wages of 50% of working people are less than RUB 20 thousand per month. Such a nation-buyer does not need economic growth. These people will not buy anything in any case. And the incomes of the richest families, making 0.4% of the population, amounts to RUB 10 trillion per year when the federal budget collects RUB 15 trillion.

In order to produce more, it's required to rightfully distribute what we already have and what is produced.

Redistribution of incomes in the interests of the middle and poor classes should be effected together with the change of correlation between prices to transfer to the balanced and just economy.

The consumer demand should moderately outrun production abilities (*Ludwig Erhard, Professor, Minister of Economic Affairs and Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany*).

Abnormal inequality slows down economic growth (*Alexey Shevyakov, Professor*).

It's impossible to revive economic growth at the expense of economy connected with decrease in demand that leads to even bigger decrease in output and employment (*Joseph Stiglitz, Noble Prize in Economic Sciences*).

National expenditures should be maintained or even increased in crisis in order to create jobs, raising taxes collected from well-to-do people (*Eric Maskin, Noble Prize in Economic Sciences*).

Reference Points for Development of Purchasing Power

1. The middle and poor classes (95% of working people) wage fund balanced with GDP should in the next 6 years grow stage-by-stage from 25% of GDP up to 50%, and then to 60% of GDP. This is a necessary condition for economic growth and social stability.

2. Stage-by-stage correction of incomes distribution in favour of the poor and middle classes.

– Taxes on super-high incomes and super-rich property.

– At the first stage 25% tax on that part of resident's income that exceeds RUB 20 million per year and 2.5% per year from that part of cadastral value that exceeds RUB 100 million. This will refer to 0.3% of the population and add about RUB 1–2 trillion per year to the state budget.

– Flat tax scale without tax declarations for the overwhelming majority of the population (99%) in the next 10 years.

– Taxes on expensive property in the United States are the basis of budgets of prosperous municipalities.

– Diversification of tax load on enterprises of various categories: working with raw materials, processing, making finished products and trading.

– Cuts in taxes for middle and small-sized enterprises.

3. Balance of wages and prices on “products for common people”.

Reference Points for Wages Compared to Products for Common People

Minimum monthly wage =

= cost of 1,000 l of petrol

= cost of 300 kg of bread

= cost of 6,000 kWh of electric energy

Average monthly wage =

= 2 minimum wages

= cost of 1 sq. m of residential space

The principal investor in the economy is the people (95% of the population), getting balanced wages and salaries.

Only residents of cities (95% of urban population) can be the main investors with paying capacity into the agriculture of the Russian Federation via buying agricultural products if they get balanced wages and salaries.

Small share of GDP to pay for labour of the main (95%) share of the population is the main obstacle for development of the country and its economy.

Fuel and electrical energy are the most expensive in the Russian Federation as to the purchasing power parity (PPP), and the share of power engineering and fuel in our GDP is the biggest among industrial countries, which is a pressure for business. Because of that stage-by-stage reduction of home prices for fuel, electrical energy and transport is required at the expense of optimization and control (including control over consumers), to wit:

- production costs and unsubstantiated investments,
- exclusion of super-high salaries and bonuses for top management, super-expensive offices,
- cuts in taxes on mining natural resources,
- and other deductions to the state budget.

Reference Points for Correlation of Prices for Products for Common People

1 liter of petrol and diesel fuel should cost about RUB 35 per liter.

The said reduction of home prices will actually become an investment in the sectors producing “products for common people” and will help increase purchasing power of the middle and poor classes.

We should refuse solution of budget problems by increase of tariffs for “common people” (fuel, energy, transport, etc.), utilization and environmental fees without bringing them in accordance with the poor and middle classes’ wages. Increase of these tariffs goes to increase of prices for “products for common people” and is covered by their consumers thus inhibiting consumer demand.

If investments in fixed capital are less than 20–25% of GDP, this means unsatisfactory work of the Government, and there should be a vote of no confidence to its economic bloc and managers of state banks. Today, investments in fixed capital amount to 17% of GDP.

Development of target crediting and control over the foreign currency market and capital outflow are necessary (*S. Yu. Glazyev*)

All GDP redistribution should be decisive but balanced and subject to correction. And redistribution should not exceed 5% of GDP per year in order not to bring about non-balanced consumer demand and anomalous inflation.

The inflation index as to “products for common people” is most important for 90% of the population of Russia – bread, vegetables, milk, meat, tariffs for housing and communal services, transport, taxes paid by the poor and middle classes.

Social Sphere

It's required to bring the GDP share referred for **social expenditures for human development** (public health, education, science, culture) from 10% up to the European level (25%) within 10 years. These expenditures should be stage-by-stage brought up to 17% of GDP already by 2022 in accordance with the table.

Expenditures, % of GDP	2017	2022
Public health	3.5	5.5
Education	4.5	8
Science/Russian Academy of Sciences	1.2/0.16	2.5/0.4
Culture and cinema	0.6	1.3

The source is incomings to budget in the form of taxes on super-richness paid by natural persons (see above), reduction of expenses on bureaucracy and means at the expense of economic growth.

Scientific analysis shows that increase of expenditures for public health in the Russian Federation from 3.5% up to 5.5% of GDP will allow to prolong lifespan from 71 to 76 years and reduce death rate from the current 12.5 down to 11. This will decrease the number of the deceased in the Russian Federation per year in absolute figures from 1.8 mln down to 1.5 mln, i. e. by 200 thousand people per year.¹

It should be understood that defense expenditures in the Russian Federation amount to 3.5% of GDP (if PPP is used that equals \$150 billion, and they amount to 2% of GDP or \$390 billion in China, 3.5% of GDP or \$700 billion in the United States). Well, we take 1% of GDP from the Army. And what happens? Russian Army should be strengthened as well, keeping our rivals in mind, after many years of insufficient financing. And super-incomes of the richest people, making 0.5% of the population, amount to about 15% of GDP.

Special attention should be paid to training engineers, especially in machine building, machine tool building, power-machinery construction, production of gas turbines and aircraft engines, IT technologies.

Home Policy

Development of democratic culture of the people and the multi-party system. Permission of election blocs of several parties.

Introduction of the voting variant “against all candidates” in ballot-papers.

Any voting is legitimate only in case of participation of more than 67% electors with the right to vote.

All voting (including to legislative bodies) in two rounds, when two candidates with the biggest number of votes are admitted to the second round.

No more than 20% of deputies can be elected from party lists.

Financing election campaigns only from the state budget according to unified standards.

Considerable reduction of the number of bureaucrats.

The Russian Federal State Statistics Service should no longer be subordinate to the Government, and its status should be similar to the status of the Chamber of Accounts.

Appointment of every minister only upon the agreement of the State Duma.

¹ Death rate (number of deaths per 1,000 people per year) in Russia like in European countries amounted to 10.5 by 1987. After the reforms in the 1990s, it increased in Russia up to 16.7, and that is supermortality. In 2003, public health system's financing started to increase considerably in the Russian Federation, and it reached 3.5% of GDP by 2015. As a result, death rate decreased down to 12.5 by 2017. From 1991 to 2017, 14 mln people died before their time in comparison with 1990.

This is the price our people paid for destruction of the socialist system and transfer to the extreme market system.

Death rate in the new EU countries (Poland, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Baltic states) was preserved at the 1990 level and approximately equals 11, and lifespan equals 76–78 years. Death rate in old EU countries decreased from 10.5 down to 9.3 after 1990, lifespan equals 78–81 years, and it is 71 years in Russia.

But in order to bring death rate only up to the 1985–1990 level, it's required to increase expenses for the public health system from 3.5% GDP (RUB 20 thousand per year per person) up to 5.5% (RUB 30 thousand), and to bring it up to the today's European level – up to 7% (RUB 40 thousand), which requires RUB 3 trillion per year.

Conclusion

We'll be able to achieve our goals only after creating just rules in internal affairs, to wit, in economy and state system, step-by-step re-allotting national income for its just and optimal distribution for economic growth. Only in this way we'll be able to strengthen our sovereignty, defense potential, strengthen our production forces, improve intelli-

gence and the standard of living of our people. It's required to take the society, economy and technologies development laws into account for that. And to achieve positive attitude of citizens of the country to their state leaders and for them to think that brains and justice rule in our country. Only then Russia will be able to become stronger and have a positive and effective impact on the global civilization development.

S. A. Oskolkov¹

THE TIME-BINDING THREAD... ABOUT THE ROLE OF ARTS IN THE DIALOGUE OF CULTURES

The real history of our civilization is, first of all, the history of arts. Scientific discoveries, even the greatest of them, are sometimes overshadowed and even cancelled by the following discoveries and inventions. Periods, social, political and economic systems of the societies and states change, wars and destructions are replaced by peace and construction, countries and people are getting either rich or poor. Only arts in their variety and richness perform as the carrier of human memory and are not subjected to inflation and oblivion.

The great and common manifestations of artistic creativity from cave drawings to today's graffiti, from Ancient Greek, Ancient Roman and Judean music, the evidences of which have been miraculously preserved, from the Znamenny (plain) chant to electronic experiments by Karlheinz Stockhausen, uncountable paintings, poems, musical opuses make the priceless treasury of our civilization.

The Arts have been the invariable thread connecting times and generations through wars and revolutions, changes of periods and beliefs. Neither production relations, nor economy, nor politics but exactly the arts and culture provide sustainable evolutionary existence of the humankind. The classical thesis about "the basis and the superstructure" interprets the so-called superstructure too vulgarly, referring such important aspects of the society as the systems of law, the forms of state systems, religion and, most important, arts and literature to it as "secondary".

Everything is transient in our world: kingdoms and realms, empires and republics... Common people, great rulers, whole nations come to this world and leave for the eternity, one generation is replaced by another. But, creations of artists (often unknown) that lived and worked near them, stay as evidences of their being on the Earth. Isn't this richness the real basis of the society in all times and eras?

The nature of unbending creative spirit of great masters is incognizable and unexplainable as well as long-suffering and perseverance of common servants of the Muses. Neither poverty, nor humiliations by the powerful could make

them leave the chosen way of creativity. Surely, there were examples in history and not once, when influential rulers and patrons created working conditions for artists and musicians that lived at the same time with them. But, we remember even the majestic Medici family mostly because Michelangelo, Botticelli, Benvenuto Cellini, Rafael, Tiziano Vecellio created "for them"... And who remembers the name of the Kurfürst, to whom the great Bach, caring for his choristers, humbly presented his genius work – the Mass in B minor – accompanied by the letter with the following text: "Your Highness the Kurfürst, the most gracious master! I present your Royal Highness this humble work in my deep respect to you, it was created with my skills attained by me in music. I ask you as your loyal subject to look at it with your benevolent eyes not because of the poor composition but because of your world-known mercy and take me under your Highness' protection..."? Joseph Haydn in his "Farewell" Symphony tried to bring about the patron Prince Esterházy's compassion or at least pity to the musicians of his Chapel... The Count of Colloredo kicked Mozart downstairs only because he handed in his resignation wishing to leave the service that was a burden for him... Many artists lived and died in poverty, fully dependent on favour or disfavour of rulers – but their pictures in our times are sold at auctions for millions of dollars... The history of arts is rich in such examples.

But the most important thing is that the spiritual storehouse of the humankind is steadily filled in with new and new chef d'oeuvres. Notwithstanding the illusiveness of life prospects, artistic professions inevitably attract numerous detachments of amazing individuals, wishing to dedicate their lives to serving the creativity.

Arts do not know chronology. They are always contemporary if we perceive them today and now. One unimportant moment separates us in the history of the world from the finished *Madonna* by Raphael or *La Gioconda* by Leonardo, Symphony No. 40 by Mozart or *The Rite of Spring* by Stravinsky, *Romeo and Juliet* by Shakespeare or *The Master and Margarita* by Bulgakov... The great creations of human genius are always actual and up-to-date.

Arts keep memories: memories of various periods, various nations, and various traditions. All of them appear in front of us clearly visible, in a live dialogue, in direct interconnection and never-fading relevance via great creations.

However, there are times when some or the other chef d'oeuvres are forgotten and not acknowledged as numer-

¹ Head of the Audio Engineering Department of Saint-Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, Professor, Honored Worker of Higher Professional Education of the Russian Federation, Honored Artist of the Russian Federation. He wrote about a hundred works of various genres, including three operas, three musicals, three cantatas, two concertos for piano and symphony orchestra, two string quartets, eight piano sonatas, many vocal cycles on poems by the Russian poets, a number of compositions for folk instruments, music for theater and cinema. S. A. Oskolkov is a member of the Union of Composers of Russia, a member of the Interregional Union of Concert Community of the Russian Federation. Professor Emeritus of SPbUHS.

ous achievements of ancient masters were not in demand in the diversified and outstanding culture of the Middle Ages, later their discovery brought about a humanistic outburst in the Renaissance. There are times when some or the other chef d'oeuvres are inaccessible because they are located far, it is difficult to lay the road to other lands, other nations. Thus, achievements of Eastern masters were for a long time unknown and alien to Western connoisseurs, and Western achievements were unknown and incomprehensible for Eastern people.

And only now, in today's globalized world, we finally and fully acquire the universal timeless community that arts keep in their real essence. Now, we are able to appreciate the arts' uniting, preserving potential, giving the humankind the actual cognition of the eternal value of its own achievements in the aggregate.

The today's pluralistic and dialogue-focused consciousness allows us to encompass all the variety of artistic traditions and achievements by our eyes. At the same time, modern achievements of science and technologies eliminate the problem of distance – both historical and spatial. Now, the story of young Bach, who travelled for hundreds of kilometers to listen to famous organist Dieterich Buxtehude, seems a curious incident: now one click of the computer mouse is enough to find yourself in a concert hall or an opera theatre, in any city of the world, to listen, watch and enjoy the arts of great actors. The information being of interest to us, the results of historical research, with numerous illustrations creating the feeling of real presence, are becoming accessible to us within several seconds.

But there are not only limitless fruitful opportunities and prospects opening for us now, when we entered the digital technologies era, but also numerous dangers and problems. These dangers affect the very development of arts, their actual movement especially strong. They present us rich materials from the past, but aren't they fraught with negative impact on the arts' moving to the future? Shouldn't we pay special attention to these dangers in order to avoid suspension of the artistic process?

Score editors helped a lot in the work on musical scores, the work of sound engineers has been visualized (now, we do not just hear but also "see" sounds). When composers and arrangers got virtual tools, they acquired an opportunity to listen to the score in all its orchestral colours. Animated cartoon designers acquired an operating tool for creation of their moving pictures. A new profession of multimedia director appeared. It is impossible to list even one hundredth of all advantages provided to us by digital technologies...

The backside of this inspiring picture is the danger of sliding down to dilettantism in the worst sense of the idea

by representatives of a number of professions. The likeness of a musical or visual product made with the help of computer and a real work of art generates an illusion of skills and mastering the profession in case of its creator. People having no ideas about elementary music basics (to say nothing about numerous specific professional disciplines such as harmony, polyphony, musical form, science of instruments and instrumentation, history of music, etc.) are now "making" (a widespread expression!) music for movies and theatre and arrogantly calling themselves composers.

The development of technologies, making achievements of arts and culture of various nations and periods so easily accessible for the first time, and so strongly enriching and simplifying the creative process, unexpectedly turns into loss of interest to this easily accessible material, even negation of its value as if exactly the simplicity is the obstacle for high evaluation. Modern young people referring themselves to creative professions under-rate achievements of the past and are fixed upon the future. However, fixing upon the future, not established in the past, they may deprive themselves of this future in essence. That is how another side of the fact that arts are "the time-binding thread" is revealed: the future is impossible without the past.

The reason of such ungrounded self-conceit of many young people in our country, pursuing an occupation in the field of arts, is troubled times in the 1990s, when this "time-binding thread" was actually torn for reasons independent of them. One of the fundamental principles of the cultural society was lost – the principle of succession of generations. After the disintegration of the Soviet Union, when the new state system was looked for, the life experience of the older generation, accumulated in the course of decades of fruitful work, turned out to be not required. The younger generation mostly focused on Western cultural values (and often more likely "pseudo-values") began negating everything that was "before them".

But the idea of succession is inalienably connected with the idea of culture, and each new generation just has to learn the experience of the generations that are already gone and leaving in order to have prospects for further development and renewal basing on traditions.

I am looking into the future with optimism as I am sure that self-conceit related to development of technologies, simplicity of communications as well as gaps of the 1990s will be overcome sooner or later, "the time-binding thread" will be restored, creative people, really interested in their artistic development will preserve their high professionalism, and Arts and Culture will be rightfully the "basis" of our society.

V. Prodanov¹

THE FOURTH INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION AND THE RISE OF THE DIGITAL RISK SOCIETY

The risk society idea was developed initially in 1986 by Ulrich Beck, and it became popular later.² First of all it is related to the unpredictable consequences of new scientific discoveries. Their quick implementation as well as globalization is a prerequisite for the rise of the global risk society. However, currently, when digital economy of the Fourth Industrial Revolution grows, we can rephrase this idea as the rise of the digital risk society.

The Fourth Industrial Revolution actively unrolled when the 2008 crisis began. It is based on robotics and artificial intelligence, 3D printing and the Internet, things related to development of the Mobile Internet, quantum computers, synthetic biology, economy based on waste recycling, renewable power sources as well as development of digital economy and e-states. It is characterized by the growing convergence processes of physical, social, biological spheres and exponential acceleration of the rates of changes taking place.

According to all analyses and forecasts, this leads to several fundamental consequences, which will cardinally change the world economy and politics over the next decade. The first consequence is automation and considerable reduction of requirements in unskilled and cheap labour, when competitive advantages of such countries as Bulgaria disappear, and it's not accidental that investments in our country are already declining, and there is a global trend of return of big companies to developed countries. The second consequence is new technologies' not requiring a transit globalization stage to realize respective production. They reduce global production chains. The third consequence is increase of uncertainty, fears, dangers originating as a result of these technologies' application, leading to boost of anti-global sentiments. The fourth consequence is origination of opposite prerequisites: on the one hand, increase of inter-dependence of people, growth of information exchange and cooperation, and, on the other hand, expansion of opportunities for big companies and control over each step of individuals, blurring of borders between the public and the individual.

The Fourth Industrial Revolution changes the social structure of society, increasing the gap between workforce supply and demand, and more and more people lose their jobs as a result of labour automation leading to reduction of the required unskilled labour. On the one hand, the Revolution substantially increases produced wealth, but

on the other hand, it requires less and less manpower because of labour automation. For example, it's well-known that every year thousands of seasonal emigrants from Eastern Europe go to the United Kingdom in order to make money at the harvest time collecting agricultural products. At the same time, they already started using robots in some farms for the same agricultural activities, and robots don't need rest, it's all the same for them if they work in the daytime or at night, they don't care about the length of the working day, they don't present any claims to employers.³ The same trend can be seen in many other fields: in traditional industrial production, defence industry, the growing part of the service industry.

The consequence of this process is a higher level of technological unemployment. But when people lose their value as workforce or military force, the existing economic and political system no longer requires them. This leads to the growth of the segment of the segregated and chronically unemployed, which makes a dangerously explosive mixture, capable of leading to increase in the number of crimes, mass protests, conflicts, riots, terrorism, intensification of disintegration processes in various regions of the world.

Creation of a common information space leads to a completely new state of affairs in case of traditional ideological tools and cultural hegemony by way of which statehood was established at various stages of human development. It transforms politics as well at the rates unseen before, creating digital prerequisites for any traditional ideology's functioning: liberalism, conservatism, socialism, communism, etc.

Liberal and neoliberal technological optimism dominated in the 1990s and early 21st century. However, it is currently in crisis, attacked from various, often opposite, directions.

The first of these directions is crypto anarchy or digital anarchy, a kind of digital manifestation of traditional leftist anarchy. The so-called crypto anarchists are becoming more and more popular – groups of hackers with negative attitude to the existing states, trying to warn about the dangers in the world, where everything is connected online. They are sure that digital technologies can create a society free from state chains, as it's possible with their help to undermine governments' ability to watch, control and tax the population. With this goal in mind, crypto analysts work out computer codes to protect people online. It's said in "The Crypto Anarchist Manifesto" presented by Timothy May at the crypto anarchists meeting in 1992 that "A specter is haunting the modern world, the specter of crypto anarchy. Computer technology is on the verge of providing the ability for individuals and groups to communicate and interact with each other in a totally anonymous manner. Two persons may exchange messages, conduct business, and negotiate electronic contacts without ever knowing the True Name, or legal identity, of the other". This is

¹ Director of the Thracian Scientific Institute, Professor of the Department of Political Economy of the University of National and World Economy (Sofia), corresponding member of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Principal Secretary of the Bulgarian Philosophical Society (1978–1989), Director of the Institute of Philosophical Sciences (1988–1992) and the Institute of Philosophical Research of the BAS (1995–2010). Author of more than 500 scientific publications, including 22 monographs: "Cognition and values", "Biosocial values", "Bioethics", "Civil society and global capitalism", "Global changes and the destiny of Bulgaria", "Violence in the modern era", "The future of philosophy", "Sociology of philosophy", "The theory of Bulgarian transition", "System cycles and future of history: Where is the world heading", etc. Member of the editorial boards of a number of scientific journals. Public intellectual and author of hundreds of papers in mass media.

² Beck U. Risikogesellschaft. Auf dem Weg in eine andere Moderne. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1986.

³ Chaffin J. Farm robots ready to fill Britain's post-EU labour shortage // Financial Times. 2017. 25 Apr.

viewed by crypto anarchists as means to free from dependence on the state.¹

It's well-known that Julian Assange is a crypto anarchist and before the WikiLeaks case he was an active member of one of the most influential of such groups. It is surmised that Edward Snowden is also connected with them. Opposing themselves to monetary systems controlled by the state, they use crypto currencies like Bitcoin that are beyond state control, and transactions, in which they are used, are impossible to follow and tax. It's becoming difficult for states to follow new forms of online crimes as such hacker groups distribute various ciphering tools in the free access area and create the so-called Dark Net – the network of closed websites, which are practically impossible to control.²

The second anti-systemic direction is conservative and populist. It mainly relies not on weakening but strengthening of the state as a way of overcoming the existing contradictions. Its most vivid manifestation was Donald Trump winning the Presidential election in the United States, attributed to a large extent by his extensive use of social networks as Twitter, which turned out to be more influential than traditional media giants like *The New York Times* and CNN, which were until then considered very powerful and on which his opponent Hillary Clinton relied. Globally this trend looks even more striking in various versions, manifestations of which could be seen in China, Turkey and Russia before the USA. In any case, social media support anti-systemic forces on the left and the right more and more, as they are not controlled to the same extent as traditional mass media, most of which support the neoliberal status quo.

Traditional educational and mass media systems can be relatively easily monopolized by the state or big corporations and thus their main contents can be affected. Currently, billions of people are drawn into digital space and social networks, everything is decentralized, anyone can become a source of information, which is then reproduced, often attracting millions of users, especially if it is uploaded to video sharing platforms such as YouTube. Various interested groups and states can place such information, and that, on the one hand, leads to a great volume of various data that can hardly be verified, processed and interpreted by an individual; on the other hand, it leads to all kinds of descriptions, interpretations and concepts; and, third, to information wars among various groups and forces, especially in connection with the increasing multipolarity and the world system's crisis as a whole. In recent years, these crisis processes of capitalism generated hysteria that the world is entering the age of "fake news" and "post-truth". Thus, the initial optimism related to our entering the information society and knowledge society with new technologies, is being replaced by pessimism that this trend rather leads to the creation of disinformation society and ignorance society.

A typical example of that is Wikipedia, which was originally viewed as a democratic way of free of charge creation of a giant global encyclopedia, where it is possible to get information practically about everyone and everything. The project was launched in 2001, at the peak of the global neoliberal universal ideology, prevailing in the United

States, after announcement that other ideologies went bankrupt and there was one truth left that would lead the world forward. Originally, Wikipedia functioned within the framework of traditional encyclopedias, the articles for it were written by selected experts in each field. However, that turned out to be a task beyond the strength of the participants, and in several years it turned into something, in creation of which anyone can take part, i. e. the Wikipedia of our times. Everything offered in it was declared scientifically neutral as information in academic encyclopedias. The problem was that every encyclopedia of social sciences and humanities is based on some aggregate of values and world view, and it selects and interprets some facts in a certain way, while ignoring or alternatively interpreting others.

In 2014, a group of scholars from Harvard researched Wikipedia and established that politically and ideologically it was really much more biased than traditional encyclopedias in treating liberal interpretation of reality.³ Thus, the crisis of liberal universal order and the movement towards multipolarity influenced the attitude towards Wikipedia. Various alternative encyclopedic websites sprang into life, they used their own terms and interpretations, claiming to present true interpretations and truths on this or that topic. Right wing forces started blaming Wikipedia for falling under the influence of trolls and authors oriented in a certain way and presenting wrong data and interpretations.

American Theodore Robert Beale professionally known as Vox Day, a representative of the right wing supporting Trump, announced that Wikipedia got under the influence of the left-wing forces (the right-wing in American political life usually brand the progressives and liberals as left-wing) and he decided to create an alternative to it, which would offer the true, in his opinion, rightist interpretations. Using the MediaWiki program from Wikipedia he built his website Infogalactic and began providing alternative descriptions of facts, events, biographical information. For example, if one individual is characterized in Wikipedia as a "conspiracy theorist", he is described on Infogalactic as a bestselling author, independent journalist, etc. Thus, the struggle between Trump and his liberal opponents turned into a struggle of alternative digital encyclopedias.

However, a number of other encyclopedias appeared together with Wikipedia and Infogalactic, offering their own alternative interpretations, backed by various different groups.

Metapedia appeared and started offering alternative encyclopedic articles about persons, events, processes, related to extreme right-wing views of white nationalists, anti-Semites and neo-Nazi, denying the Holocaust, anti-American and Euro-centric oriented. It is distributed in 16 languages and especially popular in Hungary and Germany. There is also Conservapedia, offering facts and interpretations according to religious conservative views of the world order.

After the notions of "fake news" and "post-truth" became popular starting from 2016, as characteristics of digital space, the audience of these alternative reference and encyclopedic publications started growing rapidly. A powerful opposition to Wikipedia interpretations appeared and it's becoming stronger and stronger, and claiming to be a reli-

¹ May T. The Crypto Anarchist Manifesto. URL: <https://www.activism.net/cyberpunk/crypto-anarchy.html>. 1992

² Bartlett J. Forget far-right populism – crypto-anarchists are the new masters // The Guardian. 2017. June 4.

³ Trick W. Wikipedia Is More Biased Than Britannica, but Don't Blame the Crowd // Harvard Business Review. URL: <https://hbr.org/2014/12/wikipedia-is-more-biased-than-britannica-but-dont-blame-the-crowd> (date of access: 03.12.2014).

able information source, offering true and universal knowledge in contrast to it. It was similar to what happened to American mass media, which Trump accused of lies. Alternative tools have been created saying what is true and what is not.

Digital space lost its neutrality charm and turned into a field of battle where perception of post-truth and fake news dominates. All accuse each other in not having reliable sources of information and checked up facts. For example, one of the critical comments about Wikipedia texts related to today's processes, is that they are based on such sources as *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post*, viewed as the main tools of the liberal status quo.¹ Thus, there is no consensus any more as to reliability of sources that make one fact exactly a fact. Existence of a centralized nucleus of people, offering us truths and facts, was challenged. In this sense, the trend of ideological disintegration of the previously dominant neoliberal consensus, is reflected in the new digital public space in new forms and on a new scale.

The previous technological revolutions lead to a change in the space, in which most wars were fought – from land to sea and air and to space. Now, digital space is becoming the main field of battle. Entering the digital network realm is loaded with contrasts, it opens new opportunities thanks to the networks we join, but at the same time makes states and other subjects much more vulnerable. The more developed the digital space you have at your disposal is, the stronger you become, but the more vulnerable as well – exactly that may be called “a network paradox”. Relatively small groups, including terrorist networks and hackers, can get power, which states do not have, destroy and curtail economies, steal giant amounts of money, carry out propaganda wars. With the increase of data volume and artificial intelligence development, we can imagine such a prospect when one individual, a perfect master of algorithms, can win over a state having the biggest and well-equipped army. The fact that the “cool war” is again combined with a Cold War between the USA and Russia as well as growing tensions between the USA and China, help to aggravate conflicts.

New technologies carry a number of new previously non-existent dangers at each stage of their development. The most typical example of that is transport development. In the last century, cars became the most popular means of transportation, but annually about 1.25 mln people die in traffic accidents (only in recent years), and the number of injured ranges from 20 to 50 mln.² Nuclear energy is another example. Approximately 500 nuclear reactors currently being in use in various countries of the world, produce energy vital for millions of people. But at the same time, thousands of nuclear bombs can wipe the humankind off the face of the Earth. That's exactly the state of affairs to

which the Fourth Industrial Revolution leads us with its total digitalization of all spheres of social life. The difference is only in the magnitude of impact, being the consequence of total inter-dependence and the fact that not only the state but also individuals or groups of people can become initiators, creates the feeling of increasing danger present in the surrounding world.

Cyber attacks in 2017 blocked more than 100,000 thousand organizations in 150 countries around the world, from hospitals to mobile operators and state institutions, including such as, for example, the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia. The Russian Kaspersky Lab (anti-virus software developer) found malware programs in 27% of industrial world systems in 2016 alone.³ A notice appeared on the screens of infected computers with blocked information that it was necessary to transfer money in the form of digital currency of Bitcoins in case if you wanted to restore your information. Here we're speaking about practically total virus spreading. The more one society is computerized, the more it is vulnerable. An important factor here is that in contrast to previous battles, this attack is anonymous and it's difficult to find the real initiator, leading to mutual accusations by states with strained relations.

There are more and more attacks against business structures, especially financial organizations and companies in the service industry. Financial structures on average become objects of cyber attacks 65% more often than other business organizations. In 2016, financial institutions were attacked 200 million times, which is 29% more than in 2015. The first five places according to the type of attacked companies are taken by those engaged in retail trade, health services, manufacture, financial services, information and communication services.⁴

The goal of e-governance and e-government is to improve the functioning of global institutions, but at the same time it makes them more vulnerable than the governments that existed over the previous historical period. Thus, wars between states acquire a more and more digital character, as they target all aspects of the opponent's infrastructure which are now inter-connected via the new technologies. At the same time, viruses and tools, developed by states to fight their opponents, can end up in the hands of other states or individuals that was demonstrated by the cyber attack in 2017, when the Wanna Cry virus, developed by the CIA, was stolen.

The Fourth Industrial Revolution expands the scale of vulnerability and poses a dilemma for states and certain institutions as to how to react to the challenges of the digital risk society – either isolate themselves and maximize the digital sovereignty in order to avoid invasions and attacks, or sharply increase the magnitude of control over every individual, putting an end to traditional separation of public and personal life.

¹ Fitts A. S. Welcome to the Wikipedia of the Alt-Right // Wired. URL: <https://www.wired.com/story/welcome-to-the-wikipedia-of-the-alt-right/> (date of access: 21.06.2017).

² Road traffic injuries // World Health Organization. URL: <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs358/en/> (date of access: 31.05.2017).

³ Добрев А. Апокалипсис с име на компютърен вирус. URL: <http://glasove.com/categories/komentari/news/apokalipsis-s-ime-na-kompyutren-virus> (date of access: 15.05.2017).

⁴ Cooney M. IBM: Financial services industry bombarded by malware, security threats // Network World. URL: <http://www.networkworld.com/article/3192927/security/ibm-financial-services-industry-bombarded-by-malware-security-threats.html> (date of access: 27.04.2017).

H. M. Reznik¹

THE POLITICAL CULTURE OF POST-SOVIET RUSSIA: HISTORICAL CONTINUITY AND TRANSFORMATION

The discussion of the place of Russia in world history, the ratio of the Western and Eastern civilization values in the culture of the country, its special way and destiny, which never stopped in the Russian philosophy before the October Revolution and was interrupted by the Bolshevik regime, revived again after the USSR disintegration. It has become keener in the recent decade because in the environment of Russia's confrontation with the West, the authorities strive in their foreign and home policy to find a foundation in the cultural and historical traditions of the country.

The main vital issues of the correlation of power and property, state and individual were solved in the multi-century history of Russia differently from Europe and the United States. This does not require detailed proof and substantiation. It's just enough to compare: the English Great Charter and the United States Bill of Rights are respectively more than 800 and 300 years old – the serfdom was flourishing just 150 years ago in Russia and Soviet totalitarian regime collapsed only one quarter of a century ago.

But it's not fruitful and even risky to explain the current realities by a special civilization code, strictly programming the public psychology from the ancient times. According to Norbert Wiener, the longer the way, the lesser the weight. The course of history accelerated. Political culture can considerably transform, behavioral scenarios can become various under the impact of changes in the way of life, urbanization and globalization processes, interaction with the institutional structure.

Thus, contrasting Russian collectivism and Western individualism has become a stable stereotype. It fed on the ideas of conciliarism and collegiality in the period before the October Revolution. A. Khomyakov, the leader of the Slavophiles, wrote that "The spirit of consent and brother's love is typical for Russian life, while Western life is war of all against all". The Bolshevik regime announced collectivism to be the state ideology, individualism was blamed as manifestation of backwardness and antisocial egoism. Dropping ideological blinders, acknowledgement of human rights and freedoms as the highest value in the Russian Constitution did not change the notions fixed in the public views and ideas that individualism can't become the dominating world outlook within the framework of Russian political culture as it goes against the national archetype. In recent years, V. Putin acknowledges such an outlook, say-

ing in particular on the Russia Today TV channel that "the basis of American self-consciousness is the individualistic idea, and the basis of Russian one is the collectivistic idea", because of which "it's sometimes difficult for us to understand each other".

But historical facts clearly don't interfere into such a cliché, besides being ideologically tinted. Collectivism and individualism supplemented each other in recent Western history. All West European countries had an agricultural way of life some time in the past, and peasant communities originated everywhere naturally. As the Western society "mutated", urbanism developed and strengthened, the property relations changed, collectivism in human relations was not lost but took the forms corresponding to urban life – shops of craftsmen, guilds of traders, inns and collegiums of lawyers, religious communities and trade unions of workers later. The free will of collectivism strengthened – in accordance with convictions, inclinations and interests of the people. And currently, the state of affairs in cases of public solidarity, people trusting each other, local self-government, volunteers and charity, trade union movement is much better in the West. At the same time, individualism dominates with its values of freedom, rivalry and personal success. That turns out to be "collectivism of individuals".

The history played an evil joke on Russian political culture. While social class and feudal ties weakened in Western Europe, tsarist Russia was stuck in the Middle Ages – serfdom enslaved the natural rural community, turned voluntary association of plowmen into a forced one. The half-hearted Emancipation Reform of 1861 did not solve this problem. After peasant riots of 1904–1906, the unsolved agrarian issue, the necessity to change the form of land ownership was already understood by many educated statesmen. As P. A. Stolypin said in front of the State Duma in 1908–1910, "Is it really forgotten... that the colossal experience in guardianship over a giant part of our population already failed and seriously failed... According to our concepts, it's not the land that should own humans but humans should own land... Free labour and not forced, our land won't be able to compete with our neighbours' land".

The Bolshevik regime did not allow to apply free labour to land. And what is more, liquidation of private property and total nationalization of economy enslaved all working people – not only in villages but in cities as well. All working people became slaves of the state – the only property owner in the USSR. Frail sprouts of civil society just born in tsarist Russia in the 20th century were crushed. The state took all spheres of human vital activities under its control, turned citizens into its subjects, achieved their alienation from interests related to recognition of political and economic rights and freedoms. Natural human rights were treated as a bourgeois invention, the law was defined in keeping with positivism like any law, to which the will of the ruling class is raised. The urban and rural proletariat was hypocritically called that, while really a new ruling class was created – nomenclature, or functionaries in key admini-

¹ Vice-President of the Federal Chamber of Lawyers, Cand. Sc. (Law), Honoured Lawyer of Russia. President of the chamber of lawyers of Moscow (2002 – February 2015). Author of more than 300 publications on the theory of law, criminal law and procedure, criminology, including monographs: "The Personality of the Criminal: the legal and the criminological content", "On defining crime", "Attorney: the Prestige of the Profession", "The internal belief in the evaluation of evidence", "When liability comes", "The constitutional right to be protected", "Honour. Dignity. Business reputation: disputes involving the media", "Contradictions of Urbanization and Crime", etc. Vice-President of the International Union (Association) of lawyers. Member of the Council on the issues of improving justice under the President of the Russian Federation. He was awarded with the Gold Medal of F.N. Plevako, badges of honour "Recognition by the Public" and "Symbol of Freedom"; the highest legal award in Russia – Themis Award, National Lawyers Award "For Honour and Merit". Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS.

nistrative posts. Personal initiative was suppressed in every possible way, except taking upon oneself higher obligations to fulfill state planned tasks ahead of time. The basis of Soviet totalitarian regime is: everything should move forward exclusively by bosses' initiatives and ventures.

That's why the word "individualism" became nearly a swearword for many decades. Collectivism was praised mostly as an ability of Soviet people to unite around the Party and Government and sacrifice their personal interests to building bright future and fighting enemies.

It would be a mistake to explain long existence of such an unnatural economy in the country, excluding any possibility for an individual to take care of his/her well-being himself/herself, by only giant natural resources of the country. A new man was required for such economic activities, and the Bolshevik authorities engaged in his creation. And it should be acknowledged that they achieved unquestionable success on that way. Permanent repressions, the Iron Curtain, elimination of other information sources except the Party radio and newspapers and later TV, constant propagandist brainwashing did their work. And if Bulgakov in his *The Master and Margarita* could assess the residents of Moscow of the 1920s through Woland as common people just spoiled by the apartment issue, Soviet people did not already satisfy this characteristic after collectivization and repressions of the 1930s.

Surely, there is a big variety of human types in real life. But the image of an average Soviet individual as seen by analysts with various political orientations – prominent public figures, scientists, writers – was allotted such qualities as standardized ideological conscience; lack of initiative and evasion of personal responsibility; indifference to results of one's labour; paternalism; submission to authorities, resigned obedience to any boss orders; lowered ambitions; low level of social aspirations; readiness to staunchly endure life hardships; inclination to hard drinking. At the same time, there was the feeling of participation in solution of the grand task of building the just Communist society, pride of one's state, winning once and again on the international scene, successfully opposing hostile capitalist surroundings.

Finally, the Homo Sovieticus type was formed by the victory in the Great Patriotic War, strengthened by making the nuclear and hydrogen bombs, Yuri Gagarin's flight into space. Perceiving oneself as a small part of the giant force, in front of which the whole world trembles, compensated poverty, poor households, total shortage of products for a Soviet individual. Socialist equality ("everyone lives like that", "equal parts for everyone") also helped to endure financial difficulties.

The USSR disintegration, break-up of the totalitarian economic system dealt not only an economic but also a moral and psychological blow on the overwhelming majority of the population. The strong Socialist power turned into a totalitarian monster in the state propaganda, on pages of printed mass media, which immediately transformed, and a Soviet man with his blown-up "victor's complex" turned into a nobody, Homo Sovieticus made a fool of by Communist and Soviet authorities. Wild capitalism originated, and energetic and enterprising fellow citizens, who managed to enter the practically unregulated market, psychology of social Darwinism to which haughtiness and boorishness were added, widespread. The aphorism "If you're so wise, why

are you so poor?", ascribed to the Americans, was widely circulated.

Such a turn in the world outlook, when money and ability to make it were announced the main values instead of labour, knowledge, education, social justice, could not be accepted by the population of Russia – mostly those who worked for the state and were paid from the state budget. A simple truth though forgotten by the reformers was revealed – no nation can reconcile itself with national humiliation, people need not only bread to sustain them, they need to be proud of their country, they need glorified heroic past, which may even be mythical, it's difficult for them to part with illusions, "golden dreams" evoked by utopia that had been in power.

That's why discrediting the 70-year way endured by the country, with the lack of social, including educational psychotherapy called to soften the most difficult consequences of the "shock therapy" in economy, was taken by the Soviet people as spitting at them, their fathers and grandfathers, the life they lived.

These public sentiments were detected by V. Putin during the first year of his Presidential term: the offered by him and later adopted state symbols – state coat of arms, state flag and national anthem – were intended to bring the ideas of succession in the country's existence, to stand in a sense under political feuds and quarrels that shook the history of Russia: the Bolsheviks announced complete break-up with the Russian Empire and intention to destroy it down to the foundation; the Constitution of the Russian Federation of 1993 announced recognition of human rights and freedoms the highest value, introduced prohibition to establish any ideology as state and obligatory, and thus fully renounced the ideocratic Soviet regime.

Russia always was, is and will be a great power – the Russian people responded to this presentation, which the Kremlin started promoting in foreign and home policy. Opposing the United States on the international scene, protection of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, intervening into the conflict in Syria, support of Russian-speaking secessionists in the Ukraine, annexation of Crimea, rearmament of the Army, menacing military rhetoric, softening attitude to Stalin ("he should not be excessively demonized") – all that was called "getting up from the knees" by the official propaganda, picked up by masses of people, Putin's approval rating breaks all records no matter the economic recession in the country. Soviet features of a today's Russian did not disappear – we can tighten our belts for the greatness of the country.

Social surveys fixed patriotic upsurge in all strata of the population, including variously politically oriented people, and structural changes in economy strengthened during the third V. Putin's Presidential term together with that: the share of private business steadily declined and the state's role increased. The Federal Antimonopoly Service (FAS) informed in its report that state monopoly capitalism was established in Russia, the state and state companies increased their contribution to GDP twice over ten years, from 35% in 2005 up to 70% in 2015, the number of state and unitary enterprises tripled over the recent three years, and according to FAS assessments, they are "the main enemies of competition on local markets".

The state is the biggest employer in contemporary Russia. A half of the working people work for it directly or in-

directly. For comparison: there are only 17% in the USA, and the authorities evaluate that as a too heavy load on the budget.

Nationalization of the economy is a worrisome trend in two aspects: competition is limited and efficiency of commodity markets reduces, corruption multiplies; paternalist sentiments inherited from the Soviet period are conserved and additionally fed.

Historical development highlighted a governing law, which is principally not argued by anyone: *ceteris paribus*, the economy based on competition of private owners is more efficient than state capitalism. Private property does not obligatory make the state flourishing but there is not a single example yet when liquidation of the free market could provide a worthy life for the people.

Collectivism and individualism should not be made to collide and played as ideological cards. Both of them are important and common to all mankind. Individualism with

its idea of the society as an aggregate of individuals with equal rights and equal virtues is the most important catalyst for world civilization development. Collectivism appeals to the necessity to protect the weak, guarantee the minimum living conditions, calls for social solidarity. Collectivism should not be forced. Development of civil society, non-commercial, first of all volunteer and human rights organizations, expansion of jurisdiction of jury courts are urgent for today's Russia. The mainstream movement is expanding opportunities for self-realization, basing on one's own strength, desacralization of the state, understanding it not as some sacred high power but an employed administration, an agent for the society.

The history of Russia is multifaceted. No traditions predestine its future. The society itself decides what to take from the past and what to part with – but not forget in order not to repeat. We only have not to make a mistake in choosing.

N. S. Safronov¹

THE ARTS AS A FORM AND SPHERE OF THE DIALOGUE OF CULTURES

The arts are a special subsystem of the spiritual life of the society, where the artist realizes himself, creatively reproducing the reality in some or the other artistic images.

The special place among the numerous functions of the arts (aesthetic, social, compensatory, hedonistic, cognitive, prognostic, educational) is occupied by the function, which is rather rarely mentioned in textbooks and reference books – the communicative function. Today, in the environment of fierce confrontation between various states, military and political blocks, leaders of some countries, this function of the arts is becoming especially important. There are objective prerequisites for its realization. First, the arts are referred to cultural universals, i. e. elements, inherent to any culture both in diachronic (from primitive culture to contemporary culture) and synchronic (any of the cultures existing at present, from primitive to developed, has some or the others forms of arts) aspects. Second, the arts satisfy the natural need in dialogical digestion of both the culture of other nations and universal heritage. Third, the arts integrate and synthesize both national and cultural special features of a certain country, ethnoses, and universal values.

It should be noted that the arts, as the history shows, can perform communicative functions even in the areas not directly connected with artistic processes. For example, *La Gioconda* was not included in the one hundred chef d'oeuvres of the Louvre Museum until it was stolen on Au-

gust 21, 1911. That raised hell in mass media and even became an additional factor for aggravation of international relations. The French accused the Germans of the theft, and the latter in their turn accused the French. The topic stayed in the headlines for a year and was so popular that bakers, waiters and other representatives of the service industry put miniature *La Gioconda* images on their overalls or aprons.

The painting was found two years later when the thief, Vincenzo Peruggia, tried to sell the *Mona Lisa* to the owners of the Uffizi Gallery in Florence, and they called the police. He admitted that he wanted to return *La Gioconda* to its Motherland.

The finding of the stolen picture again stirred interest of the public to it, and here the communicative function of the arts was manifested fully. The matter is that the Americans had NATO troops in France after World War II, the attitude of the French to that was as to a national humiliation, and they wanted to change the state of affairs. The picture was sent to the exhibition in the United States with the help of Jacqueline Kennedy, the wife of the then President of the USA, it was a sensation there and it was seen by more than 10 million people. As a result there were such public sentiments that served as the background to push the decisions at the state level. The Americans withdrew their troops from France and gave the French an opportunity to have their own army. Thus, this picture played an important role in the history of diplomacy.

The communicative function of the arts was traditionally manifested in the creative work of painters. For example, E. Delacroix made a lot of sketches when he travelled over North Africa, and later they were the sources of inspiration for him. This dialogue of the painter with the little-known in Europe culture later allowed to introduce the images of Arab men (*The Arabs before the City of Algiers*, *Arab Saddling his Horse*, *The Lion Hunt in Morocco*), Eastern women (*The Women of Algiers in their Apartment*, *Moroccan Women*, *Jewish Women of Algiers*) to the cultural space of

¹ Academician of the Russian Academy of Arts, Professor at the Department of Design and Interior Arts, Ulyanovsk State University, Honoured Artist of the Russian Federation, People's Artist of the Republic of Dagestan. Honoured Doctor of the Azerbaijan State University of Culture and Arts. Honoured member of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts, Zhurgenov Kazakh National Academy of Arts. Honorary citizen of the Ulyanovsk Region and cities of Ulyanovsk, Baku, Kaspiysk. He was awarded the Gold Medal of the Russian Academy of Arts (2011, 2015), Orders of St. Constantine the Great, St. Stanislaus, St. Anna, II degree, Gold Medal of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He takes part in charitable projects for building and restoration of Russian Orthodox churches, supports many charity foundations. His personal exhibitions are held in Russia, the USA, Belgium, Ecuador, the UK, Italy, the Ukraine, Turkey, Bahrain.

France and other countries, to familiarize the public with special features of wedding rites and costumes of other nations (*The Bride of Abydos*, *Jewish Wedding in Morocco*). The architecture of Morocco (*City Wall of Meknes*, *Moroccan Courtyard*), elements of musical culture (tambourine and Arab lute in *Jewish Musicians in Morocco*) became accessible and interesting for the European public.

The same tradition is traced in the creative work of contemporary artists who bring numerous sketches and drawings from their journeys to various countries, and they serve the basis for creation of paintings becoming the form and factor of the dialogue of cultures. The well-known woman artist from St. Petersburg Yevgenia Lysogorova lived in India for a long time and created a number of beautiful paintings reflecting genre scenes from the life of Indian and African people (*African Girl*, *Girl with a Flower*, *Residents of Africa*, *Buddhist Children*, *In Africa*, *Portrait of an Old Indian*). The contemporary Russian artist Yuri Kovalev managed to reflect the bright features of the Spanish culture, express his attitude to traditional Spanish entertainments in his picture *The Soul of Bullfight*.

The communicative function of the arts is also realized nowadays in exhibitions, biennale and festivals. This is one of the most mobile and dynamically developing forms of the fine arts' actualization. On the one hand, they have a strong historical tradition (exhibitions organized by S. Diaghilev; The Exhibition of Russian and Finnish Artists 1898, The International Exhibition of Paintings organized by *The World of Arts* magazine in 1899 and others), on the other hand, these forms became efficient means of communication of the arts and social environment in the contemporary artistic practice. The depictive artistic text becomes a communications channel in the space of exhibition, biennale, festival, both between the artist and the viewer, and between various periods, kinds of arts (painting, literature, sculpture, choreography, cinema, animation, etc.), cultures of various countries and nations.

Here the ability of one culture to master achievements of the other is realized fully, at the same time they mutually enrich one another. As M. M. Bakhtin wrote, "Alien culture reveals itself more fully and deeper only in the eyes of another culture... One meaning opens its depths meeting and coming in contact with another, alien meaning..., it's as if a dialogue starts between them, which overcomes the restraint and one-sidedness of these meanings, these cultures... In case of this dialogical meeting of two cultures, they do not merge and do not mix, but they are mutually enriched".¹

The Small Gallery of the Louvre Museum presents "The Theatre of Power" exhibition as a part of its third season (from September 27, 2017 to July 18, 2018), which clearly demonstrates close ties between political power and the arts. The exhibition occupies several halls arranged according to the thematic principle. The "Images of Princes" hall tells about various roles, functions of monarchs – King-pastor, King-architect, King-warrior. The "Inclining to Legitimization of Power" hall is dedicated to Henry IV – the ruler who looked for national recognition. The portraits of monarchs, power regalia, coronation items, etc. are collected in the "Symbols of Power" hall. This exhibition is an entertaining show, where the connection of power and arts can be traced in various countries and various historical periods with the help of paintings and audio-visual effects.

Now, there is the "Form of Time" exhibition held in Vienna, at the Museum of Art History (from March 18 to July 8, 2018). This is the first group exhibition thought up by the Museum of Art History as a part of the "Modernity and the Present Time" program. It combines works of art created in the past centuries and in our times. There are works by Tiziano Vecellio and William Turner, Rembrandt van Rijn and Mark Rothko, Peter Paul Rubens and Maria Lassnig, Édouard Manet and Diego Velázquez displayed side by side.

The works of art are placed in the picture gallery halls in such a way as to find out and emphasize the similarity of historical and contemporary objects of creative understanding, views, values and wider – cultures. Visitors get an opportunity to look in the past and the present at the same time, compare works divided by hundreds of years and thousands of kilometers, see the succession and ties of cultures. The exhibits for this exhibition were provided by the British Museum and the Tate Gallery in London, the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, Musée national Picasso and Musée d'Orsay in Paris, the Art Institute of Chicago as well as private collectors.

It's important to emphasize that big artistic projects, uniting exhibits, artists and organizers from various countries, are realized no matter the political differences, economic wars and other forms of confrontations between countries. The arts' ability to carry out the dialogue of cultures not only as a function but also as a kind of mission is seen in that, and the well-known phrase from F. M. Dostoevsky's novel *The Idiot* – "Beauty will save the world" – is perceived in this context as an appeal to all artists and prominent figures in the field of arts, to which they answer today as best as they can in various forms.

¹ Бахтин М. М. Эстетика словесного творчества. М., 1986. С. 354.

M. Sanayee¹

CONCERNING THE VECTOR OF NEW PROCESSES IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

By singling out the processes which emerge in the international sphere, it is possible, to a certain extent, to determine the general direction and vector of international changes and subsequently speculate on the way to resolve the problems of the international community's future. The processes that can be singled out are as follows:

- In the area of the international politics, populist politics has become widely spread, and today we witness an extensive proliferation of this paradigm. In fact, the role of the intellectual elite in determining the direction of processes and politics and in shaping the prevailing international community paradigm has lessened. This tendency resulted in a dangerous situation. In many western countries of today we witness a decline in critical thinking and behavior of the reigning elite. Possibly, the spread of populist politics is, to some extent, a natural outcome of its distribution through advanced means of communication and virtual space, however the situation itself is a manifestation of adverse effects of this type of communications.

- Stirring xenophobia and other phobias as a means to political ends in the area of international relations. Presently we witness encouragement of anti-Islam sentiment by certain leaders and western centers, while anti-Iran sentiment and anti-Russian sentiment (neo-McCarthyism) are the instances which can be observed in behavior of the US and its western allies. Although the downfall of unipolar system ended the cold war, the former paradigm of thinking still persists; the concepts of dialogue between civilizations and multipolar system are still not implemented. As a result, democracy was compromised, and such phenomena as imaginary enemy and xenophobia were reproduced. In fact, the situation of continuing balance of forces and demonization of others impedes emergence of a dialogue-based world.

- Reoccurrence of classical capitalism and anti-globalism in the US have led to capitalism-induced changes. Militarist capitalism, lack of attention to environment and humanitarian inequality, neglect of international law are the features that determine the logic of power and profit underlying this kind of capitalism. In spite of emerging economical and technological poles, this situation is unlikely to predominate; however, it can cause a lot of harm to the world, people and environment.

- Undermining of international law and obligations by the governments, as well as attempts to establish rules outside of acceptable legal framework, are another dangerous

process where national interests prevail over common rules and principles.

- There is an obvious shift towards unipolarity. Apparently, the West is seeking to ensure and prolong its supremacy in the international system. The aim of confronting the new states is a well-formed idea of the American national security strategy document.

- The United Nations Organization and its affiliated structures are gradually losing momentum in the world, while the processes outside the scope of this organization are simultaneously growing stronger.

- Nowadays such noble ideas as establishment of global peace and stability are sacrificed in favor of what might be identified as short-term interests of certain governments. This situation brings chaos and uncertainty to the international community, giving a chance to non-governmental actors, such as ISIS, to play their part.

- The dynamics of change shifts to the situation where countries rely mostly on their internal resources, where regionalism grows and where countries attempt to seek for new allies. An example of this dynamics is emergence of such structures as BRICS, SCO, and Eurasian Economic Union.

Hence the important question: What future are we intended to create? What is our model of global future? In what direction is the world heading? Are the reigning elites working to meet the expectations of people, to ensure sustainable development and social peace?

It is necessary to give the intellectuals a key role in such fields as governance of societies, advancing the public thinking, and setting the vector of public opinion on the journey towards cultural standards improvement, solidarity and peaceful co-habitation.

At present, the comprehensive dialogue between the intellectual and executive elite in order to agree on values and the common path is an obvious priority for achievement of peace and global stability, acceptance of cultures and civilizations, prevention of arms race, prevention of global slip down to confrontation and cold war of a new type, prevention of religious, cultural and civilizational rifts in the human society. An essential historic task of the intellectuals is to establish a presence in the influential, vastly reaching mass media, and raise a question concerning the ongoing process in the minds of the public and the politicians, setting a standard of responsible and ethically upright politics.

¹ Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the Russian Federation. Head of the Iranian Centre for Russia Studies at Tehran University (2005–2013), a member of Majlis of the Islamic Council (2008–2013), Cand. Sc. (Political Studies). Author of books "On the Great Silk Road", "Law and Politics in Islam" (textbook), "Relations Between Iran and Russia" (co-auth.), "Revival of the Iranian-Islamic Civilization" (Vozrozhdenie irano-islamskoj civilizacii), "Relations between Iran and Central Asia", and of research articles. Mr. Sanayee is Honorary member of the Union of Writers of Russia, a member of Kazakhstan Academy of Social Sciences.

J. A. Scholte¹

A TRANSCULTURAL FUTURE?

Introduction²

As the 2018 Likhachev Readings approach, world politics is in a decidedly unhappy moment. The current dominant narrative tends to divide humanity into essentialised, internally uniform, and diametrically opposed ‘cultures’. Such binary identity politics *inter alia* juxtapose Russia and the West. Each side is invited to cast the Self as good and the Other as evil. From this ‘us-them’ construction it is but a short step to mutual fear, discrimination, conflict and violence.

Such scenarios of binary cultural politics are hardly new, of course. The Russia-versus-West thematic has recurred over several centuries. In addition, other long-standing cultural oppositions have set Christianity against Islam; the native against the foreigner; the white against the coloured; humanity against nature; and so on. Indeed, binary identity constructions are the cultural stuff of modernity.

Yet, as an attribute of modernity, binary cultural politics are a historical phenomenon. This way of (mis)handling cultural diversity is not inherent to the human condition. It is not a ‘natural’ behaviour. If binary oppositions are a context-bound habit, then it should be possible to develop different kinds of cultural politics. What, then, are possible alternatives?

This paper explores this question in four steps. A first section below sets out a general concept of ‘culture’ that informs this discussion. A second section elaborates on features and harmful impacts of binary cultural politics. A third section considers three alternatives (i. e. multiculturalism, monoculturalism, and interculturalism), but finds each of them irretrievably flawed. A fourth section advances another possibility, dubbed ‘transculturalism’, as a more promising alternative form of cultural politics for world society.

Culture

A reflection on ‘the world’s cultural development’ requires a guiding concept of ‘culture’. After all, ‘culture’ can be understood in many ways. The present discussion takes ‘culture’ to refer to processes of the social construction of meanings. Thus culture is how people jointly come to know their situation: by (re)formulating, expressing, communicating, receiving and (re)negotiating their life-worlds, their life-ways, their life-styles.

¹ Professor of Peace and Development Department at the School of Global Studies University of Gothenburg (Sweden). Co-Director at the Centre for Global Cooperation Research University of Duisburg-Essen (Germany). Visiting Professor at the Chair of Social Sciences and Humanities, Moscow School of Economics, Moscow Lomonosov State University. He has previously taught at the University of Warwick, the University of Sussex, the London School of Economics and the International Institute of Social Studies in The Hague. He has been an adviser to the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Trade Organization (WTO), and the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN). Author of a number of works on globalization, including “Globalization: A Critical Introduction”, “Civil Society and Accountable Global Governance”, and others.

² This paper draws on earlier writings including: Scholte J. A. A Transculturalist Path to Democratic Global Cooperation // International Journal of Cultural Research. 2014. Apr. № 1 (14). P. 82–87; Global Cooperation through Cultural Diversity: Remaking Democracy? / ed. J. A. Scholte. Duisburg: Centre for Global Cooperation Research, Global Dialogues 8, 2015.

Culture has far-reaching implications for other core dimensions of social relations. For example, culture affects the ways that people relate to the wider web of life (ecology). Likewise culture has implications for the ways that people manage resources (economy), the ways that people imagine their identities (psychology), the ways that people regulate their collectivities (governance), the ways that people map and create spaces (geography), and the ways that people demarcate and experience time (history). This is not to suggest that culture is the primary and sole determinant of social life, but it is to underline that everything in society has cultural dynamics.

With these wide impacts, culture is deeply bound up with social power. On the one hand, power relations in society affect the forms that culture takes. Conversely, cultural constructions can, depending on their form, either reinforce or undermine existing social power relations.

Culture shows substantial variation across humanity. People know and enact their circumstances in diverse ways. Society is steeped in cultural divergences: contrasting ways of making sense of the world, each with its own internal coherence. There is no – and no prospect of – cultural uniformity in the world.

Cultural diversities fall along multiple lines. The variations tend to be most frequently described in terms of nationality, ethnicity and religion. However, cultural diversities can also arise in relation to age, caste, class, (dis)ability, gender, geography, institution, language, pastime, race, sexual orientation, and vocation. Hence one can discern youth cultures, business cultures, mountain cultures, parliamentary cultures, football cultures, queer cultures, military cultures, etc.

Indeed, the social construction of meaning normally involves intersections of multiple vectors, since different dimensions of life-worlds cannot be isolated from one another. Thus, for example, business cultures vary by nationality, gender cultures vary by class, Islamic cultures vary by age group, and so on. The relative prominence of the many axes of cultural diversity – and the ways that they combine – alternates from one context to the next.

Culture is also diverse over time. Culture is never static – always in motion. Cultural production always mixes continuity and change. Even fundamentalisms that claim to recover old truths may in fact be inventing new ones. Given the inevitable evolution of culture, undue insistence by ‘traditionalists’ on preserving inherited life-ways can be problematic.

An important distinction can be drawn between cultural *diversity* and cultural *difference*. Cultural difference involves not just variety, but also incommensurability, where ideas and practices of one life-world cannot be understood by those situated in another life-world. The many instances of such non-translatibility include radically deviating religious beliefs or incomparable senses of humour. Some cultural incommensurability is innocuous (i. e. where people can respect and accommodate the differences involved), while other cultural incommensurability is unpalatable (i. e. where people cannot accept the differences and indeed may attack them). Cultural difference

es which parties regard as unacceptable are particularly challenging to negotiate.

Cultural diversity and difference can test social fabrics. Across history, conflicts between life-worlds have often taken violent turns and produced much harm. The challenge is to address cultural diversity and difference in constructive rather than destructive ways. But how to accomplish this end?

Binary Cultural Politics

As a dominant modern approach to diversity and difference, binary cultural politics have generally not done well for co-operation and peace in world politics. Binary constructions can be appealing in their simplicity, but they run roughshod over the complexities of culture described above. Moreover, binary framings often create exaggerated oppositions, and can thereby encourage discrimination, exclusion, conflict, and violence.

As a first oversimplification, binary approaches understand culture in terms of pairings. Binary thinking presents culture in terms of a Self and an Other, us and them, insider and outsider. Different binaries highlight different dualisms: e. g. of classes, civilisations, nations, or races. In each case, culture is understood in terms of a neat bifurcation, with no in-between. Yet, as indicated earlier, cultures do not in practice split into hermetically sealed categories.

A second oversimplification in binary perspectives treats culture as unidimensional. In other words, these understandings focus on one bifurcation as the principal cultural dividing line in society. Different binaries may place the primary emphasis on different vectors, whether national, ethnic, religious, or whatever. In each case, though, a single type of binary is regarded to trump any other. Yet actual cultural dynamics are far messier, with constant shifts in the relative significance of various dimensions of culture.

In a third oversimplification, binary politics generally essentializes cultures. Each side of a dualism is assigned an 'essence': an intrinsic, fixed and immutable character. Binary thinking thereby posits that 'essential' features define 'Vietnamese', 'aboriginal', 'Jewish', and other 'identities'. Each culture has 'roots' which anchor its location. Everyone who ever bears a particular cultural label is deemed to exhibit and experience certain inherent qualities. Yet, in practice, it is difficult to specify the purportedly core and immutable characteristics of a given culture.

A fourth oversimplification occurs when binary cultural politics set the poles of a given dualism in opposition to each other. The two sides are made incommensurable, such that it becomes native *versus* immigrant; straight *versus* gay; Russia *versus* the West; and so on. The Other is defined as an antithesis of the Self. Inclusion within a particular culture is affirmed through exclusion of other life-worlds. Unity on the 'inside' of a culture is achieved by removal of the 'outside'. From binary oppositions it is but a short step to asserting group hierarchies and accompanying discriminations. The Self becomes superior and righteous, while the Other becomes inferior and flawed. In this way binary cultural politics have fuelled ableism, ageism, classism, heterosexism, patriarchy, racism, and other structural domination.

This account deliberately describes four cornerstones of binary cultural politics in stark terms. Still, binary habits

to separate, simplify, essentialize and oppose cultures tend to be the norm in modern identity politics – with often destructive consequences for local and global politics alike. The question then is whether alternative and more constructive modes of cultural politics are available.

Flawed Alternatives:

Multiculturalism, Monoculturalism, Interculturalism

Among possible different models of cultural politics are what can be called multiculturalism (alternatively, communitarianism), monoculturalism (alternatively, universalism or assimilationism) and interculturalism. Each is briefly reviewed below and found to have significant shortcomings as a formula for negotiating cultural complexity. These critiques then set the stage for a more promising transculturalist alternative.

Communitarian multiculturalism affirms that humanity is divided into multiple mutually exclusive cultural groups who best lead mostly separate lives in a spirit of respectful mutual tolerance. Avoiding deeper contacts between cultural differences allegedly reduces conflict, fear and violence. However, as stressed earlier, humanity does not split neatly into discrete 'cultures'. Nor is communitarian cultural separatism feasible amidst the density of today's global interconnections. Furthermore, many contemporary societal challenges unavoidably require significant cooperation across cultural differences. Thus communitarian segregation is not a practical option.

A second alternative to binary cultural politics, monocultural liberal universalism, prescribes that people across the planet should abandon their cultural differences by assimilating to a western-modern life-world. However, western modernity does not have all the answers to societal challenges and may indeed in some ways (such as capitalist exploitations and the arrogances of science) be a substantial part of the problems. Moreover, it is plain that large swathes of humanity do not accept (everything in) western modernity and regard its spread as an imperialism. To this extent liberal cosmopolitanism can undermine rather than underpin democratic global cooperation.

A third approach to negotiating cultural diversity, interculturalism, improves upon multiculturalist communitarianism and universalist cosmopolitanism by accepting the need to forge social condominium out of plural life-worlds. Interculturalism maintains that, with carefully pursued cross-cultural communication and negotiation, destructive scenarios of 'clashing civilisations' can be avoided and constructive collaboration achieved. However, interculturalism retains multiculturalism's unsustainable assumption that culture maps onto neatly separable groups, when in practice life-worlds overlap and intersect. In addition, interculturalism tends to neglect that the negotiation of cultural differences must address power inequalities among life-worlds. Also, interculturalism can overlook that some cultural differences are a source of deep conflict, such that goodwill alone is not always enough to reach intercultural condominium.

Of course these accounts of multiculturalism, monoculturalism and interculturalism are simplified, but this brief review suffices to indicate that each of these frameworks for negotiating cultural complexity has core flaws. As a suggested improvement on these models a further alternative of 'transculturalism' is now explored.

Transculturalism

Ideas of 'trans-culture' are not completely new. Already in 1940 the anthropologist Fernando Ortiz coined the term 'transculturalisation' as a way to discuss mixes and mergers of life-worlds.¹ More recently, ideas of the transcultural have marked the thinking of Arturo Escobar, Walter Dignolo, Wolfgang Welsch, and others.² That said, the seven-fold conception of transculturalism developed here offers a distinctive take on ethics and politics of cultural diversity.

A first pillar of transculturalism, *insistence on reflexivity*, in many ways sets the tone for the other six. Reflexivity is a form of critical self-regard which is constantly alert to, and questioning of, the particularity (i. e., not universality) of one's ideas and practices. Reflexive thinkers continually make their assumptions explicit and constantly relate their knowledge and behaviour to their specific historical and social context. With reflexivity any presumption that a person can hold a 'supra-cultural' truth is abandoned. Instead, reflexivity breeds an acute awareness that one's life-world may not be shared by others. Negotiation of cultural differences can be facilitated when, through reflexivity, parties are more keenly attuned to the precise character of their differences. A searching self-consciousness of this kind is generally lacking in the other approaches to cultural diversity discussed earlier.

The second anchor of transculturalism, *acknowledgement of culture/power relations*, means understanding that the social construction of meaning is always suffused with enabling and disabling potentials for the parties involved. For transculturalist politics it is particularly important to identify, highlight and interrogate structural inequalities that can prevail among different life-worlds, especially in situations where a hegemonic culture arbitrarily marginalises other rationalities. In a transculturalist mode, parties to negotiations of diversity make explicit, underline and question that their own and other life-ways can have built-in (dis)advantages. The interlocutors moreover appreciate that cultural subordinations can breed anger, suspicion and resistance on the part of the silenced. Furthermore, actors in dominant cultural positions who enter transculturalist conversations accept an obligation to unlearn and discard their arbitrary privileges. Sustainable global cooperation is advanced when the parties are open and honest about cultural power hierarchies in their relationships, refuse opportunities to abuse unfair advantages, and strive in principle to accord all cultural positions equal opportunities for respect and voice.

A third pillar of transculturalism, *recognition of complexity*, entails an appreciation that culture is not (as other approaches would generally have it) manifested in neatly bounded and mutually exclusive populations, with homogeneity inside each group and binary opposition between them. Culture as actually lived involves porosity, intersections, overlaps, permutations and movements. Transculturalist recognition of complexity allows each person their own particular multidimensional and fluid life-world. The resulting more nuanced and open understanding of both

self and other selves can lay firmer ground for global cooperation.

A fourth mainstay of transculturalism, *celebration of diversity*, suggests that pluralism in life-worlds is not only recognised, but also in principle positively embraced and actively promoted. In contrast to other approaches, transculturalism does not regard difference as a problem that can at best be 'tolerated'. Rather, cultural pluralism is enthusiastically welcomed as a creative resource. Encounters of diverse life-worlds are seen as opportunities to develop new insights, to open wider potentials, to discover alternative answers. In transculturalism global cooperation is not made contingent upon a consensus around meaning. In principle diverse understandings of, and practices towards, the same issue can be pursued side by side in complementary fashion. From a transculturalist perspective it is not necessary – and on the contrary anti-democratic – to force everyone into a single cultural mould.

A fifth building block for transculturalism is *humility in the face of difference*. For all that cultural diversity might be celebrated in principle, situations arise where different constructions of meaning are incommensurable and unpalatable, triggering moral aversion and impulses to deny the other. On these occasions transculturalism prescribes humbleness. Instead of immediately adopting a stance of confrontation and affirming one's own greater virtue, parties to transcultural communication and negotiation acknowledge the imperfections of their own life-ways and their severely limited comprehension of contrasting life-worlds. Awe at one's ignorance of most human experience, and wonder at the sheer scope of human creativity, can check impetuous dismissals of contrary life-worlds and encourage maximal accommodations of difference. Transculturalist humility does not require one to accept every difference and to like others whose views and practices seem offensive. However, by discouraging hasty denigrations of difference, as well as its violent suppression, transculturalism can wherever possible nurture respectful co-existence.

Humility facilitates a sixth core principle of transculturalism, namely the *promotion of deep listening*. Capacity to listen across diversities is a key skill that has been strikingly underdeveloped in modern politics. Transcultural listening goes beyond polite nods to concentrated, careful and patient attention that strives maximally to hear, empathise with, receive from, and respond to counterparts. This is not to suggest that any amount of listening can overcome certain cultural gulfs. Still, a transcultural mode of listening equips parties better to develop actions that show honour and care for diversities and a mutual recognition that their respective lives are worth living. In this way transculturalist listening is an act of solidarity which, when practised on all sides, advances deep acquaintance and trust.

Seventh and finally, transculturalism presumes a process of ongoing *reciprocal learning for positive change* among diverse life-worlds. Transculturalism treats exchanges across cultural diversities as learning opportunities that can in turn promote positive social transformations. The interplay of diversities – particularly when approached with transculturalist emphases on reflexivity, complexity, openness, humility and listening – generates continual self-conscious cultural reconstructions. A transcultural outlook not only recognises the inherent dynamism of culture, but positively welcomes and fosters the creative potentials offered

¹ Ortiz F. Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar. Durham, NC : Duke University Press, 1995 [1940].

² Dignolo W. D., Schiwy F. Transculturalisation and the Colonial Difference: Double Translation // Translation and Ethnography: The Anthropological Challenge of Intercultural Understanding / eds. T. Maranhao, B. Streck. Tucson : University of Arizona Press, 2003. P. 12–34 ; Welsch W. Transculturality — The Puzzling Form of Cultures Today // Spaces of Culture: City, Nation, World / eds. M. Featherstone, S. Lash. L. : Sage, 1999. P. 194–213.

by mutual transformations. Engaging cultural diversity is an opportunity to discover that new ways are possible. Learning from another is at the same time an invitation to change the self. However, such an exercise does not normally lead to cultural convergence, since different parties take different lessons from the exchange and apply them to different contexts to generate different changes.

Conclusion

With the seven tenets set out above, transculturalism offers great prospective benefits. For one thing, transculturalism can advance cultural vibrancy as a value in its own right. A situation of diverse and dynamic life-worlds is core to human flourishing in a good society. Unpalatable differences apart, cultural diversity is intriguing, stimulating, enriching and fun.

In addition, cultural vibrancy as fostered through transculturalism can advance other primary values in society. When cultural diversity is recognised, celebrated and sensitively engaged towards mutual change, democracy, distributive justice, liberty, peace and solidarity are also more likely to thrive. In addition, humility, listening and learning across cultural differences could open new paths to enhanced ecological integrity and material security for all.

That said, transculturalism is not a panacea. It does not necessarily answer challenges of ecological damage, abuses of human dignity, and fragile democracy. More gener-

ally, the social changes which emerge from transculturalist exchanges need not always be for the better.

Moreover, power inequalities could give some people little interest to enact transculturalism. For instance, many demagogues thrive on binary cultural politics. Other elites might see their privileges served by the assimilationist demands of liberal cosmopolitanism. Certain social movements gain much of their strength through multiculturalist insistence on conserving 'tradition' and would therefore resist transculturalist tenets of humility, listening and mutual change.

Indeed, transculturalism itself is political: its practice would always favour some relative to others. On the one hand, transculturalism could bring greater respect, voice and influence to marginalised life-worlds. However, in some scenarios transculturalism might reinforce or even increase power differentials in society. In certain instances transculturalist discourse could even be a hegemonic tool that convinces subordinated groups to cooperate with dominant power. In this case transculturalism could legitimise injustice rather than resist and subvert it.

Hence while the prospective benefits of transculturalism for democratic global cooperation might be considerable, the realisation of these gains cannot be taken for granted. Transculturalist principles do not intrinsically bring good: it depends on the contexts and practices of implementation. Thus, for all that transculturalism might hold promise, it requires continual critical scrutiny.

M. V. Shmakov¹

MARXISM, CULTURE OF ECONOMIC VIEWS AND IDEAS, AND TRADE UNION IDEOLOGY

It's evident for me as the person, who has been heading the biggest, on the global scale, national trade union center, that Karl Marx's ideas had a great impact on the growth of economic and social self-awareness of the international and Russian trade union movement. And the farther we are from the times of the industrial society, to which the main works

of the classical author are dedicated, the more new features are brought in by the post-industrial society, the more we need to clearly, logically comprehend these innovations in fine details, and they are capable to confuse not only public and political figures but also serious theoreticians and thinkers of the modern times.

Recently, I've been hearing several ideas interpreted in various ways from my foreign colleagues and sometimes from social partners as well: employers and representatives of the state. Their essence can be narrowed down as follows:

- the Marxist ideas are hopelessly outdated, Capitalism of the industrial society exists as an anachronism. The modern capital is filled with other meanings, the financial capital ruling on the market has ripened besides the industrial capital. The financial capital's power over labour is of a different nature, it is hardly interested in surplus value, it makes profit on financial markets. Monetary reference points' separation from the golden equivalent broke the former dependencies and laws, because of that the Marx's theory cannot be applied;

- the post-industrial capital contains new component parts that do not allow to treat it from the point of view of the classical economic theory. It includes intellectual property besides the material and financial components, i. e. a part of the "human capital". The economy of knowledge and innovations overturn reasoning and arguments

¹ Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia, Vice-President of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, Vice-President of the European Regional Council of Trade Unions, President of the Universal Confederation of Trade Unions. Chairman of the Trustee Council of SPbUHSS. Author of academic papers and books on social and labour relations, social policy, theory and practice of labour and trade union movements, including books "Russian Trade Unions into the 21st Century", "here is No Win without a Fight!", "For Honorable Labour" "Trade Union News Though the Lens of Humour" (co-author); manuals for trade union workers and active members of organizations: "Conflicts in Work Collective" (co-author), "FITUR in the Changing Society", "FITUR in Questions and Answers"; of the chapter "The Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia" in the book "15 Years of the UCTU: Looking into the Future". Head of the editorial board of the book "History of Trade Unions of Russia". Head of the group of authors of the book "Comments to the Labour Code of the Russian Federation". Coordinator of the Russian trilateral commission for regulation of social and labour relations between all-Russian associations of trade unions, all-Russian associations of employers and the Government of the Russian Federation, Chairman of the Trustee Council, Honorary Professor of the Academy of Labour and Social Relations. Member of the Board of VEO (Free Economic Association) of Russia. He was awarded the Order of Friendship, the Order "The Badge of Honor", Order for Service to the Motherland, III, IV degrees, the Medal "In Commemoration of the 850th Anniversary of Moscow", the Diploma of the Government of the Russian Federation and others. Professor Emeritus of SPbUHSS.

from the industrial past. Machine production without people in the near future will lead us to refusal from hired labour and replace social production with automated production. Synthesis of food and everything required for human existence will start. If some human biological requirements are preserved and not satisfied, it will be possible to solve the problem by transhumanists' methods, i. e. combining the human body with machine elements (artificial organs, etc.);

– the property right to labour is no longer an issue of pressing concern as well as any other private property. Private property is not required in the system where the economy of joint consumption (use) rules. An individual freed from concerns about buying and servicing property (his house, car, bicycle, furniture or clothes) will be really free. Being provided with the universal basic income, he will stay an active economic consumer and will practically find himself in a Communist society.

This reasoning reminds pictures from Nikolay Nosov's fairytale novel "Dunno on the Moon", where the author described in detail various aspects of "Moon Capitalism".

I have to remind several simple truths in this connection.

Russian trade unions as economic organizations fighting for the rights of hired workers originated and were legally established on the wave of revolutionary events in 1905, absorbing the Marxist ideology to a large extent. Mass setting up of territorial associations of Russian trade union organizations that took place under the impact of the Russian revolution of 1917, reflected expectations and hopes of hired workers to liberate labour from oppression by capital. The ideas of building just social-labour relations, direct participation of workers in the processes of cardinal renewal of social and production relations, including with the help of trade unions, are based on Marx's social thoughts to a large extent. Marx's ideas were already doubted at that time as built on reasoning and arguments referred to the first battle for workers' rights that started in England in 1842, however, Marxism held its ground.

Why is Marxism attractive? In my opinion, Marx created an orderly, well-composed and still up-to-date theory, describing the laws of capitalist economic system's functioning and development. He showed that capitalist production, the aim of which is money accumulation, getting profits, absolutely logically flows out of common commodity production, the aim of which is consumption and where money is just an intermediary in the exchange. He deducted the first and the second laws of capitalism, not disproved till now. Marx managed to systematically reveal the meaning, contents and role of such a specific phenomenon as "labour force", step by step, starting from his early works and ending with *Capital*. Marx singled out and scrupulously researched "surplus value" as an independent economic phenomenon. Marx illustratively explained the source and nature of profit on capital with the help of this notion as well as various forms of exploitation of workers and worded the main contradiction of labour and capital.

The Marxist-Leninist theory was especially actively criticized when the Socialist system disintegrated in Russia and Eastern Europe. However, critics of Marxism aimed not so much at the primary sources (many simply did not read them) as at interpretations of Marxism that were made based on the works of the classical author to solve certain tasks of building Socialism. Practically no one of serious re-

searchers of Marx creative works ever doubted the impact of his ideas on social views and ideas and contribution to economics. Thus, Vasily Leontyev, a Noble Prize winner in economics, wrote in his paper *The Contemporary Meaning of K. Marx's Economic Theory*: "Marx was a great expert in the nature of capitalist system... If someone wants to find out what profit, wages, capitalist enterprise really are before trying to explain economic development in some way, he may get more real and qualitative information from the primary source, the three volumes of *Capital*, than he can find in ten consecutive reports by the United States Census Bureau, in a dozen textbooks on today's economy..."

Turning to the thesis on automation, I'll mention that robotization of production is really capable to increase the output of products but it has a little impact on the attained by now efficiency of labour of a certain individual, and if that happens, the amount of capital investments in such cases is often incomparable with profits. As one of the "pioneers" of the modern "industry of knowledge" Elon Musk said recently, automation and at the same time failure to take into account the human role in production, are capable to increase small miscalculations and mistakes made at the early design stages many times and lead to unprecedented amounts of defective products and waste.

Another controversial issue is inclusion of intellectual property and other components of the "human capital" into market value. If we discuss skills, education, professional training and workforce on the whole, it can't be a commodity as it can't be freely exchanged on the market – another person can't own the "human capital". No one has been still able to disprove the theory of alienation, which Marx presented in his third manuscript in 1844. Marx emphasized as opposed to Smith, that the result of labour was not only profit for owners of production means but also human alienation in case of those who were deprived of such property, deprived of an opportunity to freely use one's time, abilities, had to take the social role forced upon them in the course of production processes.

The main demands of the proletariat in the times when Karl Marx lived and created his works, were demands to raise wages, provide normal working places, rights to decent life. These demands are still urgent today all over the world, including the Russian Federation. It's widely known that ignoring these demands plunged the world into the series of social upheavals. This should not be forgotten by our contemporary liberal economists and their students in the government and business community. The power of the financial capital, which liberals love to discuss, led to a series of world financial crises, including such unordinary ones as the 2000 financial bubble on the high-tech companies market. The institutions established by financial capital owners for their needs turn out in the centers of such crises. I mean international rating agencies that were not known to Marxists in the two previous centuries, but today exactly these agencies are entrusted with the most important selection task in economy. It's absolutely not accidental that BRICS states worded the task to set up their own rating agency already at the first stage of working out measures for a more just world order. They learnt very well that financial accounting and economic analysis became factors and tools for management and control both in economy and politics. It's not only "what is counted" that is important for the financial capital but also "how and who counts". Crises

generated by the power of money always led to reduction of incomes, purchasing power of workers' wages and abrupt increase of poverty. At the same time, not a single rating agency lost its license because of unauthentic information. At the same time, the production capital generated industrial revolutions that always led to development, though via destruction of the previous system.

As for various extravagant theories about the automated future, consisting of semi-synthetic people with artificial organs, trade unions treat their authors and propagandists as visitors of the Fool's Island from the already mentioned book by Nosov, that were to turn into harmless white sheep by the end of their human life.

The idea of the society without private property deserves serious attention. I'd like to emphasize the exceptionally high culture of economic views and ideas attained by Marx, trying to eliminate contradictions and logically unfinished ideas from this theoretical works. This directly refers to the topic of Communism. He mentioned that if there was no more private property as a result of its appropriation by the state, we would get "crude Communism", the ideas of which were rather widely developed later in the Soviet period. The newly appeared thinkers are trying to build a new model of Communism, replacing Marx's "crude Communism" (and Hegel's at the same time) with

Communism where private property will be concentrated in the hands of a small group of owners, while the main "human mass" will not require property, only paying rent, sufficient for its owners, for its use.

But where is Communism here? If we break from the Soviet interpretation and base on numerous works by philosophers and Karl Marx, human activities in the time of Communism stop being just labour, they turn into free human activities that are unattainable either in the industrial society or the modern economic system as Communism replaced Capitalism as an alternative, in which there is no place for accumulation of wealth.

Celebrating the 200th anniversary of Karl Marx, we give him his due for his fantastically rich scholarly heritage. Trade unions all over the world are armed with his contribution to the development of economics, the impact of his ideas on the development of social thinking, and they are still urgent in today's Russia.

"Professional unions should prove to the whole world that they are fighting not for narrow, selfish interests but for liberation of oppressed millions", K. Marx wrote in one of his papers. These words sound very up-to-date to trade unions of the 21st century, fighting for practical realization of the concept of worthy labour as an inalienable condition for sustainable development on the global scale.

V. S. Styopin¹

SOCIAL SYSTEMS AND METHODOLOGY FOR FORECASTING THEIR FUTURE STATES

Determination of the contours of the future in the era of accelerating global social changes assumes that there is an overtly or implicitly accepted social forecasting methodology. It is expedient to explicate it and reflect on it.

It's important to single out two components of such a methodology. First, this is the idea of the structure and dynamics of the society. It is represented within the framework of the scientific approach by a contemporary version of the picture of social reality as a special form of scientific knowledge that introduces systemic and structural vision of

the subject of research by social sciences and the humanities. Second, this is the contemporary systems analysis concept that emphasizes revealing special features of complex self-developing systems.

The society is viewed in the contemporary scientific picture of the world as a whole, complex, historically developing organism, reproduction and changes of which are determined by interaction of its main subsystems – economy, the subsystem of social relations in big and small social groups, culture.

Culture plays a special role here. It appears in the contemporary understanding as a complexly organized and developing system of suprabiotic programs for human vital activities – activities, behaviour and communications of people. Worldview universals (concepts, categories) of culture are their system-forming basis: "man", "activity", "nature", "individual", "rationality", "power", "traditions and innovations", "good and evil", "faith", "hope", "love", etc. The meanings of the worldview universals are presented like fundamental life orientation points and are felt by people as the basic values. They function in the life of the society similarly to genes in biological organisms, forming a kind of genome of social life in their connections. And as origination of new biological species is impossible without genome's transformation, radical changes of social organisms are impossible without transformation of their cultural-genetic code, represented by fundamental values, the meanings of worldview universals of culture.

Hence analysis of the value foundations of the society and their changes is the main and determining factor

¹ Head of the Section of Philosophy, Political Science, Sociology, Psychology and Law of the Department for Social Sciences of the RAS, Director Emeritus of the Institute of Philosophy of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor. Author more than 750 scientific works, including 30 monographs: "Formation of the Scientific Theory", "Philosophical Anthropology and Philosophy of Science", "A Scientific Picture of the World in Culture of a Technogenic Civilization", "Philosophy of Science and Equipment", "An Era of Changes and Scenarios of the Future", "Theoretical Knowledge" (2000; in Spain – Styopin V.S. *El Saber Teorica*. Estructura, Evolucion Historica, 2004; in English – Stepin V. *Theoretical Knowledge*. Springer, 2005), "Science Philosophy: Common Problems", "Civilization and Culture", "Scientific Knowledge of a Social Context", "History and Philosophy of Science", "Human Knowledge and Culture", "Philosophy and Methodology of Science", "Philosophical Anthropology and Philosophy of Culture", "Human. Behavior.Culture" etc. President of the Russian philosophical society. Foreign member of national academies of Sciences of Belarus, Ukraine, full member of the International institute (academy) of philosophy (Paris), full member of the International academy of philosophy of science (Brussels), Professor Emeritus of Lomonosov Moscow State University, honourable doctor of the Karlsruhe University (Germany), honourable doctor of the Novgorod State University, Rostov State University, Bashkir State University, honourable professor of the Belarusian State University. Laureate of the Award of the Government of the Russian Federation in the Field of Science and Technology. Was awarded the Order of Friendship of Peoples, and "For Merit to the Fartherland", IV degree. Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS.

in forecasting the future, if we are speaking about radical changes and turning points in the society's development.

Economy and development of productive forces as a result of technological innovations are viewed in the Marxist concept of the society as the generator of social changes.

The contradiction between the new level of productive forces and the established previously production relations, originating in the process of this development, leads to their change, transformation of the established macrostructure of the society (relations between classes, social groups, castes) and origination of a new socioeconomic formation as a special kind of a social organism.

Many real characteristics of societies' evolution are expressed in this picture of social changes. But if we analyze in more details the process of new production relations and transformation of the society's macrostructure, we find out that this process assumes the change of the status of values that dominated previously and formation of new value orientation points, new meanings of worldview universals. And until they are not known to the mass consciousness as the foundations of the new picture of the lifeworld, the period of instabilities, contradictions, collisions of various social forces will go on. Spiritual revolutions always precede political revolutions, changing the macrostructure of the society and its social institutions.

It's not enough to review only the arrangement and changes of the economic life to understand, explain and foresee social transformations, cardinally changing the type of the society. It's required to understand the economic life itself from the point of view of the domineering cultural-genetic codes, representing basic values of respective types of the society.

The society as one whole organism, the natural environment (biosphere), in which it is submerged and with which it directly interacts, the society's subsystems (economy, social sphere, culture) are complex self-developing systems. Forecasting the future supposes finding out the special features of such systems' functioning and development.

A number of structural special features of developing systems were fixed in Hegel's philosophy. K. Marx developed Hegel's ideas and worded methodological principles for analysis of complex objects and demonstrated the efficiency of this approach when researching the process of origination of commodity-and-money relations, the following money transfer into capital and establishment of capitalism.

The following steps in research of the self-development systems' special features were already made in the science of the 20th century: formation of quantum and relativistic physics and cosmology, creation of genetics, systemic ideas in Earth sciences (V. I. Vernadsky), development of cybernetics, dynamics of nonequilibrium systems and synergetics, the theory of information and semiotics. All that provided a lot of various materials for systemic generalizations, allowing to single out essential characteristics of complex developing systems (natural, social and mental).

Complex self-developing systems are characterized by hierarchic arrangement of elements. All these systems are open to the environment. They exchange the matter, energy and information with it. Each system of this kind is reproduced according to self-regulation programs in sustainable states in the process of this exchange. But these programs feel the disturbing impacts of the environment all the time

and can mutate under such impacts. In this case the system enters the stage of qualitative changes (phase transition).

Philosophy characterizes such stages as a jump, a break of gradualness in development, as transition of quantitative changes into qualitative changes, transformation of a possibility into reality. These general characteristics in contemporary science are rendered concrete when they are described in the synergetics language. In this case, phase transitions are described integrally as origination of dynamic chaos, bifurcation points, formation of possible development scenarios, action of cooperative effects and escalation modes.

Basing on these ideas, new steps are possible in description of phase transitions, presenting their integral characteristics differentially, in "time scanning" of the process of the developing system's qualitative changes.

I suggested to single out three stages inside phase transition, replacing each other in time, in my papers in recent years, including in my report at the previous XVII International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

The first stage is characterized by origination of dynamic chaos in the environment when preceding order indicators and respective self-regulation programs stop providing reproduction of the complex system in the sustainable state. Bifurcation points and a range of possible scenarios for the system's development originate. These scenarios in the synergetics language are characterized as attractors in the nonlinear medium. Their numbers are not unlimited; they include only those scenarios that are not in contradiction with the established objective laws. Realization of any of these scenarios is determined by probable causality, it depends on numerous accidental factors. Because of that even the least probable scenario may be realized.

Competition of scenarios at the second stage of phase transition may single out some of them as domineering, outlining the mainstream development. In this case original probabilities of each scenario change. When one of them starts determining the course of the system's change, the probability of the others' realization abruptly decreases.

Surely, this does not exclude the possibility of a disastrous scenario as the mainstream development, the one that may lead to simplification and destruction of the system. But if the scenario providing the rising development trend becomes the domineering scenario, a kind of purposeful movement of the system to the new level of arrangement originates. The target-oriented causality starts playing the main role here.

Formation of the new level of the system's arrangement at the final stage of phase transition provides a retroactive effect on the previously formed levels, transforms them, imposing certain restrictions on the operation of their laws. As a result, a new wholeness of the more sophisticated system is formed as well as new programs for its self-regulation and respective order indicators.

Transformations of this kind are the most important component of complex self-developing systems' evolution.

It's possible to give a lot of examples of such transformations applied to natural, social and mental systems. One of such examples is the regulative role of culture in relation to human behavioural biogenetic programs. Culture as the system of suprabiotic programs for human activities, behaviour and communications does not eliminate the instinctive behaviour laws (feeding instinct, instinct of self-

preservation, sexual instinct) but has a regulative impact on them, forming respective traditions, customs, social standards (including moral and legal regulators) that determine the framework of instinctive behaviour admissible in this or that society.

Synergetics still has not fully mastered the special features of this transformation process in case of previously formed levels of a complex system under the impact of originating new levels. Nevertheless, it was fixed phenomenologically within the framework of integral phase transitions' description that the future influences the past in escalation modes (works by S. P. Kurdyumov). This statement looks unusual and even irrational from the outside. But if we take into account that the past is fixed in the structural levels of the system that originated previously, the future's impact on the past is fairly rationally explained. The explanation reflects the principle according to which the condition for the system's wholeness restoration in case of its complication is transformation of the previously originated levels under the impact of a new level.

All these special features should be taken into account when forecasting the future of social systems. If we are speaking about the stages when a social system is relatively stable, forecasting its future may be based on finding out the self-regulation program and prolongation of the established trends of the system's changes. But forecasts of such kind are already not working if the system enters the phase transition state. In this case it's principally important to determine at which stage of this transition the system is and what type of causal links is the basis for forecasting its future.

Transformations of the society at the phase transition stage may be of different deepness. The deepest qualitative transformations of the society that determine its future evolution often for many centuries, take place when these is transition to a new type of civilization development.

There were two such transitions in the history of the humankind – 1) from archaic societies to civilizations of the traditional type; 2) establishment of the technology-related type of civilization development that originated in Europe and then spread all over the globe.

There are a lot of grounds to think that contemporary global changes and accompanying them crises are the original stage of transition to a new type of civilization development, the third in relation to traditional and technology-related types.

The value matrix (meanings of the universals of culture) is transformed and new value orientation points are formed in case the type of civilization development changes. They form the nucleus of the genetic code of the societies realizing the respective development type. This nucleus in each of such societies is connected with the type's specific features, expressing the historical features of culture of this or that kind of society (civilization).

I have already emphasized in my papers and not once that there are growth points of new values originating in the contemporary technology-related culture, and they serve a forerunner and prerequisite of transition to a new type of civilization development. Here it's possible to single out two clusters of values. The first of them is referred to understanding human attitude to nature. The image of nature as a field for transforming activities and bottomless reservoir of resources, the idea of man's dominance over nature

was the most important component of the spiritual matrix of technology-related cultures. They served as the deep-laid value foundation for economic development strategies, including the modern versions in the societies of consumption. But other ideas of nature and human activities were worded in the course of science's development, already in the 20th century. It turned out that the natural environment, with which humans directly interact, is a one whole live organism, global ecosystem, biosphere. Human productive activities have a growing impact on it, and that may lead to local and then global environmental crises.

Philosophical ideas of Russian cosmism, development of the biosphere and noosphere concept by V. I. Vernadsky, ideas of the Club of Rome about the limits of growth, environmental ethics concepts (B. Callicott, L. White, R. Attfield) and critical analysis by Ervin László already in this century of the main principles of the economy's of the societies of consumption arrangement made a considerable contribution into the development of these ideas, and the conclusion that these principles ("the more we consume, the better we live", "each generation solves its problems itself") orientate to consumption of natural resources in expanding scales, and that in its turn leads to increasing pollution of the environment and environmental catastrophe. The ideal of man's dominance over nature was transformed into the ideal of coevolution of man and nature as a generalization of all those ideas.

The second cluster of new values arising in bifurcation points of technology-related culture is connected with the problems of scientific and technological progress. It has always been the core of changes in social life in the technology-related type of development. Complex self-development systems are becoming the main objects of the breakthrough scientific research and technologies. The special place among them is occupied by man-sized systems, including humans as their component. The examples of such systems are biosphere, biogeocenoses, all social objects in their development, the objects of today's convergent NBIC technologies (nano-, bio-, information and cognitive technologies).

The activities with complex developing systems have their special features. They are not just a purely external factor in relation to the system, but are included in it, actualizing some development scenarios and reducing the probability of others.

When researching self-developing systems, there is always the problem of their development scenarios' analysis, arising at the phase transitions stage. There may be unfavourable scenarios among them, and even disastrous for humans. It's necessary to analyze and assess them. This task is solved in the process of socio-ethical expert examination of scientific and technological programs and projects. The efficiency of such an expert examination depends to a large extent on the use of achievements of social sciences and the humanities in it. These sciences in the process of research and technological mastering of complex systems actively interact with natural and technical sciences, forming interdisciplinary complexes of knowledge, required for solution of certain research and practical tasks.

In the near future, the humankind mastering convergent technologies will run across new problems, the solution of which will require the new level of social and humanitarian

scientific research. Robotics and application of information technologies set the task to change educational and training strategies. Questions arise as to how to restructure educational processes, how to arrange upbringing of the new generation from childhood.

The problems of human consciousness formation in the context of changes of culture should be comprehended

as determining all other spheres of human vital activities. And that comprehension is impossible without a build-up of the potential of social sciences and the humanities. In this connection it is appropriate to remember the statement by the famous ethnologist and expert in cultural studies Clause Lévi-Strauss: "The 21st century will be the century of social sciences and the humanities, or it won't be at all".

V. A. Tishkov¹

ETHNIC AND RELIGIOUS VARIETY OF RUSSIA: RESULTS AND PROSPECTS OF THE RESEARCH

The Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology of the Russian Academy of Sciences realized a big scientific project under my supervision for studies of ethnocultural and religious variety of Russia in 2015–2017 as a part of the Russian Foundation for Fundamental Research target contest "Social and Cultural Aspects of National Security". Besides a number of collective and individual publications by the participants of the project, we published our collective work as a result of it,² and we'll present a number of theses and conclusions from it in this report for the International Likhachov Scientific Conference 2018.

This research encompassed the following issues: the changing dynamics of ethnic demography and identity in the post-Soviet period and at the current stage, and what that means for stability and solidarity of the Russian nation; transformations in the sphere of ethnic, civil, religious, regional identity; the dynamics of religious confessions and institutions, including analysis of the state of affairs in case of Russian Orthodoxy and Islam; the state of affairs in ethnocultural education and language policy; migration processes and integration problems; ethnocultural brands of Russian regions and locations. The central scientific problem, at the solution of which our three-year project was targeted, consisted of revealing, analysis and comprehension of cultural and confessional variety of the Russian society from the perspective of overcoming risks and providing national security of the country. To be more ex-

act – searching the answer to the question: does the complex ethnic and religious composition of the Russian population mean the weakness of the state and an obstacle for its successful development, or is this factor not directly related to stability and well-being of the multinational Russian Federation, and does it even, on the contrary, make an important resource for its development?

Russia is a polyethnic and polyconfessional society, where the state of affairs is aggravated by the fact that institutionalization of ethnicity is provided by ethnoterritorial autonomies in the form of republics and autonomous districts as a part of the federative arrangement of the country, and long primordial vision of ethnicity both in everyday life and at the expert level. There are differently directed factors of centralization as well as regional and ethnic disintegration in force in Russia: on the one hand, nationwide institutions (the system of education, the Army, universal use of the Russian language and operation of mass media in Russian, high professional culture, etc.) help formation of the common civil identity, on the other hand, ethnonational institutions in republics, preservation of traditional cultures, support and development of particular ethnic cultures (literature, folk arts and crafts, ethnic tourism, etc.) support ethnic identity among non-Russian people, giving it primary importance in a number of situations and cases. This primary importance can develop into inter-ethnic conflicts and even rejection of the common state.

A kind of a mirror state of affairs exists in a certain environment also in evaluation of the state of culture and political manifestations on behalf of the domineering majority of the population – ethnic Russians, whose identity is historically expressed powerfully and in many facets, starting from the language, religion and ending with the country's name. It's impossible to deny that the Russian exists because there are the Russians, and this is surely the starting point of the statehood and the country's power. However, politicization of the Russian factor in certain environment can also contain risks that are no smaller than risks of peripheral nationalism or secessionism. It can seem that there is no one for the Russians to separate from, and they are the first keepers of the statehood, but we should not forget 1991, when exactly "the Russian Russia" in the person of the RSFSR became one of the initiators of the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

Religion became a new factor for formation of group identities in the Russian Federation, its role is also ambiguous and contextual: in some cases it blurs ethnic borders,

¹ Academician Secretary of the Division of Historical and Philological Sciences, member of the Presidium of the RAS, research supervisor of the Miklukho-Maklay Institute of Ethnology and Anthropology of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor, Honoured Scientist of the Russian Federation. Author of more than 400 academic papers and scientific-promotional papers, including monographs: "The Liberation Movement in Colonial Canada", "The History of Canada", "Requiem for Ethnos. Research in Social and Cultural Anthropology", "Essays on Theory and Policy of Ethnicity in Russia", "Political Anthropology", "The Society in Armed Conflict", "Experience in Ethnological Monitoring", "Science and Life. Talking to Ethnographers", "Sustainability and Mobility of Ethnocultural Borders", "The Russian People: History and Meaning of National Consciousness", etc. Member of editorial boards of the journals *Ethnographic Review*, *Federalism*, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, etc. Member of the Council for Foreign Relations under the President of the Russian Federation, Academic Councils under the Security Council and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Council of the Russian Humanitarian Scientific Foundation, etc. He was awarded the State Prize of the Russian Federation for science and engineering, the State Prize of the Russian Federation for science and technologies. He was awarded the Order of Honour, the Order of Friendship, medal "For Labour Valour", Order of the Russian Orthodox Church of Saint Blessed Prince Daniel of Moscow, III degree.

² Этническое и религиозное многообразие России. 2-е изд., испр. и доп. / под ред. В. А. Тишкова, В. В. Степанова. М.: ИЭА РАН, 2018.

in other cases, on the contrary, it strengthens ethnic identity, but on the whole religion is called to be a stabilizing and conciliatory factor, if no radical, fundamental programs and forces originate in its environment or around it. From this point of view Russian polyconfessionality is an interesting and important field for studies.

Both ethnicity and religion form certain special cultural features of worldviews and behaviour, which are usually described in the terms of "national characters" or "ethnic stereotypes". At the same time, civil integration as a result of purposeful efforts of the elite and authorities leads to establishment of national culture with its own codes and symbols, clear to everyone. This process is based on the long experience in interaction and all-sided inter-influence by representatives of various cultures and confessions within the framework of the historical Russian state: the Russian Empire, the USSR and the Russian Federation.

The object of studies in the course of our research was the issues of relation and interaction of the nationwide culture with ethnic and religious traditions, values and norms: how they combine, if they are capable of integration and non-conflict co-existence, or destined for a permanent conflict as the followers of the theses on "incompatibility of cultures" and "clash of civilizations" as well as opponents of nation-building on the multi-ethnic civil foundation, insist. Our hypothesis proceeds from understanding of culture as an ideal matrix used by people to put the world picture in order. At the same time, culture is heterogeneous and changeable, it does not have fixed borders, and culture can be interpreted.

Cultures are permanently interacting and have a considerable impact on one another, and that leads to origination of hybrid cultures and complex, not excluding each other forms of collective identities: "I am Russian, and I am a citizen of Russia". All that becomes evident in the globalization environment and has an impact on ethnic and national, and even religious cultures, though religious borders are more rigid than ethnic. And the main thing is that individuals are not a mere tool of culture; on the contrary, they are capable of efficient cultural adaptation and existence in several cultures or "between cultures", which is often witnessed in today's world. Because of that we don't share the tough stances, advocated by right-wing conservative and ultra-national experts and politicians, thinking that not common cultures and values dominate between the Russians and representatives of other nationalities in Russia, but some civilizational incompatibilities, and that migrants from other ethnos are incapable of integration.

We think that a lot depends on an individual, his internal resources, mindsets and intentions. Though these mindsets themselves depend on a whole set of factors – social, cultural and psychological. The state policy and impact of strong institutions of the civil society are determining in providing inter-ethnic friendly relations and stability of polyethnic communities. Because of that the most important focal area is studies of how exactly identity is formed in today's world – national, ethnic, religious identity, what factors influence that, how these factors interact with each other (if they are cooperating or clashing with each other), what people mean under the notion of national, ethnic and religious identity and how these identities influence their real life, what these identities mean in various spheres of life (private and public life, cultural and religious needs, profes-

sional and everyday life, etc.), or if they have equal importance in the same areas of human existence.

How is the "ethnic culture" image formed, what is it made of and what does it mean for culture natives? What do "cultural values" mean and what meaning is put into this notion? What really happens when cultures interact and what happens at that time with the idea of "values"? Is an individual capable of being competent in several cultures at once? Can a nationwide identity in a polycultural state have some common cultural and historical foundation? If yes, what exactly this foundation should be, does it require working out a special historical myth (big narrative) and how can the general be combined with the particular?

Analyses of national, ethnic, religious symbols, their social interpretations, symbolic behavioural rules, the language factor's meaning (including bilingualism and multilingualism), social memory and images of the past, the role of professional culture in modern identities' formation are important to solve these tasks. Ethical ideas of the world are no less important, in particular, about neighbours, religious (traditional) understanding of the meaning of history and its combination with scholarly approaches, the identity's impact on people's behaviour, their attitude to the world, to "us" and "them". It's clear that all that depends on social and cultural competence as well as the context-situation (*locus*), in which an individual finds himself or to which he refers himself. Because of that special features of primordial, multiple, situational and symbolic identity (the "ethnic drift" phenomenon) and their instrumental meanings for the people of Russia are important for the studies of the diversity.

One of the most important objects of studies is religious ideas and practices (connected with both traditional and new religions), having an impact on the identity, as well as contemporary forms of cultural and religious intolerance and violence, xenophobia, racism and neo-Fascist based on them. The dynamics of ethnic and religious composition of the people of the Russian Federation and the changing list of nationalities as well as various rates of their growth and internal migrations at the level of certain regions have an impact on these processes.

Studies of the ethno-confessional diversity of Russia are not only academically important but it also has an impact on the practical policy of nation-building, civil education and upbringing, including and first of all the young generation of Russian citizens. Here our original thesis is important, supported by certain materials – joint residence of natives of many cultures and native speakers of many languages within the framework of one country and as parts of one Russian nation was typical for our state during its whole history. The variety of people became the source of constant and mutually enriching communications, the condition for the country's development. It's difficult to imagine what the Russian state could be had it developed for many centuries just on territorial, demographic and cultural foundation of one or several East Slavic tribes.

The Slavic culture, the Russian language and religious Christian and Byzantium tradition in the form of Russian Orthodoxy made the foundation and a kind of referent (domineering) culture of the Russians for many centuries. They still stay that till nowadays. However, the Russian people are unthinkable without representatives of other

nationalities – natives of other cultural and historical traditions as the religious life of the country is unthinkable without those professing Islam, Judaism, Buddhism. Though ethnoconfessional differences become the reasons for conflicts, intolerance and violence, we proceed from the fact that ethnic and religious variety as well as numerous nationalities within the Russian nation made it rich and strong not only in the past but still make now. And what is more, they are the condition for the country's stability and development. Such presentation of the problem is innovative as notwithstanding the provision of the Constitution and statements by the President of the country, the risks and incompatibility motives prevail in academic and public debates on the topic.

The Russian people, no matter the demographic problems, stay the biggest European nation. The inertia of the past, conservatism of the expert community and ethnic nationalism of a part of the elite were the obstacles for many years to a more powerful establishment of the idea of Russia as a formed nation-state and the Russian people as a civil nation. Old scholarly approaches and superficial political messages proceed from the fact that there is a task as if set "to make Russian citizens" from the Russians, Tatars, Chuvashes, etc. This is a detrimental interpretation of the essence of things. The Russian people-nation is not a result of unification but a joint ethnic variety. The population of new Russia is characterized by the high degree of social-political and historical-cultural unity. The overwhelming majority of the population is proud of their civil identity ("citizen of Russia").

The views and attitudes of individuals, their groups and institutions, their ideas, purposes and values are quickly changing in modern Russia, with deep social and political changes as a background. This contradictory process brings about a lot of disputes and dissatisfactions, but on the whole it is positive, and we should see and support this positive character. In the 1990s, all our attention was drawn to the conflict in the sphere of ethnocultural development, contradictions tied with revival of religious life of the country. But there are different trends nowadays. We are witnessing a new degree of consolidation of the Russian society, positive aspirations of people, increased activity of non-governmental organizations, helping ethnoconfessional dialogue. This new positive development of the society is manifested in various forms, including the growing potential of the civil society's institutions in providing all-national accord and inter-national peace.

The state has a certain "responsibility area" in establishing ethnocultural relations. We are speaking first of all about advancement of the Russian legislation, which is still lacking in the sphere of ethnonational policy. We are for adoption of a federal law on the foundations of ethnonational policy and provision of national unity of the Russian Federation.

At the same time, ethical and religious life is to a small extent the state's "territory of responsibility". Ethnic and religious life is the choice and effort of the citizen himself, setting up organizations and unions jointly with other citizens. Ethnic and religious life is the right of an individual to stay himself, not to be like others. At the same time, people should obey common laws, co-exist together, strengthen their civil solidarity for the state's flourishing. The latter is also a strategically important task.

Complication and rapid dynamics of ethnocultural, social and political configuration of the modern Russian society in connection with its social stratification, urbanization, mass migrations, differently-directed ethnodemographic trends combined with growing social inequality of regions and areas in the environment of market economy's development create the grounds for dissatisfaction of the people, mass phobias and prejudices, worries about the future. Russia has become the country admitting migrants, people speaking different languages, with their traditions and mentality are coming to us. We should be ready to integrate migrants and to change ourselves, to stay calm and maintain peace, attain strengthening of people's solidarity. Ethnic variety of Russia and its national unity may become the basis for this solidarity.

Let's sum up some results and offer forecasts.

1. The ethnic, religious, language, cultural variety of the Russian Federation and its regions is not itself the source of its destabilization but at the same time it is not an automatic guarantee of stable and successful development either. Purposeful efforts of the authorities and civil society are required in the environment of cultural variety to prevent tension and conflicts on the grounds of cultural differences and to transform the diversity into the creative development resource.

2. Risks originate when governance is contrary to cultural (ethnic and religious) norms and traditions of local people. In case of culturally sensitive and competent governance the very factor of polyethnic population can be the source of enriching interaction and development. In case of poor governance and management and politicization of ethnicity and religious issues, this factor is a serious risk for destabilization and conflict.

3. Analysis of the dynamics of the ethnic composition of Russia confirms not only deep historical roots of the multi-ethnic nature of the Russian people but also reveals the stable structure of the ethnic composition proper. This means that notwithstanding internal and external migrations, acculturation and assimilation, the composition and relation of the main ethnic communities (nations) on the whole are maintained over a long historical period. The ethnic structure of Russian citizens is stable with the Russians domineering (80%) and distribution of two dozens other biggest groups that together with the Russians make 97% of the population of the country.

4. The stable composition and relation will be typical for most regions of the country in the next two decades in case of the current birthrate and migration processes. However, the trend for increase of the share of people referred to the Moslem historical and cultural tradition and confession will be fixed (10.4% in 2010, 13% in 2020 and 14.5% in 2030).

5. There are negative trends for increase of monoethnicity of the population in a number of regions (first of all, the North Caucasian republics and Southern Siberia) in favour of the so-called title nations as well as formation in the central regions, where the Russians predominantly live, of the "suburb phenomenon" in the form of complexes of mass multi-storied residential development with the newcomer population, often belonging to a different from the local residents ethnicity. Special risks are brought about by possible conflicts of the two groups of population with different life patterns and traditions and lack of social and

cultural control over the incoming young people by traditional environment as well as lack of neighbourly relations providing mutual adaptation of the citizens.

6. All serious studies show that ethnic affiliation is first of all the issue of personal identity, and it is not connected with just blood origin and other primordial ideas. Because of that a more sensitive attitude to state and society governance is required in ethnocultural development, as well as transfer to a more flexible idea of the list, composition and status of ethnic communities, which in particular should provide for a possibility for people to fix their complex ethnic affiliation. About 15% of the Russian population are the descendants of mixed marriages and are inclined to ethnically identify themselves dually, this figure is even higher in some regions and depending on age.

7. Research of the confessional state of affairs confirms the fact of conjugation and conflict-free coexistence of traditional confessions and the leading role of the Russian Or-

thodox Church in Russia. The lack of inter-religious conflicts does not exclude the risk of destabilization by radical and extremist groups. In case of the due condition of the confessional and state relations and responsibility of religious communities, the religious factor is a resource for preservation and support of traditional social norms and practices as well as an important peace-making mechanism.

8. Sociological analysis in polyethnic regions of the country revealed a considerable demand on the part of students, parents, the public for learning both the Russian language and non-Russian languages as well as the growing interest to studies of such subjects as local ethnic cultures, ethnic cuisine and fashion, ethnic tourism, etc. This disproves the opinion about disappearance of local ethnical diversity and casts a doubt on the educational policy providing exclusively all-Russian standards based on the Unified State Exam and minimization of ethno-regional contents in educational programs.

P. P. Tolochko¹

"STOP POKING THE BEAR"

In the end of 2016, Robert W. Merry, the political editor of American website *The National Interest* supposed in his article under a noteworthy title "Stop Poking the Bear" that the United States and Russia would stop being enemies "tomorrow". The hopes were associated with Donald Trump winning the US Presidential election. The author saw that as a signal to the world "to change shoes" quickly, and those who will not understand it, can regret it. The Russian community of political scientists had similar hopes, and the deputies to the State Duma of the Federal Assembly even raised glasses with champagne drinking to changes in the US White House.

Today, only lazybones do not speak ironically about that in the Russian liberal camp. And it's not fully clear what inspires them so much. Political naivety, ingenuousness and simple-mindedness of people hoping that after D. Trump's coming to power, relations between Russia and the United States will improve or their own insight that this was not to be.

I also demonstrated restrained optimism at the 2017 Likhachov Scientific Conference in connection with D. Trump's being elected the President. I supposed that the United States and Russia would not become friends but the world would feel calmer if they stop being at odds with

each other. Unfortunately, this did not happen. D. Trump did not drain "the Washington swamp" and no one had to "change shoes". Neither in the United States, nor in the countries under their control. And what is more, the new US President became a natural part of that "swamp", supporting its efforts in aggravating relations with Russia. Though when he was a candidate for Presidency, he did not exclude a possibility of their improvement.

Some small European countries, which only recently became NATO members, or are exerting all efforts to become such members, were especially happy with that. Their selfless devotion to Hillary Clinton declared by their authorities until the day the results of elections in America were announced, did not become the basis for change of the United States' attitude to them. The new President pretended that he had not noticed their caustic remarks about him as a candidate for Presidency or political opponents had not given him a chance to see that. Critics of D. Trump also quickly forgot about that and now they started looking for favours from him.

The example of the Ukrainian President P. Poroshenko is especially demonstrative in this respect. Only "yesterday" he showered H. Clinton with compliments and saw only her as the US President, and now he is looking for every opportunity to shake the sovereign hand of D. Trump.

Unfortunately, the new US Administration did not listen to the advice given by the wise politician and statesman Henry Kissinger and did not choose the way for normalization of relations with Russia. Following Robert Merry's metaphors, one can say that the "Bear" is not just poked now but also set the dogs on. Just take the cynical exclusion of Russian sportsmen from the 2018 Olympic Games in South Korea without any arguments. This should be despicable for a civilized society. No matter the attitude of political elites of the collective West to the Russian authorities, it's a shame to vent their anger on the whole country and its people. Really, this brutal demonstration of force is its opposite. Revengefulness is always the lot of the weak.

¹ Member of the Presidium of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Honorary Director of the Institute of Archeology of the NAS of Ukraine, academician of the NAS of Ukraine, foreign member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor. Author of more than 500 scientific publications, including 25 books: "Ancient Kiev", "Ancient Rus", "Ancient Russian Feudal City", "Historical Portraits", "Russian Chronicles and Chroniclers of the 10th–13th Centuries", "Vladimir the Saint – Yaroslav the Wise", "From Rus to Ukraine", "The Ancient Russian People, Imaginary or Real", "Power in Ancient Rus in the 10th–13th Centuries", "Ukrainians in Russia", "The Origins of Russian Land", etc. Member of the Academy of Europe (London), corresponding member of the Central German Archaeological Institute. Laureate of the State Prize of the Ukrainian SSR in the Field of Science and Technology, State Prize of Ukraine, the Grushevsky Prize of the NAS of Ukraine, Makariyevskaya Prize and Alexander Nevsky Prize (Russia). Awarded the 3rd–5th Class Orders of Prince Yaroslav the Wise, "the Badge of Honor" (Ukraine), the Order of Friendship and the Order of the Badge of Honor (Russia). Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS.

It's surprising that young European allies of the United States that actually rave about the revenge for insults by Russia in the past, are the most inspired in this case as well. They regularly demand to impose new and new sanctions on Russia from the United States and the West, and not only economic but political as well. The Ukrainian political circles were rejoicing after the Russian Parliamentary delegation was deprived of the right to vote in the PACE. Timid attempts by the top officials of this authoritative organization to somehow correct the mistake made and return Russian parliamentarians to Strasbourg, were decisively opposed. The head of the Ukrainian Parliamentary delegation said: "If Russia is returned to the PACE, then the Ukraine will leave it". Most likely, this threat would not have been brought into life, but the PACE officials have to take it into account.

The statement by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Ukraine P. Klimkin in the interview to the German newspaper *Rheinische Post* looks no less tactless: "Lifting sanctions imposed on Russia will lead to Europe's split", he said. Who could have thought it? He has not been taken into that Europe yet, and he already blackmails it with a possibility of a split. Surely, if P. Klimkin had no American supervisor at his back, he would have hardly had the courage for such mentoring in case of the leading European countries.

Such a position of the Ukrainian authorities seems counter-productive for me. It won't bring anything serious except satisfaction of personal ambitions by realization that Russia was humiliated. It won't solve the problems between the Ukraine and Russia accumulated over the four years. Russia's non-participation in the PACE operation practically excludes any influence of this organization's on the position of Russia. And if we take into account the Law "On Reintegration of Donbass", adopting which the Ukraine in essence refused the Minsk Agreements, the possibilities for the Ukrainian-Russian relations' getting out of deep crisis turned out to be zero.

Construction of a military base by Americans in Ochakovo will become a big obstacle on that way. As if for the Ukraine but really for themselves. In the way it already happened in Romania and Bulgaria. The Ukrainian authorities are enthusiastic about that as about deliveries of lethal weapons to the Ukraine. At the same time, they emphasize all the time that the Ukraine protects not only itself but also the whole democratic Europe from Russian aggression. Surely, virtual as there is no real yet and most likely there won't be.

I don't know if today's leaders of the Ukraine understand that such statements are nothing else but acknowledgement that they are the tool for alien policy and alien for the Ukrainian people interests. Here-and-now profits in the form of credits obtained from the United States, International Monetary Fund, some European structures don't compensate even to a little extent for the Ukrainian losses because of breaking economic relations with Russia. And this is not a theory but the sad reality. Ukrainian citizens are rapidly being reduced to poverty. Their numbers decrease threateningly. More than 10 mln died, at least 5 mln left for Russia and European countries to work.

The sad certification of the Ukrainian economic well-being and the standard of living of its population is the fact that, according to the survey conducted by the International

Institute of Sociology, the results of which were published in January, 2018, 45.2% of the Ukrainians do not see their future in the Ukraine and would like to leave for a foreign country. Unfortunately, this reality is not fully recognized by most Ukrainian people that go on believing the President's optimistic statements about the bright European future of the Ukraine.

It's well-known that other post-Soviet countries have not found the Paradise on Earth – Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia that are already members of the European Union and have obligingly provided their territories for placement of the US military forces and bases. Their population, which was not numerous originally, is also steadily reducing. I don't know if common Estonians feel satisfaction from the fact that American fighter aircrafts and bombers based on their territory can reach St. Petersburg in 16 minutes. If yes, then it's deep self-deceit. God forbid an armed conflict, but they may not take off at all. And their tragic fate will be shared by small Estonia.

If you listen to Polish political scientists actively taking part in shows on the Russian TV, you involuntarily get an impression that they completely lost the sense of reality. The relations with the United States as military allies give them the feeling of euphoria. They say with delight that Americans sent their troops, 3.5 thousand men with 80 tanks and armoured vehicles, to protect them. And though there is nothing showing that Russia intends to attack Poland, the Russian threat bugaboo is the best sold commodity in Poland.

These "young Europeans" hardly believe that Russia has malicious plans to conquer them, but the bugaboos and scare stories about the Russian threat bring them good dividends from the rich West. First of all, from the USA. Surely, this is deception, but the one enjoyed by Americans themselves, because they to a certain extent make placement of military infrastructure legitimate by the borders of Russia. Thus, some post-Soviet and post-people's-democratic countries in the person of their political authorities suffer from historical complexes and find themselves on the front line of the global confrontation of the United States and Russia.

And surely, Poland plays a special role here, becoming a kind of temporary charge d'affairs of the United States in Europe. It was the first of the European countries honoured to receive D. Trump. The President of Poland Andrzej Duda welcomed expansion of the US sanctions against Russia when he met Rex Tillerson in Davos and said that he was sure in their strengthening. The US Secretary of State in his turn visited the strategic partner after Davos and supported Poland in its opposition to Russian and German plans to build the Nord Stream 2 gas pipeline.

The unconditional following in the wake of American dominating policy and confrontation with Russia by Poland, the Ukraine, South Baltic states and some other East European states certifies not only the lack of these states authorities' responsibility for the European future but also the lack of the elementary instinct of self-preservation. If you tease the bear all the time, the bear may snap at you. And then not only imaginary but real reasons for new offenses may originate in case of the above-mentioned countries. It's impossible to live with Russophobia all the time. It's a dead-end and a dangerous way. The old Europe went along it for a long time, trying to expand the so-called "territory of freedom", not taking the interests of Russia into account. And

often bringing damage to Russia. And that was done and is still being done not by drawing Russia into the European free economic space and demonstrating advantages of Western economic development models, but with the help of armed forces, NATO strengthening, drawing new members into this organization. Probably, this gives Western countries assurance and they feel more secure from their point of view. But at the same time, it deprives Russia of a similar assurance. It generates mutual distrust and new mutual fears.

It seemed that after the disintegration of the Soviet Union and breaking up of the Warsaw Treaty Organization, the need in NATO should be eliminated by itself. It became an anachronism in the new life. This was even mentioned by D. Trump in his speeches during the election campaign. But no, the anachronism goes on living and strengthening. And for some reason it does not come to mind of civilized Europeans that a challenge always generates an adequate answer. And no one will feel calmer because of it.

Recently, there is an understanding originating in old European countries that it is impossible to live in the environment of the confrontation thrust upon the world by the USA – military, economic, ideological. The economic sanctions imposed on Russia negatively affect not only Russia but European countries as well. According to the conclusion by the Institute of World Economics, published in December, 2017, Germany loses Euro 618 million every month because of its own sanctions. Several Prime Ministers of German federal states said fairly definitely that it was necessary to lift them. The Minister of Foreign Affairs Sigmar Gabriel emphasized that it was an internal affair of Germany when he answered the opponents of the Nord Stream 2.

The Federal Chancellor A. Merkel started sharing such sentiments and presented several important thoughts at the World Economic Forum in Davos. “We think that we should cooperate and that protectionism is a wrong way. Controversial issues should be settled, taking into account the opinions of various parties and not unilaterally”. But it seemed that her main political message was the statement: “We should take our fate into our own hands”.

One should think that “we” are Germany and other European countries. Thoughts about the necessity to end the confrontational policy of sanctions were also expressed in some of them. They said about that in the Belgian Parliament, in the House of Lords in the UK. The President of the Czech Republic Miloš Zeman, the Prime Minister of Hungary Viktor Orbán, the Prime Minister of Belgium Charles Michel spoke on the subject fairly definitely. They are tied by corporate behavioral rules as members of the European Union, but they fairly well understand the absurdity of the American domineering policy based on armed coercion, thrust upon the world by the United States.

The contours of the future, outlined in the American nuclear strategy, making provisions for use of nuclear weapons in the environment of a common military conflict as well as appointment of Russia, China, Iran and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the role of the United States' enemies, should not satisfy the international community. These are apocalyptic contours. The future of the whole planet cannot be determined by one country. The time has come when all nations of the world and their governments should recognize their responsibilities to the future and say decisively after Mrs. Merkel about their wish “to take their fate into their own hands”.

Zh. T. Toshchenko¹

THE PAST, THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE IN THE RUSSIAN INTELLIGENTSIA'S MEANINGS OF LIFE

The future cannot exist just by itself. It is a value when it is based on the experience of the past and feeds on the blood and flesh of the present. This refers to all processes taking place in the world and in each society without exception. This also refers to such a phenomenon as culture, personifying the degree and level of the humankind's interactions not only with nature but also between people themselves.

If we analyze the contents of all, especially outstanding creative works of global and domestic culture, it's possible to come to the conclusion that they reflect deep process-

es taking place in the consciousness, value orientations, in principles-purposes of life. And these essential elements of culture, its concentrated contents, in our opinion, are reflected in such a real phenomenon that can be called the meaning of life. Exactly the meaning of life embodies everything that elevates an individual, shows the degree of his mastering the achievements of the humankind, allows to manifest and to demonstrate the world and the environment in conclusion and readiness of people to solve the problems that worry them.

The meaning of life as a special form of value orientations, being the manifestation of various kinds of culture, has become urgent in connection with solution of pressing socioeconomic, social-political and social-cultural problems. The demand for it became especially urgent in connection with deep shifts taking place in the social-cultural life of the world and each society. But it's possible to understand its significance and role only by comprehension of the organic unity of the past, the present and the future in vital activities and especially of that stratum of the society, which we call intelligentsia. We can understand the future

¹ Chairman of the International Editorial Board of the RAS journal *Sociological Studies*, Chief Researcher of the Institute of Sociology of the RAS, Head of the Department of Theory and History of Sociology of the Russian State University for the Humanities, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor. Author of more than 660 publications, 22 monographs and 5 textbooks, including: “Paradoxical Man”, “Sociology of Labor”, “Thesaurus of Sociology”, “Milestones of Sociology” (editor-in-chief), “Centaur-Problem: An Attempt at Philosophical and Sociological Analysis”, “Political Sociology” (editor-in-chief), “Sociology of Management”, “Phantoms of Russian Society”, “Sociology of Life”, etc. Honored Professor of Lomonosov Moscow State University and the RSUH. Honorary Doctor of the Institute of Sociology of the RAS. Laureate of the Kovalovsky Award of the RAS.

of culture and its carrier – the intelligentsia – only in case if we review their future in the context of achievements of the past and looking for ways to solve problem now.

In this case we analyze the meanings of life of Russian intelligentsia, and that means revealing both fundamental and specific features, characterizing only this social stratum, taking into account special features of various groups from it.

First of all, let's pay attention to the special approach to analysis of the meanings of life characteristic of intelligentsia. Let's underline that *the theoretical and methodological basis of their analysis is time modes – the past, the present, the future*. We'll review the meanings of life of various groups/communities of intelligentsia exactly from this perspective, and specify at the same time that when we speak about the *past*, we mean the *significance* when *memory* plays a very important role. When analyzing the *present*, the meanings of life reflect *values, value orientations*, when people operate with *judgments*. When reviewing the *future*, it's important to see *goals (public and personal)*, which intelligentsia is governed by, resorting to such a prognostic thinking tool as *imagination*.

It's possible to offer the following classification of today's Russian intelligentsia exactly if we combine various meanings related to *the past, the present and the future*. Let's mention that we put aside judgments about the difference between the notions of “intelligentsia” and “intellectuals”, thinking that in real life people still use the notion of “intelligentsia”, referring individuals with higher education and/or engaged in mostly intellectual work to it. However, there is an opinion according to which the key role in changes that took place in the 1980s and the 1990s was played by the stratum of the society that should be called semi-intelligentsia. Its main features were and still are *the imitation of intelligentsia's culture, intellectual inactivity and passivity, conformism, “complete inability to think independently about social issues”* (italics by the author – Yu. O.).¹

What really happens in intelligentsia circles? Does it bring the future nearer? What positions does it take in the field of culture? Does it differ in the worldview from the general public around it? What meanings does it adhere to, what allows to assess its life-world on the whole but not by separate indicators?

Realists-rationalizers

This group, according to sociological research, is predominant in numbers but not the most influential in determining the fates of the modern Russian society. *This group's meaning of life consists of its making personal plans and plans for the society, basing on positive assessments of the past, acknowledgement of the necessity to use its achievements, rejecting attempts not to take into account traditions, assessments of the past established earlier, viewing the present and forecasting the future from the positions of the past*. When assessing the past, they consider the history of Russia and the Soviet period to be progressive development stages, though not without losses, defeats and failures. The actions of the well-known politicians of Russia, with whom the main events of the history of Russia are connected, are important and determining positive events for

them, these names are Prince Vladimir, Baptizer of Russia, Ivan the Terrible, Peter the Great, Alexander I, Lenin, Stalin. At the same time, they are critical, and impartially analyze many activities and actions of the said people. As to the today's present, they evaluate positive shifts in exercising such rights as freedom of movement and expression of one's opinion, they compare them with the preceding stage and not in favour of the existing reality. They regret disintegration of the USSR as 60–65% of the population, though they understand that there will be no turning back. But they can't shut their eyes to the fact that during more than one quarter of a century, from the beginning of the 1990s, Russia not only failed to move forward but it did not achieve what the RSFSR had in 1990 in many indicators. They are especially concerned and can't be reconciled with giant social inequality, frozen social lifts, damaging changes in educational sphere, public health and culture. At the same time, their sentiments are mostly positive, they see the way out and promote various forms of Russia's modernization, though their ideas about the variants of its bringing into life differ greatly. Their focusing on shifts and principal changes is based of taking achievements of the past into account as well as acceptable methods of achievement and realization of new requirements of the time. However, no matter that their strata are significant, in most cases they are passive marking time in expectation, they hope that common sense will prevail and provide a progressive evolutionary change of the society.²

As for the future, according to the all-Russian survey “How do you live, intelligentsia?” (1,350 people, 2016, Russian State University of the Humanities), only one third or realists-rationalizers (36.5%) is focused on “return of the great power status to Russia” (with 47.2% of the general public being of this opinion), which allows to state that intelligentsia understands clearer and assesses more precisely its position in the world today. Because of that orientation to observance of “justice, equal rights for all” in the state (61.5%), provision of “stability in the society without wars and revolutions” (48.8%) is predominant in this group of intelligentsia. To put it differently, *this community of intelligentsia is to a bigger extent focused on solution of internal problems of the country, on the necessity to pay attention first of all to social problems*. At the same time, these groups of people are clearly and positively inclined to use the experience of other states' and nations' development but closely tied with national special features.

When characterizing this group, we should emphasize its special feature: when criticizing some or the other states of the contemporary society, rejecting a number of official acts and carried out changes, its representatives do not restrict their discussions and actions by just their negation: they offer constructive solutions, they worry about the way of making these changes, they are aimed at permanent improvement and advancement of the established state of affairs. All that allows to come to the conclusion that creative and constructive aspirations of this part of intelligentsia are considerable but not always used by decision-makers.

² See: Жизненный мир научно-технической и социально-гуманитарной интеллигенции: общее и особенное. М.: РГГУ, 2015; Луков В. А. Миссия интеллигенции в современном российском обществе. URL: http://www.zpu-journal.ru/gum/society/articles/Lukov_Val; Шевченко В. Н. Интеллигенция и общественность в российском обществе: история и современность // Личность. Культура. Общество. 2002. Т. IV, № 3–4 (13–14). С. 107–128.

¹ Олейчук Ю. Полуинтеллигенция // Свободная мысль. 2002. № 10. С. 27–28.

Social Groups Inclined to Narcissism

These groups are mostly represented by liberals, neo- and radical liberals. Their main characteristics are peculiar features of life arrangement that poorly correlate with the reality or don't correlate at all. A kind of locked, artificially constructed world turns out in their case.

They do not want to know the past, they ignore its experience and lessons. They are clearly negative in their attitude to the Soviet period, and they are if not rejecting then evidently skeptical in relation to all historical past.

As for the Soviet Russia, all its actions – industrialization, collectivization, reforms of the 1960–1980s – are unambiguously negatively assessed as senseless, faulty and perverse. Exactly this group of intelligentsia in the years of the Gorbachev's Perestroika (restructuring) initiated criticism of Stalin from Lenin's point of view, then criticism of Lenin from Marx's point of view, then of everything referred to Marxism and Socialism (Communism) for final and irreversible declaration of liberal values and directives.¹ The following fact is also demonstrative. Yegor Gaidar was recommended to invite the well-known sociologist M. Castells, whose works projected the future, for consultations. When the issue of the urgent reforms was discussed as well as what should be necessarily taken into account, Castells recommended to combine the Soviet experience in the form of the State Planning Committee (Gosplan of the USSR) and the State Provision Committee (Gossnab of the USSR) with gradual introduction of market relations at the first stages. Gaidar answered that everything should be broken irrevocably and to the end, without putting anything aside and not making advances to the past that discredited itself.

Recently, liberals' attacks on the past were especially vividly manifested in the discussion of the Stalin's role and his legacy. Their assessment of him is unambiguous: he is devil incarnate.² They are indignant because a considerable number of people still positively assess his activities, at the same time acknowledging his crimes, especially in the years of repressions. In order to evaluate this state of affairs, I'd like to offer the following words: "All people, notwithstanding the former horror and disgust because of his crimes, now acknowledge his power, the title he gave himself, and his ideal of greatness and glory that seems something wonderful and sensible to everyone". That was written by L. N. Tolstoy about Napoleon, when his nephew ruled in France and Bonapartism was presented as something sacred. Today, the tomb of Napoleon in Les Invalides is just one of the uncountable sites of Paris. Napoleon was not "taken out of the Mausoleum" there as well as Mao Zedong was not moved from the Tiananmen square. Just the times changed, and they became a part of the past. But such an approach does not suit liberals. According to their opinion, our predecessors in the past history acted as bad students with only the lowest grades in their record, understood nothing, knew nothing, made mistakes all the time and acted without understanding anything or intentionally distorting everything.

As for the present, they see the sense only in going on with the attempts to realize what ripened only in their ideas about what should be done. But these ideas and ac-

tions did not reflect objective social requirements in any way, they did not answer the history's call. And they do not want to acknowledge what happened to their "brilliant plans". There is a lot written about that. I'll give just one assessment: "When Gaidar launched reforms, he forecasted a short decline in output, small increase of prices – from 70 to 200 percent and after that quick improvement of the state of affairs followed by economic progress. And what happened? Horrendous failure in everything, in which it was only possible to fail. Priced skyrocketed thousands of times instead of the indicated figures! Production collapsed. Appalling unemployment, neither World War I, nor World War II threw Russia into such a crisis as these reforms!"³

Currently, these newly appeared Narcissuses offer a certain modification of the same things, the disastrousness and depravity of which became evident for the majority of the population of Russia. They reject all attempts to criticize the ideas of monetarism, and their aspirations to force upon the others their vision of processes taking place in the world and in our country serves that.

As for the future, liberals see only themselves, their ideas and their vision of the state of affairs and development of the country in it. The activities of the Institute for Strategic Initiatives (with A. Kudrin at the head) are demonstrative in this respect. Without analyzing all theoretical postulates of this Institute (they can be an asset and a subject of discussion at scholarly events), let's pay attention to their practical embodiment. According to their forecasts, the economy of Russia will grow 1.7% annually till 2030. What does it mean if according to the World Bank's forecast, all world economy will grow 3.5–4% per year? What place will Russia take by that year? May be, a principally different concept should be focused at. There are examples in the history of Russia when decisions were taken, cardinally changing the state policy. Lenin's decision, proclaiming the new economic policy, replacing the outdated and having no prospects policy of War Communism, was such a cardinal turn. But in order to do that, it's necessary to have and demonstrate political will to irrevocably turn the development of the whole country.

In this environment, today's Narcissuses, rejecting the past, dreaming in the present and not caring about the future, prefer to look for recipes for solution of all without exception problems in the experience of foreign countries. In their opinion, exactly there it's known about the right ways of Russia's development, and in the first half of the 1990s giant numbers of foreign advisors and consultants came to Russia and filled all main centers of government in the country.

Though this stratum represents a relative minority among all intelligentsia – approximately 18–20%,⁴ its representatives in contrast to passive realists-rationalizers' behaviour, are an active, ambitious group, being several various groups – from categorical supporters of the "free" market, preferably without any limitations, to those focused on compromising with the state. But all of them personify mobile, offensive and rather often aggressive communities, insistently promoting their understanding of the meaning of life, striving to force their convictions upon the practice of various bodies of authority and realize them.

¹ See: Хинштейн А. Конец Атлантиды М., 2018.

² See: Баймухаметов С. Семейя, палач // Новая газета. 2018. 5 марта.

³ Олещук Ю. О.р. cit. P. 32.

⁴ Жизненный мир россиян: 25 лет спустя. М.: ЦСПиМ, 2016. С. 357.

Ethnonationalists

This group tends for increasing and sees the course of its activities in maximum relying on the historical experience of Russia, with absolutization of the achieved and tested methods of the past, and not collection of recipes (even positive) of other successful countries. But this group in its turn consists of several subgroups, which differ a lot from one another.

One of these subgroups consists of monarchists that are really certain that only a reigning person, given the vision to make history “from heaven”, can unite the Russians. Because of that they see the past and the desired present and future in the light of status quo, actually not recognizing any principal changes in rapidly flowing time. Their numbers are not big (according to opinion polls, their share does not exceed 1%), but they are mobile, obstinate and insistent in their striving to prove the competence of their convictions. And this assuredness is characteristic of not only marginal groups. These ideas are supported and shared by such respected individuals as film director N. Mikhalkov, who at first supported monarchy and then presented “The Manifest of Enlightened Conservatism”, supported by the management of the United Russia political party.¹ Another of these subgroups is successors of the Slavophiles to a certain extent, they are focused on proving the superiority, uniqueness and special character of Russian development. Various groups of nationalists are swarming under this banner, from wild supporters of the idea of “Russia for the Russians” (according to sociological data, their numbers do not exceed 3–5%) to various kinds of followers of the Russian nation’s superiority in comparison with other nations.² The third subgroup is represented by uncompromising followers of the Communist idea carried to the point of absurdity, it is sooner a tool for its discrediting than promotion and convincing in its humanistic value. This is especially visible in people’s attitude to M. Suraikin, the leader of the Communists of Russia political party, a candidate to the post of the President of Russia, who voices the position of its extremely conservative representatives (it is supported by just fractions of a percent of voters).³

The uniting aspect of all those various groups is speculating on the ideas of patriotism – sanctum sanctorum – for many Russians, which allows to mislead a part of the population and deform its consciousness and behaviour, making it focus on achievement of goals that are known to be detrimental.

Temporizers and Hypocrites

In our opinion, the group of intelligentsia that can be for the purpose of discussion called temporizers and hypocrites is of special interest. This group strived to become members of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) in the Soviet period not because they believed in Socialist and Communist ideas but because that gave a lot of opportunities to climb the career ladder, get an executive position, be a member of some nomenklatura (Soviet system of ap-

pointments to specified positions for the Soviet elite, their relatives and minions) – district, regional or all-Union. Exactly this group that, in the opinion of its members, did not achieve the “tops” that could satisfy them, easily rushed into the lines of “Perestroika foremen” and that really brought a part of them positions, revenues and even publicity (“glory”). In our opinion, exactly this group played not a small part in the disintegration of the Soviet Union and Russia’s switching to capitalist development. Exactly this group, depending on the situation in the environment of post-Soviet Russia, strived to get into the power elite or at least be near it. Overthrow of the previous ideals and goals allowed such people as Chubais to make their “dream” come true (it was him who in the 7th grade wrote in his diary that he would definitely work in the Kremlin). But there were many actors, members of the former CPSU, who reached the tops at that period and then successfully transferred to Ye. Gaidar’s “The Democratic Choice of Russia”, then to V. Chernomyrdin’s “Russia Is Our House”, then to Yu. Luzhkov’s “Motherland” and finally they landed in the United Russia political party. However, some diverted their attention to intermediary borders such as the Agrarian Party, Social Democratic Party, Labour Party, etc. while they had claims and had some chances to be a political force to be reckoned with on the political horizon. In our opinion, such zigzags of no small numbers of the “leading” intelligentsia could not fail to be noticed by the public consciousness, and that was reflected in the fairly low evaluation of the intelligentsia’s role and its impact on the life of the Russian society.

It’s evident that the past, the present and the future look for this group of intelligentsia as some Centaurian set of assessments, opinions, relations, that to a large extent has no logic except one – to be in power, which gives an opportunity to have capital and preferably public recognition or at least regular appearances on TV.⁴ This part of intelligentsia tries to present this rubbish as real voicing of the social development requirements, and they are very much surprised that their understanding of the reality is not supported by the general public. To put it differently, we are witnessing the state of affairs that happened in the course of history not once, when those allowed to power are surprised: we care for the well-being of the people, and they are ungrateful and do not understand that. And consequently they start accusing people calling them “irresponsible”, “narrow-minded”, “backward”, “herd” and even “cattle”.

Such individuals as Dorenko and Nevzorov side with this group, they can justifiably be referred to “information killers”, whose meaning of life comes down to their “zigzags” and “searches” to be well-paid, independent of the source, and for them at the same time to provide their popularity. Thus, A. Nevzorov’s ambivalence brilliantly characterizes his social position. He started from his famous “600 Seconds” TV program, he became famous and after that he travelled along the most unbelievable trajectories: confidant of the democratic authorities, friend of Riga OMON police (special purpose mobile unit), B. Berezovsky’s favourite, deputy to the State Duma, protector of freedom and democracy and then their persecutor, monarchist, KGB protector. And now the desire to demonstrate the paradox (or pseudo-paradox) of his behaviour has ignited. What will happen tomorrow? Or is it an inescapable wish to be

¹ Михалков Н. Право режиссера сказать правду // Известия. 2010. 28 сент.

² Иванов А. “Россия для русских”: pro et contra // Трибуна русской мысли: религиозно-философский и научно-публицистический журнал. 2007. № 7. Сент. С. 92.

³ Капионов Я. “Коммунисты России” готовятся нанести “сталинские удары” // Коммерсантъ. 2016. 18 апр.

⁴ See: Тощенко Ж. Т. Фантомы российского общества. М.: ЦСПиМ, 2015; Он же. Социология жизни. М.: ЮНИТИ-ДАНА, 2016.

in the limelight, enjoy oneself if not in the rays of glory but at least general attention? Is this a representative of intelligentsia and is this the meaning of his life?¹

But all these subgroups are united by one feature – inescapable wish to regularly rewrite the score of one's life.

Several Words about the Meanings of Life of Other Groups of Intelligentsia

The groups of *xenophobes* in ethnical and confessional guise have a considerable impact on the social, political and cultural life. They occupy extreme reactionary positions as they are focused not only on ignoring but also humiliation, persecution of people from other nations and ethnic groups, those practicing other forms and kinds of religion. This is to a big extent due to the Soviet Union's leaving the international scene, when ethnonational intelligentsia, to be more exact its most ambitious representatives were armed with some historical facts, certain phenomena of national culture to substantiate the acquired independence and justify their claims to the state power, and opposed them to other nations and their culture, mostly Russian, which was reflected in the author's monograph *Ethnocracy: History and Modern Times* (2003). Religious ambitions of some strata of national intelligentsia turned out no less dangerous, they created giant areas of tension not only between world religions – Christianity and Islam – in many regions of the country and the world but also inside those religions – between Sunni and Shiite Muslims, between Catholics and Russian Orthodox and even inside the Orthodox Church, about which the author wrote in his monograph *Theocracy: Myth or Reality* (2007).

When analyzing intelligentsia, such a group as collaborators and traitors, defectors, “moles” is sometimes mentioned. It's questionable if these people can be referred to intelligentsia as the way of treachery and betrayal chosen by these people, does not allow to correlate them with the fundamental, original hypostasis of intelligentsia – to be patriots of their Motherland. Richard Nixon said very expressively after his meeting with the first Minister of Foreign Affairs of Russia Kozyrev, perplexed because of his subservience, that when he was the Vice-President and then the President, he wanted everyone to know that he was an “American son of a bitch” and he would do his best fighting for American interests.² There is nothing to say about national interests in case of this group: they preferred to be “sons of a bitch” of another country.

In the end I'd like to say that this contradiction and even opposition of the Russian intelligentsia's meanings of life led to impossibility for us to speak about its changed role and its evaluation in today's Russia both by the general public and intelligentsia itself, and that is the reflection of loss and/or deformation of the meanings of life of its many representatives (see Table).

Distribution of answers to the question:
“How do you treat the intelligentsia's role in today's Russia?”
 (% of the number of respondents)

Answer	General public (2014)	Intelligentsia (self-assessment) (2016)
The intelligentsia's role is important	9.7	15.1
It has an average impact on the life of the society	21.9	25.2
It plays an unimportant role	23.7	26.7
It plays practically no role	19.7	16.1
Undecided	25.0	16.9

Source: Жизненный мир россиян: 25 лет спустя. М., 2016. С. 367; The data of the all-Russian survey “Как живешь, интеллигенция” (Russian State University of the Humanities, 2016. 1,350 respondents).

It's evident that assessments of the intelligentsia's role and its impact on the society are very skeptical, and it's undetermined for every fourth Russian (25%). Negative or restrained assessments are predominant though intelligentsia is inclined to consider itself a more influential group in comparison with what the general public thinks about it. It is especially revealed in cases of the opinions about the importance of the intelligentsia's role. Only every tenth Russian (9.7%) agreed with the optimistic evaluation of the intelligentsia's role, though intelligentsia thinks much higher of itself – every sixth or sevenths respondent thinks like that (15.1%). But in the end positive assessments are very few, unimportant as they disprove the opinion that intelligentsia can considerably influence the affairs of the society and the state in something.

Thus, Russian intelligentsia is a “patchwork” in relation to the past, the present and the future of its various groups and strata, the meanings of life of which are impossible to imagine as one whole that was to a certain extent characteristic of Russian and Soviet intelligentsia.

¹ Тарошина С. 30 лет за 600 секунд // Новая газета. 2018. 7 февр.

² See: Примаков Е. Разворот над Атлантикой // Международная жизнь. 2002. № 9. С. 10.

V. T. Tretyakov¹

CONTOURS OF THE FUTURE: DEGENERATION OR REGENERATION?

If you treat seriously the topic of this year's Likhachov Scientific Conference – I remind you that it's "The Contours of the Future in the Context of the World's Cultural Development" – it'll become clear that we're speaking about a forecast.

I'll mention for those who don't follow too attentively if forecasts, made in recent years and even decades, come true, that not a single positive forecast was confirmed in politics, social and cultural development. And this refers not only to very optimistic forecasts but also to moderately optimistic. And first of all this refers to forecasts concerning the West itself that was most inclined to make such forecasts as to the West itself.

And disturbing, negative and even alarming forecasts come true regularly and en masse.

By the way, this refers to forecasts made in Russia by those who are now called "liberals" in everyday speech, though in essence they have never been them, i. e. this refers to forecasts made by our Westerners, to be more exact – pro-Western liberals.

And alas, nearly all forecasts by Russian conservatives, no matter if you call them misoneists or reactionaries, came true. I am one of the latter, i. e. Russian conservatives (I won't interpret the notion). And I dare say that my 15-year-old forecasts (e. g. about the state of affairs in the European Union and its destiny) are coming true. And this does not only refer to the forecasts about the EU.

Because of that I can say with assurance, at least personal assurance that most optimistic forecasts that already sounded here and will sound, will never come true.

And what will come true? Alas, not the things I'd like to see in future. Here are the "contours of the future" in the context of the world's cultural development as I see them.

First: the mass popular culture will continue its expansion, which has already crossed all sensible, ethic and aesthetic borders, and finally drive the real art and the high-level culture into museum and conservative ghetto. The mass man of the nearest future will finally turn into a mass-culture manipulated impersonal "individual".

Second: the mass-culture totalitarian regime of aggressive minorities of various kinds, living and acting according to laws of sects, will finally prevail in the mass culture itself.

Third: mass secondary and higher education will finally go downhill to the level, which even in the 19th century,

to say nothing of the second half of the 20th century, was considered ignorance.

Fourth: the wish of some marginalized dissident groups to completely change natural (traditional) relations between the sexes and bring up new generations in this vein is evident. Currently, this wish is more than successful and realized on bigger and bigger scales.

Fifth: traditional (classic), generally accepted aesthetics will change radically. The monstrous will be equaled to the beautiful and will be even placed above the beautiful. On the other hand, the gorgeous and excellent will be reduced to just beautiful, and beautiful to glamour.

Sixth: changes will take place (already taking place) in the sphere of morals. The border between good and evil will be finally blurred, sin and even many crimes will be equaled to virtue.

Seventh: the so-called creative class (former intelligentsia) will finally turn into servants of the ruling class.

Eighth: European civilization beyond Russia will cease to exist as a historical phenomenon.

Ninth: Traditional religions (again beyond Russia) will disintegrate into numerous religious groups and sects, and actually cease to exist as the main institutions supporting traditional Christian moral standards.

Tenth: a separate issue is the forthcoming and actively accelerated and advocated by many mass production of biorobots. In my opinion, their main purpose, if we proceed from today's social and political trends, dominating in the West, will be as follows: these biorobots will make a class of overseers watching people. The ruling class will stop dealing with the so-called common people at all, passing over this function to biorobots.

All that together can be called civilization and spiritual degradation or (if all that is seen by anyone as inevitable or even attractive) spiritual and civilization regeneration.

That's how I see "the contours of the future". That's my diagnosis based on the forecast presented above. If we're historically just, it coincides with what was described in many anti-utopias written in the 20th century both in the West and in Russia.

If we agree with the described above forecast, the next part of our discussion should be the talk about a possibility to oppose it, if it is worth opposing, if we must oppose it and how to oppose it. But this is another and a new discussion level.

¹ Dean of the Higher School (Department) of Television of Lomonosov Moscow State University. Author and host of the program What Is To Be Done? Philosophical Conversations (TV channel "Culture"). Author of more than 2,500 publications, scientific and journalistic articles and educational publications, including books: "Russian Politics and Policy-Makers, Norm and Pathology: A Look at the Events of Russian Life, 1990–2000", "Do we Need Putin After 2008?", "How to Become a Famous Journalist: A Course of Lectures on the Theory and Practice of Contemporary Russian Journalism", "What Is To Be Done?", "Theory of Television: TV as Neopaganism and as a Carnival", "Conflict with the West. Lessons and Consequences", "How to Become Famous on Television: The Theory of Television for All Who Want to Work on TV", etc. Laureate of the Golden Pen Award of the Russian Union of Journalists, TEFI Prize, Telegrand National Award, holder of the Golden Honorary Badge "Public Recognition".

Yu. L. Vorotnikov¹D. S. LIKHACHOV AND THE HUMANITIES IN RUSSIA:
"THE PAST – TO THE FUTURE"

Each scientist should be grateful to his predecessors, respect his contemporaries and be responsible to future scientists. Then his activities will live for many years on the globe.

D. S. Likhachov: Thoughts about Science

I can't but say a few words in the beginning of my report about the role played by academician Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov in my life, in my formation as a scientist.

When I became a student of the Philological Faculty of the Lomonosov Moscow State University in the long gone 1972, I knew practically nothing about Old Russian literature. I graduated from a common soviet school, in which schoolchildren were presented *The Song of Igor's Campaign* – and practically nothing more was said about the first nearly eight centuries of history of Russian literature. And D. S. Likhachov's book *The Poetics of Old Russian Literature* fell into my hands when I was a first-year student – and turned all my ideas not only of Old Russian culture but literature in general upside down, and also another science, which I knew little about then – the study of literature, and science as a whole, its methodology and, if you want it, philosophy.

Later I also read without stopping, "swallowed" the book *Development of Russian Literature in the 10th – 17th Centuries* by Dmitry Sergeyevich and reread it several times. There were other books by him later – and the choice was made: I dedicated myself to studies of Old Russian literature at the University and I wrote my diploma paper about one of its top, "classical" works as Dmitry Sergeyevich said, *The Story of Grief-Misfortune*, in which "everything was new and unusual for traditions of Old Russian literature: popular verses, popular language, unusual nameless character, fine awareness of a human person, though falling to the last stages of degradation".²

After that my academic life made an unexpected turn: I turned from a literary historian into a linguist, and I defended my both theses in the science of languages, and was elected a corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences. But Old Russian literature as the first love was not forgotten. A number of my articles and one book, *Golden Chain*,³ of 2003 are dedicated to it. And when in the end of 2017 the Academy offered to publish two of my small books, one of them was dedicated to my main academic profession – the science of the Russian language, and the second to that very first academic love – *The Sto-*

ry of Grief-Misfortune.⁴ Thus, today, the loop of my academic life is closed (or, to be more exact, one of its spiral turns – what is to be expected in future?): I started from Old Russian literature – I'm finishing with it, and all that under the great influence by Dmitry Sergeyevich.

Dmitry Sergeyevich played a special role in my scientific-organizational activities. I was the academic secretary of the Department of Literature and Language Sciences of the RAS for many years, and Dmitry Sergeyevich was one of its most respected members. He came to our general meetings, I went to St. Petersburg, to the Pushkin House, to off-premises meetings of our Department's Bureau – and I watched how Dmitry Sergeyevich treated his colleagues, what scientific ethical principles he was guided by, what methods he used to solve various scientific-organizational tasks – and I again learnt from him, now it was the complex art of organization and arrangement of the "academic life", in many of its manifestations associated with high ideals, and in everyday life often just routine and sometimes not without small intrigues and even some squabbles. There is nothing to be done – scientists are just people, with merits and faults common for humans. And Dmitry Sergeyevich knew how to deal with all these subtleties and how to untie these Gordian knots, never raising his weak, slightly shaking voice, but demonstrating such firmness and even determination in due moments, which nothing could sway.

I could not come to the burial ceremony when Dmitry Sergeyevich quietly died in a very old age, even here demonstrating his indispensable culture and refinement as we bitterly joked in our Department: Dmitry Sergeyevich died several days after the lady of his age, a corresponding member of the RAS V. N. Yartseva, "letting the lady go first". It's just sad humour.

After that I took part in drawing up various documents for immortalizing academician Likhachov under the guidance of V. I. Matvienko, who was the Vice Prime Minister of the Government of the Russian Federation at the time, I came to St. Petersburg, to the Likhachov Scientific Conference invited by the Likhachov International Charity Fund, and finally I was honoured to take part in the opening ceremony, when the memorial stele was opened on the square now bearing Dmitry Sergeyevich's name. D. A. Granin was present there as well, he was very old but still fairly hale and hearty. The weather was typical for St. Petersburg: low clouds and drizzling rain. Well, it was to be like that: St. Petersburg saluted its honoured resident, "who grew up in a typically average St. Petersburg family and studied in typical St. Petersburg schools",⁵ as Dmitry Sergeyevich wrote himself, with "typical" St. Petersburg weather. Later we went to the Kronwerk restaurant to have a memorial repast,

¹ Grammar and Lexicology Department Manager, V. V. Vinogradov Russian Language Institute of the RAS, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Philology). Author of more than 200 scientific publications, including: "Category of measure of attribute in the semantic structure of Russian language", "Degrees of quality in contemporary Russian language", "Words and time", "Golden chain (concerning translation of old Russian literary heritage into contemporary Russian language)", "Essay on history of the image of a swing in folk culture and Russian poetry", "Russian language today. A few strokes to the portrait", etc. Deputy Presiding Judge of Ivan Bunin Award. Honored with the jubilee medal of Military Merit, medal of the Order of Merit for the Motherland Class II.

² Лихачев Д. С. Великое наследие. 2-е изд., доп. М., 1980. С. 356.

³ Воротников Ю. Л. Златая цепь. О переложениях памятников древнерусской книжности на современный русский язык. М., 2003.

⁴ Воротников Ю. Л. Художественный мир «Повести о Горе и Злочастиии». М.: РАН, 2017.

⁵ Лихачев Д. С. Прошлое — будущему: статьи и очерки. Л., 1985. С. 574.

we spoke about Dmitry Sergeyevich, about life in general, and Daniil Granin got excited as a young man after a couple of small glasses of vodka, and even gave a short and witty monologue about female legs. And it seemed that Dmitry Sergeyevich was among us: he was sitting, looking at us with his wise eyes and encouraging us with his weak, slightly shaking voice: "Everything is fine, friends, everything is fine, you should do it like that. Life goes on, life goes on".

Why did I dedicate so much time to academician Likhachov's role in my life? Not because of vanity. "Vanity is born by spiritual emptiness",¹ Dmitry Sergeyevich said. I'd like to hope that I don't suffer from this illness. I just wanted to underline the following: Dmitry Sergeyevich always understood... no, not understood, he just felt it, he lived with it – with the fact that science is people making it. Reread his words, which I used as the epigraph, simple and clear. His language was always simple and clear. He thought that "The beauty of style' often serves as just a replacement for the lack of thought".² There is a deep thought hidden in these simple words: be grateful to your predecessors, respect your contemporaries, don't forget your responsibility to those who will come to replace you – and the future of science will be provided for. And he lived just like that. And we have to try to live like that. This is very difficult. But we have him as an example...

Dmitry Sergeyevich always had more than enough of his own academic work as well as scientific-organizational problems, but he still managed to find time for the activities related to state support of research, first of all, surely, in the humanitarian field. I already had to speak about Dmitry Sergeyevich's role in formation and development of new forms of grants to support science in Russia.³ I'll remind of just several cases related to this side of academician Likhachov's activities.

Once, viewing the video records archives of the Russian Humanitarian Scientific Foundation, I found a record of Dmitry Sergeyevich speaking, and he said then: "In this case, this is not a foundation, this is something wider, and – I clearly feel it basing on my many years of experience in the Academy of Sciences – it is destined to transform the character of our science, get rid of incompetent people, people who work little, activate science, give it new tasks, new tools and even new technology. I welcome exactly this Foundation very much".

Dmitry Sergeyevich was for grants to support science at once, from the moment the first scientific foundations appeared in Russia. Because of that he became one of the "founding fathers" of the Russian Humanitarian Scientific Foundation together with academicians N. I. Tolstoy, A. A. Fursenko, B. V. Raushenbakh, A. P. Derevyanko, Ye. P. Chelyshev and a number of others, and after that, he was a member of the Foundation Council from the date of the Foundation's establishment in 1994 and till his death in 1999.

D. S. Likhachov as a Council member was for every kind of support and preservation of spiritual heritage of Russia, for development of source studies, textological and

bibliographic research, for scientific expeditions (he especially cared for archaeological expeditions), for publication of hand-written heritage from archives, libraries, private collections.

D. S. Likhachov as a scientist published a number of books with the Foundation's financial support: "Cultural Monuments. New Discoveries. 1998", "Historical Poetics of Russian Literature" (1999), he prepared the new edition of the book "Textology (based on Russian Literature of the 10th–17th centuries)" (2001), supplemented by research by A. A. Alexeyev on textological studies of Slavic copies of the Bible and A. G. Bobrov on principles of Old Russian chronicles publication.

2006 was announced the Year of the Humanities, Culture and Education – the Year of Academician D. S. Likhachov by the Order of the President of the Russian Federation V. V. Putin. In this connection, the joint contest was held by the Russian Humanitarian Scientific Foundation and the Likhachov International Charity Fund, dedicated to his 100th anniversary.

The contest was of great interest to Russian scientists. The expert council received 652 applications to examine. On the whole, the experts noted high academic level of most filed in applications. The expert council recommended the Russian Humanitarian Scientific Foundation to support 26 projects for RUB 5 million 470 thousand, including 9 research projects, 8 publishing projects, 7 conferences and 2 expeditions, which represented big scientific and cultural centers of Russia: Moscow, St. Petersburg, Veliky Novgorod, Yaroslavl, Petrozavodsk, Krasnodar, Belgorod, Makhachkala.

Many projects were directly connected with the programme events of the Year of D. S. Likhachov. The Foundation supported the jubilee congress "Culture and the Future of Russia", dedicated to the 100th anniversary of academician D. S. Likhachov (St. Petersburg); international and regional conferences "Archivist and Historian. Interaction in the Context of Contemporary Science and Culture", "Preservation of Cultural and Historical Heritage: Urgent Issues of Russian and European Cooperation", "Historical and Cultural Traditions of Small Towns in the Russian North", "Jubilee VII Conference on History and Culture of Old and New Russia in Memory of D. S. Likhachov", "Forgotten Heritage. How to Save Russian Wooden Architecture".

Publication of works by D. S. Likhachov in three volumes "Memoires. Thoughts. Works of Various Years" was an important event of the jubilee year. Publishing projects developing D. S. Likhachov's scientific ideas were supported as a part of the joint contest: "The Dictionary of Old Russian Musical Terms", "The Donation Book of the Holy Trinity and St. Sergius Monastery of 1674", "Cosmologic Works in Old Russian Books", "Russian Hand-Written Herb Books of the 17th – 18th Centuries".

A number of supported projects was connected with studies and development of the scientist's archives: "D. S. Likhachov's Photo Collection", "Scientific and Technical Description of Academician D. S. Likhachov's Archives", with the studies of his scientific heritage: "Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov is the Researcher of Russian Chronicing", "Old Russian Religious Ethics: from Hilarion of Kiev to Serapion of Vladimir", "D. S. Likhachov's Concept of the Theoretical History of Literature and World Literary Process", "Preparation for Publication of the Old

¹ Лихачев Д. С. Прошлое — будущему. Р. 672.

² Ibid. Р. 570.

³ Воротников Ю. Л. Д. С. Лихачев и Российский гуманитарный научный фонд // Проблемы сохранения и изучения культурного наследия: к 100-летию академика Д. С. Лихачева : материалы научной сессии Отделения историко-филологических наук РАН, Москва, 20 декабря 2006 г. / отв. ред. А. П. Деревянко; сост. А. Е. Петров. М., 2006. С. 36–41.

Russian Apocrypha *The Song for the Raising of Lazarus* of the 12th–13th Centuries (Research and texts)”, “Preparation for Publication of the Collection of Archives Documents D. S. Likhachov. From Epistolary Heritage (from the Russian State Archives of Literature and Arts collections)”, preparation for publication of selected letters “From Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov’s Scientific Correspondence with Personnel of the Old Russian Literature Department of the Institute of Russian Literature of the Russian Academy of Sciences on the Argument about the Authenticity of *The Song of Igor’s Campaign*”, etc.

The contest of scientific projects conducted by the Foundation and made to coincide with the Year of Academician Likhachov, helped profound and thorough studies of scientific heritage, development of scientific ideas, making popular creative works by the outstanding Russian scientist, with whose name the establishment and activities of the Russian Humanitarian Scientific Foundation were connected for many years.

What did D. S. Likhachev think about the future of Russian humanities, the future of Russian culture and the future in general? I’ll try to be short as “brevity is a scientist’s politeness”¹ (another aphorism by Dmitry Sergeyevich!).

First. The title of one of the books by Dmitry Sergeyevich is *The Past – To the Future*. And there is the deepest thought in this very title: if we care for the favourable future of ourselves, our family, our country, the whole mankind, we just have to know, respect, appreciate and protect the past – ours, our family’s, our country’s, the past of the whole mankind. Because of that care for conservation of cultural heritage in all its manifestations is not just a bee in a bonnet (please, forgive me for the expression) of some

eccentrics stuck in the past. This is care for the favourable future of all of us. As for science, no matter all its latest achievements, no matter its innovative character, it should stand on the strong foundation of scientific achievements of the predecessors.

Second. Dmitry Sergeyevich thought that “Each area of our life will require scientific thinking in future, mechanic work will be performed by mechanisms”.² What conclusion follows from that? A very simple one: train generations of people, armed with the ability for scientific thinking already today, starting from school, otherwise there won’t be a place for us in future, we’ll be pushed out by others, who took care of that in due time. Is it simple? Yes, it is. But it’s very difficult for this simple thought to make its way to the minds of our education managers at all levels.

And finally, third. Dmitry Sergeyevich said: “We have to think that the personality of scientist will play a bigger and bigger role in science”.³ And what follows from that? Train not just erudite persons, “walking encyclopedia” in all kinds of educational institutions today, but a versatile, moral man, an individual. Otherwise, neither the country, nor its science will have a “bright” future. And that seems simple. But how difficult it is to prove the simple fact in “high” offices that education is not “providing services”, no matter that they are of a special kind, but bringing up individuals, persons.

Let’s sum up the results. What does academician Likhachov teach us? With respect to the past, bringing up versatile, moral individuals, armed with the ability for scientific thinking – forward, to the future. And then the future of Russian science, especially the humanities, will be provided for.

J. Wiatr⁴

NATIONAL SECURITY IN THE UNSAFE WORLD: A CENTRAL EUROPEAN PERSPECTIVE

Twenty-five years ago, in the aftermath of the cold war and after the fall of Communist regimes in Europe, perception of the security situation in Europe was dominated by optimism. Most of us believed that the century-old history of

wars and hostility has come to its end. Such optimism was based on three main arguments:

(1) The perspective of the world dominated by the United States led to the belief that the American leadership would lead to the peaceful resolution of conflicts and to the gradual expansion (by peaceful means) of liberal-democratic values. *Pax Americana* was seen as the fundamentally better alternative to ideological confrontation and to the conflicts based on national egoisms.

(2) The peaceful transformation of political climate in Europe, symbolized by the reconciliation between former enemies (German-French reconciliation followed by the German-Polish reconciliation) created hopes for friendly relations between former enemies.

(3) The disappearance of the ideological super-power – USSR – and the change of regime in Russia, as well as the weakening of her international position, were seen as guarantees of new, friendly relations between European nations.

In the following years the extension of NATO and of the European Union provided the Central European region with unprecedented feeling of security. Even the eth-

¹ Лихачев Д. С. Прошлое — будущему. С. 570.

² Ibid. P. 575.

³ Ibid. P. 574.

⁴ Minister of National Education of Poland (1996–1997), deputy to the Polish Parliament (Sejm) (1991–1997, 2001), Dr. Sc. (Sociology), Professor. Author of scholarly papers on sociology of politics, including the monographs “Social Studies of Political Relations”, “The Soldier and the Nation: The Role of the Military in Polish Politics, 1918–1985”, “Four Essays on East European Democratic Transformation”, “Political Sociology in Eastern Europe: A Trend Report and Bibliography”, “Socjologia wojska”, “Socjologia wielkiej przemiany”, “Socjaldemokracja wobec wyzwań 21st wieku”, “Socjologia polityki”, “Europa pokomunistyczna – przemiany państw i społeczeństw po 1989 roku”, “Refleksje o polskim interesie narodowym” etc. amny articles, including “The Eastern Europe: the Fate of Democracy”, “Poland and Russia: National Interest of Historical Memory?”, “World War Two and The New World Order”, “The Political Crisis in Ukraine and its Consequences” and many others. Honorary rector of the European Higher School for Law and Management in Warsaw, honorary president of the Central European Association for Political Science, Professor Emeritus of Warsaw University, senator emeritus of Ljubljana University, doctor emeritus of the Oles Gonchar National University in Dnepr (Ukraine). Honoured with the Order of Polonia Restituta of the second class.

nic wars in former Yugoslavia have not weakened such atmosphere of security, partly because the NATO intervention in these military conflicts (in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in Kosovo) put an end to the war phases of these confrontations.

Only few authors argued for caution and challenged the prevailing optimism. One of them was the prominent Israeli political scientist (and my good friend of many years) Shlomo Avineri. In an essay on Eastern Europe, Avineri warned about the possibility of a “return to history”, by which he meant the heritage of authoritarianism and nationalism in East-Central Europe.¹ The other was Samuel P. Huntington who – in his famous book on “three waves of democratization” – warned about the possibility of a “reverse wave” caused by “authoritarian nationalism”, “religious fundamentalism”, “oligarchic authoritarianism”, “populist dictatorships” and/or “populist dictatorships”.²

The most radical versions of such scenarios have not materialized – at least for the time being. In post-cold war East-Central Europe no democratic regime has been overthrown by force and no dictatorship has been established. While recent developments in Hungary and Poland lead many of us to the critical evaluation of the “new authoritarianism”,³ they have not created dangers to peaceful relations between nations of our part of Europe.

Today however, there are reasons to be concerned for the long-term implications of the political changes which took place in the early years of the 21st century. Four such changes are of greatest importance for the security situation of the nations of Central Europe (as well as for the others).

The first is the crisis of American leadership. It has been caused by the adoption of the highly ideological approach to American foreign policy, particularly during the George W. Bush’s presidency. In early February 2001, I attended the National Prayer Breakfast in Washington at which the newly elected president delivered his first important speech on the aims of American foreign policy. President Bush argued that it was God’s will to entrust the United States with the mission of promoting democracy all over the world and that he – as the president – considered his sacred duty to fulfil this mission. Rarely have I heard such clear declaration of the ideological nature of foreign policy. Soon after the terrorist attacks of September 2001, the United States (with support of the United Kingdom and some other states, including Poland) launched a war against Iraq. The Iraqi war turned out to become a major debacle for American position in the world. While militarily it was a fast success, politically it turned out to become a catastrophic defeat. Zbigniew Brzezinski has identified three main consequences of the war. First, it caused “calamitous damage to America’s global standing” and “has discredited America’s global leadership”. Second, it “has been a geopolitical disaster”. Third, “it has increased the terrorist threat to the United States”.⁴ It is mostly because of the Iraqi fiasco that Brzezinski called the Bush presidency “catastrophic”. In the aftermath of the war, the weakening of the Amer-

ican leadership undermined the trust of other nations in the effectiveness the alliance with the United States and encouraged some other states to take a more assertive stand in international relations.

The second factor, closely related to the first, is the growth of international terrorism. While not a new phenomenon, the terrorism of the present century became a qualitatively new factor in world politics. It is no longer limited to a single state (or region). It became truly international. No nation of the world can feel secure any more. Even the most aggressive policies directed against the terrorists have not been able to prevent the continuous repetition of terrorist acts.

Consequences of the Arab Spring have been disappointing – contrary to the early assessments in the majority of Western media and academic circles – and have become the third factor in the worsening of political climate. With the exception of Tunisia, all Arab states affected by the upheavals either turned to renewed autocratic regimes (Egypt) or fell in the state of prolonged civil wars (Libya, Syria, Yemen). The war in Syria produced the emergence of the “Islamic State”, a terrorist stronghold for religious fanatics committed to the idea of the world caliphate. Because of support given to the two sides in the Syrian civil war, the United States and the Russian Federation find themselves in a precarious position with potentially dangerous consequences.

The fourth factor of the new international situation is the growing strength and assertiveness of the regional powers – China and Russia – which challenge the world hegemony of the United States. From the perspective of Central Europe it is the new role of the Russian Federation which causes concern. Before trying to address the question of the Russian challenge, I should like to stress the fact that there has been a direct link between the failure of American foreign policy and the growing assertiveness of the Russian Federation. The weakening of the American power encouraged Russia to challenge the world hegemony of the United States, particularly in the regions close to Russia and considered Russia’s “close neighborhood”.

Crucial for the security of Central Europe is the role of the Russian Federation as the strongest regional power in close vicinity of the eastern frontiers of the European Union. Is Russia a real threat to our security? Is she likely to provoke a new war, as predicted by the former deputy chief of NATO forces British general Richard Shirreff in his newly published political fiction?⁵ In his fictitious scenario, Russia invades Latvia and is finally defeated by the combined efforts of NATO and local Latvian partisan forces but the conflict remains confined to the Baltic area and do not escalate to the level of the third world war.

Serious discussion of the Russian challenge requires an understanding of the political transformation of Russia after the fall of Communist regime and the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Internally, the post-Soviet period of Russian history has been marked by the chaotic years of Boris Yeltsin presidency, defined by Klaus von Beyme as “anocracy” – a combination of autocracy and anarchy,⁶ and by the neo-authoritarian rule of Vladimir Putin in the 21st century. The failure of democratic transformation has had its roots

¹ Avineri S. *The Return to History: The Breakup of the Soviet Union* // *The Brookings Review*. 1992. Spring. P. 30–33.

² Huntington S. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late twentieth Century*. L. ; Norman : The Oklahoma University Press, 1991. P. 293–294.

³ Wiatr J. J. *New and Old Authoritarianism in a Comparative Perspective* // *Studia Socjologiczno-Polityczne*. Warsaw, 2017. № 2 (7). P. 123–137.

⁴ Brzezinski Z. *Second Chance: Three Presidents and the Crisis of American Superpower*. N. Y. : Basic Books, 2007. P. 146–149.

⁵ Shirreff R. 2017 *War with Russia*. L. : Hodder & Stoughton Ltd., 2016.

⁶ Beyme K. von. *Transition to Democracy in Eastern Europe*. N. Y. : St. Martin’s Press, 1995. P. 166.

both in the Russian political culture (including the heritage of the totalitarian dictatorship in the last century) and in the mistaken policy of the democratic West which refused to offer Russia badly needed economic assistance in the first years of its transition from Communist dictatorship. Putin's rule has been marked by successful efforts to restore Russia's position as great power. It is this aspect of his rule which, according to public opinion surveys, explains his strong popularity among Russian citizens.¹

From the perspective of the Central European nations the crucial question is whether Russia of today constitutes a real danger to our security. I am convinced that she does not. In this, I oppose the dominant political narration in my own country. There are two main reasons for my position.

First, Russia is not an ideological power (like the former Soviet Union) and does not intend to export her political system and political philosophy to the rest of the world. Her national interest dictates the policy of regional hegemony within the geographically close vicinity of former Soviet republics and parts of Asia closest to the Russian borders.

Second, Russian leaders are well aware of the potentially disastrous consequences of attacking a member of NATO. Only a lunatic would risk the war with NATO – the most powerful military alliance in world history.

Because of these two factors, I do not perceive Russia as a direct threat to the security of Central Europe. This does not mean, however, that conflicts with Russia can be excluded from our strategic thinking. It would be naïve to ignore the possibility of such conflicts, but it would also be wrong to exaggerate their impact on our security.

Recently, the Ukrainian crisis resulted in the deterioration of our relations with Russia not because of a direct danger to our security but because of the determination of the European Union to protect Ukrainian sovereignty endangered by the annexation of Crimea and by Russian-supported secession in the eastern provinces of Ukraine. To understand this conflict one should go back to the precarious Russian-Ukrainian relations after the dissolution of the USSR. From the very beginning it was obvious that the ethnically Russian majority resented the incorporation of Crimea to Ukraine and wished its returned to Russia.² Until the crisis of 2014, Russian position on this issue was subordinated to the strategic consideration according to which close relations between two states were given preference to the interests and demands of the Crimean people. This has changed in early 2014, when the overthrow of the pro-Russian president Victor Yanukovich and the radical reorientation of Ukrainian foreign policy caused the Russian government to abandon its cautious stand on the Crimean issue and to offer support (perhaps even encouragement) to the secessionists in the Donbas region. While NATO and the EU have had good reasons to offer political assistance to Ukraine and to oppose Russia on this particular issue, it would be a mistake to subordinate the totality of our relations with Russia to the resolution of the Ukrainian conflict. There are other important issues in which co-operation with the Russian Federation is vital for the security of Europe, including the solution

to the civil war in Syria, the struggle against international terrorism and containing the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

Political realism tells us that conflicts between regional powers cannot be ruled out. In the world of today they result from national interests rather than from fundamentally hostile ideological commitments as it had been the case during the cold war. Conflicts of such nature should not, however, be seen as catastrophic. Moreover, I am convinced that the only way to the resolution of such conflicts (Ukrainian included) is through a compromise – not very likely in the nearest future, but inevitable in a longer perspective.

More difficult to deal with are two other challenges: international terrorism and the flow of refugees from the Middle East and North Africa. These two issues call for unity of the democratic states and for a serious rethinking of our global strategy.

International terrorism constitutes the most dangerous challenge to our security because by its very nature it makes compromise solutions impossible. Central Europe has not been targeted by international terrorists yet, but it would be a dangerous mistake to assume that this state of affairs will last forever. It is, therefore, imperative that we close ranks with our allies in Western Europe and in America to collectively stand up to this challenge. It is also essential that we seriously address the social and political roots of the problem, including the unresolved Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

European solidarity is also necessary for finding a realistic solution to the refugee issue. Unlimited admission of refugees from war-affected region of Middle East and Africa is not a realistic policy, because it inevitably would cause the continuous growth of the number of potential migrants. On the other hand, both from moral and from political reasons it is wrong to wash our hands and to leave this issue exclusively to those states which have been directly affected by the influx of refugees. What is at issue is not only the fate of the refugees but the cohesion of the European Union.

What practical recommendations can we draw this analysis? I should offer four suggestions.

First, maintain and strengthen the unity and solidarity of the community of democratic nations of Europe and North America. Stand up to all attempts to weaken the European integration and oppose the policies of national egoism and isolationism.

Second, follow the policy of compromise and avoid the temptation to impose our will on others. Keep in mind that compromise is not a capitulation. Avoid double-standards in evaluating policies of friends and adversaries.

Third, avoid subordination of our foreign policy to ideology, even it would mean abandoning the dreams of a "crusade for democracy". Keep in mind the dramatic consequences of the ideologically motivated war with Iraq as the crucial caveat for the future.

Fourth, deal realistically and collectively with the refugee problem and with international terrorism and be ready to undertake necessary burdens in solidarity with the rest of the community of democratic nations.

This will not make Central Europe immune from dangers which characterize the world of today. Security analysis is not a recipe for a utopia but an intellectual instrument for making our practical policies more effective.

¹ *New Trends in Russian Political Mentality* / ed. E. Shestopal. Lanham : Lexington Books, 2016.

² "Frozen conflicts" in Europe / ed. A. Bebler. Opladen ; Berlin ; Toronto : Barbara Budrich Publishers, 2015. P. 189–207.

A. V. Yakovenko¹,
I. D. Dimitrov²

THE DIGITAL WORLD: THE CONTOURS OF THE FUTURE

There is hardly the need to argue that evolution of the human society will be determined by development of information technologies, even in the foreseeable future. Public institutions follow the rapid progress of communication means: the newspaper that originated in the early 17th century, became the key institution of politics and the real “fourth power” only in 250–300 years; the potential of radio and television was revealed in 30–40 years after their invention; but the key social networks, now forming the political discourse in many countries of the world, were launched just a decade ago. Digital platforms have become the main means for informing the people, and more and more information is presented in the multimedia form (they are infographics, the flourishing of the video blog genre and meme pictures). The increase of the Internet connection speed and introduction of new standards (5G is already tested in Russia) help that. Multimedia use makes the content more available: owners of cheap smartphones in the countries with the high illiteracy level are already using all the opportunities provided by the Internet with the help of the voice recognition function.

The technological transformation changes human behavioral models as well: visual images are perceived better than text, the correct written language stopped being the “sacred cow”, “clip thinking” simplifies the thinking process (and at the same time it’s hardly right to say that people are “growing stupid”: the amounts of mastered by each generation knowledge and skills increase all the time, because of that we are sooner speaking about the change of cognitive process forms and not about its degradation).

The role of symbols that will play the part of political programs to a certain extent, offered by politicians via media platforms, will grow in this new environment. We, those who grew up in the Soviet period, remember the set of visual images associated with the USSR and the Communist ideology. It’s possible that in future not the globally recognized symbols of ideologies and religions like sickle and hammer, or crescent will be applied (and not as much as them), but also bright and striking, visualized

slogans in meme covering (according to the author of this term R. Dawkins, they are self-sufficient units of information having the potential to virus-like spreading; this can be an easily remembered picture, a wisecrack and a short video). Memes are often based on the mass culture images adapted to the issues of the day (our experience on Twitter shows that use of popular British cultural images – quotations, proverbs and sayings, pictures, film shots – is a very successful way to deliver the thoughts to the reader).

These trends together with the boost in practical application of the Big Data to analysis of politics and economy and their more efficient management (we’re speaking not only about political technologies in the spirit of the notorious “Cambridge Analytica”) make the phrase ascribed to several modern economists absolutely justified: “Data is the new gold”. The one who collects the biggest “golden reserve” has the best chances in the geopolitical race for leadership.

When social networks just appeared, they were praised as “the voice of the people” giving a chance to self-expression for those, who previously had to keep silent. Basing on the users’ content (i. e. information from common people and not professional journalists and politicians) was announced the means of political liberalization and improving the world as a whole. Today, even Mark Zuckerberg, the founder of Facebook, prefers to speak carefully only about “the new meaningful interactions between people”, but the traditional press, losing advertising money, sets the dogs on “the new media” as transmitters of “fake news” and surely “the Russian influence” (however, the United States and the UK engaged in indoctrination of foreign public opinion and brainwashing via social networks long before the first accusations of Russia in that “sin”). The users’ content stays the basis of the Internet media, however, the role of platforms filtering the information getting to users both for strictly commercial purposes (use of a Website or an app should not bring about negative emotions) and in the interests of fighting extremism (it’s known that terrorists use a number of Internet platforms for coordination, and prohibition or total censorship of any of them just leads to a quick change of the communications channel) grows. Collection of the users’ personal information also inevitably leads to loss of anonymity on the Internet even if the law does not make it obligatory to give the provider or the state your real name. Thus, the hero of the 2000s, the fearless Internet “anonymous” under the mask of Guy Fawkes, who according to the popular then expression, “does not forgive and delivers” goes into the past, and this is a world-wide trend.

So, it seems that a common individual (“a low-ranker”) is again becoming a person of no importance. But still new technologies are gradually equalizing opportunities for people of various origin and culture. Over many centuries, language borders strictly determined career prospects for a certain individual as well as cultural and economic prospects for countries (the number of translations is the universal criterion for any author’s acknowledgment), and today the quickly developing machine-aided translation blurs

¹ Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Russian Federation to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (since 2011), Dr. Sc. (Law) (International Law), Professor. Since 1976 has held various diplomatic posts in the main office of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia and abroad. Former Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation (2005–2011). Author of several books on international space law, as well as more than 200 publications on international relations and issues of foreign policy, science, education and culture. Fellow of the Russian Academy of Natural Sciences; Member of the Russian Academy of Cosmonautics; corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences of Tatarstan; member of the Russian Academy of Sciences’ Space Board, International Institute of Space Law (IISL, Paris), International Academy of Astronautics (IAA, Paris); Professor Emeritus of the University of Edinburgh (United Kingdom). Awarded the Orders of Honor and Friendship, 1st and 2nd Class Medals of the Order of Merit, Commendations of the Government and the President of the Russian Federation.

² Head of Seldon information and analysis company (Moscow), Executive Director, E-Trading Venues Association, Public Ombudsmen for E-Trading and Governmental and Municipal E-Services. Author of articles on e-commerce and e-trading. Presidium Member, “Opora Russia” All-Russian Public Small- and Mid-size Enterprise Organization, Working Group, RF Government Expert Group for Improvement of Governmental Purchasing and Governmental Investing.

these borders (by the way, visualization of the content also makes it universally understandable). Free computer translation (including synchronous voice interpretation) that is already available in our times, provides transmission of the meaning, because of that development of artificial intelligence technologies in this sphere is of a really breakthrough importance. Though Russia is still among the leaders in the Internet presence (6.4% of all texts on the World Web are written in Russian – this is the second result after 52.1% in English; cf. 1.9% in Chinese, and just 0.1% in Hindi), destruction of the language barrier will bring giant profits to business, science and culture: this will be the true globalization, and the countries introducing respective technologies earlier will be the first to reap the fruits of it, and Russia has good chances in that.

There is no doubt that this globalization will undermine the Western hegemony (first of all, American and British)

in information and cultural space. The success of Chinese IT companies, a number of advanced technologies of which in e-trade and Big Data processing already exceeded Western results, allow to put this question on the agenda already now. In essence, only voluntary self-isolation of many big Chinese players still preserves the status quo on a global scale.

What will the global society of the future be? Unprecedentedly open for people and companies of any origin – but not leaving place for anonymousness. The one that has accumulated and uses an unimaginable amount of knowledge – but ready to follow the leader offering the best remembered wisecrack on the issue of the day. We may not like this new reality but the progress can't be stopped, because of that our task is not to try to stop the coming of the future but make it in such a way as to Russia and the Russians to occupy a worthy place in it.

A. S. Zapesotsky¹

LABOUR ETHICS IN THE SYSTEM OF POST-SOVIET RUSSIA'S TRANSFORMATIONS

The President of Russia Vladimir Putin, who got the convincing mandate of voters' trust for the next 6-year period at the 2018 elections, worded his strategic vision of the national development goals of the Russian Federation for the period till 2024 in his Decree of May 7, 2018, setting respective tasks for the new Government of the country.

It's interesting that he is speaking about the program for peace and social state building in the environment of the going on struggle against terrorism and sharp aggravation of the situation in the world, intensification of the threat of direct armed conflict with the West.

The interests of a common citizen are regarded as of paramount importance: sustainable growth of his actual incomes, improvement of living conditions, prolongation of lifespan, providing conditions for the population growth, etc.

It is supposed to attain that at the expense of the Russian Federation's becoming one of the five biggest economies in the world. The basis of economic development is seen in technological progress, innovations, personnel's training.

¹ President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation. Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Congress of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia.

Author of more than 2,550 published works. Member of editorial boards of the following magazines: "Philosophy and Culture", "Issues of Cultural Studies", "Literary Studies", "Philosophical Thought", "Partnership of Civilizations", "Philology: Scientific Research", "Pedagogy and Enlightenment", "Search: Politics. Social Science. Arts. Sociology. Culture", "LIT-ERA", "Contemporary Education", "Simurg" (Azerbaijan).

He was awarded the Order of Friendship, "For Life Saving" medal, "In Memory of the 300th Anniversary of St. Petersburg" medal, K. D. Ushinsky medal, Gold medal of the Russian Academy of Education. He was awarded the Diploma of Merit by the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Bulgaria, SIMURG medal by the Azerbaijan Association of Culture and Academician Sapargaliev medal (Kazakhstan).

Russian Federation Government's Prize winner (2007) and St. Petersburg Government's Prize winner (2010, 2016) in education, Gorky Literary Prize winner (2007), RAS G. V. Plekhanov Prize winner (2015). Doctor Emeritus of universities of the USA, Ireland, Ukraine and Poland. Academician of the Academy of Sciences and Arts (Paris), European Academy of Sciences and Arts (Salsburg).

This vision of goals and tasks contains a lot of new in stylistics of statements and figures, but the approach has not been principally changed already for about 20 years, from the time when Vladimir Putin seriously got down to the state's strengthening and realization of the key provisions of the Russian Constitution after becoming the head of state.

There is no doubt that many of the tasks set by him have been solved. A lot was done to strengthen the vertical power structure, preventing the most negative economic development scenarios, relative stabilization of the socioeconomic situation, strengthening of national sovereignty of the country and many other things.

At the same time, there are still a number of negative processes in science, culture, education, mass communications' activities, functioning of state administration and business structures, law enforcement system, etc. And that takes place in the environment when external threats are intensified; global competition is becoming fiercer and has already developed into confrontations in a number of areas.

It should be stated that on the whole after the USSR disintegration, Russia has not managed to form a socioeconomic system, competitive to fight for the leadership in the world. It's enough to say that at the time of his being at the head of the state Vladimir Putin set the task of becoming one of the five leading economies in the world 6 times already.

And that brings the analogy with the General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union N. S. Khrushchev to mind of the older generation. Khrushchev announced at the XXII Congress of the Communist Party in 1961 that "our generation of Soviet people will live in Communism". He spoke about entering Communism in 1980. The task of that time "Let's catch up with America and surpass it" is also well-known.

The middle generation of the Russians remembers Boris Yeltsin's promise "to lie on the rails" if the initiated by him liberal economic reforms lead to increase of prices more than three-four times (prices increased 26 times by Janu-

ary 2, 1992, and actual incomes of the people decreased down to 44% of the 1991 level).

Such failures contrast with numerous examples of positive results of national upswings of the 20th century. West Germany, Japan, South Korea, Singapore, Hong Kong, Taiwan, China – all these countries achieved “economic miracle” applying economic models with special national features. And originality in each case was based on deep understanding of national culture, traditions, character and mentality of the people. At the same time, a number of traditions, contrary to the interests of development were suppressed, and special cultural features and features of national mentality were sometimes thought up and introduced into the consciousness of the citizens. Some countries proceeded from archaic, semi-feudal economic patterns, the others proceeded from totalitarian (Communist or Fascist), the third from liberal.

In any case, economic upswings took place in the environment of national consensuses in the moral field. First of all, civil and labour. These consensuses encompassed all strata of the population except criminal, outlaws. The latter were fought against mercilessly.

It should be emphasized that the law and its protection, law enforcement (tough regulators) were supported by soft regulators – social climate, ideology shared by bureaucrats, entrepreneurs, hired workers, prominent figures in the fields of science, culture, arts, mass media personnel. Success in economy was never possible in the environment of total erosion of morals, in case various strata of the society had different basic values.

Surely, the talks about “digital economy”, the development of which will compensate the weaknesses of real economy, are in fashion in Russia now. It’s similar to recent declarations by bureaucrats about the forthcoming success in “nanotechnologies” that turned into production of “nanobricks”, building “nanoroads” and other economic “miracles” in the long-suffering country. There are also futuristic forecasts about robots fully replacing people, and workers, guards and drivers sittings in bars, drinking beer in front of TV screens. Writers, actors and directors, artists, conductors and musicians, who will be also soon replaced by computers, will keep them company.

Really the Government of the country is getting ready to raise retirement age, and entrepreneurs are incessantly looking for ways to curtail rights of hired workers.

Is it possible to achieve success in competing with the leading economies when the ethics of bureaucrats, businessmen, hired workers in the country is based exclusively on the principle of personal, individual material profits, ignoring the interests of a certain enterprise, sector, product consumer, the country? Is it possible to expect conscientious attitude to labour, high-quality work, increase of efficiency from an employee, if his labour ethics differs from the ethics of the enterprise owner, bureaucrats checking the owner, the ethics of producers of goods and services he buys on his wages, the ethics of producers of social benefits?

Can the population of Russia be a set of “self-interested atoms not connected by anything”, or in order to achieve success it should be transformed into a nation united by a common interest, and who should look after such a union? Or, may be, it’s enough for the authorities to proclaim slogans and after that everything will take care of it-

self, isn’t it? I think that these issues are becoming especially urgent now.

Meanwhile, independent of public declarations, the authorities have been embarked on the course of increasing bureaucracy and expanding accounting and record keeping for many years already, absolutely ignoring soft regulators of vital activities and engaged in formation of social consensus just in certain political issues.

The complexity of the state of affairs is brought about by Russia’s entering the critical period, the systemic crisis, when the problem of “to be, or not to be” should be solved in the near future on the basis of the new development scenario’s selection and the ways of its embodiment. The time-limits for a modernization spurt in the context of the dynamically changing world are shrinking, in the opinion of experts, down to a decade. The erroneously selected scenarios will not only fail to bring Russia into the five leading world economies, but will not allow it to become one of the ten.

The Russian model of social and labour relations has been in transformation crisis since the 1990s. The socioeconomic formation established in the USSR is destroyed. And it is evident that the new one is built extremely poorly. The existing market mechanisms are ineffective, traditional stereotypes of labour behaviour are deformed, socioeconomic inequality increased in the country. Violations of the social rights of the working people, intensification of social alienation and lowering the prestige of productive and conscientious labour are evident.

It’s possible to single out the following among the clearly fixed manifestations of crisis: a) giant sector of informal labour relations, preventing formation of socially oriented economy; b) non-transparency of economic activities; c) corruption of controlling authorities; d) weakness of the law enforcement system, legal nihilism of the people.

It seems that destructive trends in the sphere of social and labour relations in principle can’t be overcome by the existing institutes of law. Unfortunately, legal nihilism is demonstrated not only by the key actors of the social and labour sphere (business, state structures, hired workers) but also by the personnel of the law enforcement system.

Legal nihilism was laid as the foundation for transfer of the country from the command and administration system to the market, it became the domineering vector of ideological changes, embodied in the idea of money as the main value and the meaning of human life, criterion of individual’s importance, and enrichment as the highest form of human activities. All basic values of the previous society, their hierarchy were totally revised. And the new ideology has not been essentially changed from the beginning of the 1990s till the present time and became the genetic code of the new socioeconomic formation.

It seems that the most significant cultural symbol of our times is the large-scaled privatization of the 1990s that was openly illegal, and that predetermined all the following deformations of the system of political and legal, and socioeconomic relations in post-Soviet Russia. The authorities chose the scandalously amoral, mocking and derisive in relation to people of the country and the most harmful for the economy privatization variant. According to the World Bank’s classification, Russian privatization is classified as insider privatization, which is by an order of magnitude more antihuman than “Machiavellian” carried out by go-

vernments in the interests of its followers and supporters, its voters.

It should be noted that the way of Russian reforms in the last quarter of the century radically differs from world practice. The mass media, mass culture force false ideas upon people about the country's movement to building some "society of the Western type" according to some "Western pattern" with giant and indisputable advantages in comparison with everything "non-West".

However, there is no "West" in reality, the image of which is planted in Russia, there are no socioeconomic relations cultivated by Russian bureaucracy. The country deals with noncritical borrowings of superficially studied and wrongly comprehended mechanisms and phenomena. No matter if we are speaking about the country's inclusion in the Bologna Process, building Skolkovo, regulation of mass media activities, contests for state orders, reorganization of the scientific research system, youth policy, etc.

The result of the transformations in Russia over the quarter of the century is formation of the unique and extremely ineffective ultra-liberal model of socioeconomic arrangement. At the time when the leading world powers are developing along the course of the theory of convergence, when the set of socioeconomic development tools of the countries is incessantly replenished by the best achievements of socialism and capitalism. At the same time, there is no set of universal achievements in the world that are the best. The best is what can be the most effective in this or that certain national-cultural and socioeconomic situation (O. Bogomolov).

At the same time, the West gradually loses its leading role, stopping to be the standard of development for all the rest of the world, except Russia, in recent decades. This is related to the general development crisis of the technology-related type of civilization to a great extent (V. Styopin).

Building "social (welfare) state" and building "the society of consumption" compete and are differently combined in the development of contemporary capitalism.

The West has been the unquestionable leader in the formation of the society of consumption for a long time; however, this also led it to the evident dead-end.

Surely, the social functions of the state gradually strengthened there until recent decades, but still they did not become the leading trends: fundamental changes of the market, its losing the role of the economic development locomotive; deformation of national elites and the loss of their ability to generate new essences, finding out perspective ways of development; total degeneration of democracy; increase of manipulations with the society and annihilation of freedom of speech; destruction of the Christian matrix of culture's development.

The efficiency of classical capitalism was based on the free market with its spontaneous compulsoriness of economic mechanisms. Competition of producers, struggle for satisfaction of consumers' requirements based on production of high-quality products were its foundations. That market has become history.

The production's gravity center shifted from factory shops to people's heads. Material production was driven to the periphery of economy by production of meanings. And the very human needs are produced like products. Contemporary "information society" was not from the moment of its origination and has not become the sphere of free vital

activities of the people, showing in essence only the new form of state and monopoly arrangement of production.

The end of the 1960s and the early 1970s is the period when relatively free intellectual life of the West was decisively replaced by the mechanisms of total consciousness' manipulation. The elites' formation and functioning mechanisms are changing radically.

Intellectuals played a special role in the society in the past – writers, philosophers, scientists, professors. They enjoyed considerable freedom in analysis of the reality, generation of ideas and their deliverance to the society, they considerably influenced its existence, and sometimes it was the main impact. Their dependence on economic and political elites was relatively small.

Later practically all spiritual production in the West was privatized by monopolistic structures. As well as the state. Intellectuals turned into employees of corporations producing ideas on their order and in their interests, more and more often without any connection with the reality or connected to it but not improving it from the point of view of the common good. Big bourgeoisie creates spiritual products in its own mercenary interests and forces them upon the others in the same interests via the mass media system, with the help of mass culture distribution mechanisms. The institutes of democracy are privatized in the same way, and that leads to degeneration of the political class, disappearance of political leaders of Franklin Roosevelt, Charles de Gaulle level.

And it's not accidental that today leaders of the European Union countries with rare exceptions form a uniform line of nondescript bureaucrats, and Donald Trump elected against the will of the established in the United States power elite, is practically deprived of the opportunity to realize his campaign promises.

Turning the freedom of speech and democracy into commodity means Western capitalism's entering the critical degeneration phase. This degeneration is already called malignant. Cultural degeneration of the West, refuse Christianity with its system of values common for traditional world religions are especially actively criticized by the world community.

The whole range of global crises (exhaustion of energy resources, climate changing, intensification of terrorism, multiplying man-made disasters, pollution of the environment where humans live, etc.) in the world are more and more tied with the crisis of the Western development model, civilization paradigm.

And the newly appeared Russian elite started cultivating this model on the local ground, and without special understanding of it and without the skills to cultivate anything.

As a result, lack of nationally focused labour ethics based on value dominants of domestic culture became one of the key problems of practically all spheres of social production in Russia. The post-Soviet model of social and labour relations suffers from failure to take national and cultural roots, historically sustainable worldview dominants of national culture are only faintly seen in it. And what is more, the value discord of the ways of production arrangement with deep spiritual foundations of Russian civilization is becoming the source for expanse of space and range of social and labour conflicts.

We have to acknowledge that formation of the social and labour relations model took place in recent decades by

non-critical, insufficiently comprehended transfer of Western principles of capitalist economy, production arrangement forms and corporate ethics models to Russian realities by bureaucrats and entrepreneurs. The process of building nationally focused labour ethics was originally blocked by the ultra-liberal “development scenario” for the state and the society that was established as the key criterion of “civilization”.

Meanwhile, the historical experience convincingly certifies the importance of spiritual traditions as the resource for competently carried out economic reforms. For example, technological upswing (starting from the 1960s) in the number of countries in the Pacific region was to a large extent provided by the “cultural factor” – the preserved civilization originality: traditional ethics of responsibility and law abiding, collective identity of nations, readiness to sacrifice the individual in favour of the common good.

However, the ultra-liberal doctrine brings to the mass consciousness false in its essence understanding of religious, national and cultural differences of nations and countries from the “average European standard” as a negative factor – “archaism”.

Expansion of the Western civilization project to Russian traditions established over many centuries and spiritual experience of the nation is manifested in the form of cultural disintegration of the country – disintegration of the one whole spiritual space of the nation. There are mutually exclusive worldview dominants and conflicting survival strategies and scenarios of the future in case of various strata of the society. The conflict of reproduction and development programs (existential, worldview, political) provokes the social rift that reduces the space for dialogue and stimulates destructive trends in the society.

Contradictions are especially aggravated at the forced modernization stage, when the process of purposeful transformation of the key spheres of social production requires selection of a certain, whole, acceptable for the main part of the society model. The specific character of this stage is sharp aggravation of conflicting opposition of traditions and innovations, to wit: the more dynamic movement to a new economic system and establishment of its worldview basis is, the more considerable is resistance of conservative forces and traditional matrixes of culture. Such asynchrony in dynamics of labour ethics and social and labour relations’ components also expands the space of social and labour conflicts and leads to intensification of social tension.

That economic model can’t originate in cultural vacuum, outside civilization matrixes – it originates based on labour ethics, which is constituted by culture prevailing over economy, creating it “in its own likeness, in its own image”. Like the man, like the material world created by his hands.

The worldview dominant of culture (P. Sorokin) in its turn and national identity are formed in accordance with human “nature”, human psychophysical characteristics that

are determined by geography, history, religion. Capitalism, generated by European civilization, is not only “economic” but also, first of all, a “cultural and anthropologic phenomenon” – it’s well-known that the capitalist model became possible in the environment of essential correction of Christian anthropology (M. Weber).

Nationally focused labour ethics, being the worldview basis of culturally legitimate and socially responsible behaviour of all subjects of social and labour relations, originates as a result of systemic interaction of three groups of factors: a) national culture, determining its spiritual dominants, hierarchy of basic values and sense-making life scenarios; b) nation’s mentality providing wholeness of culture and national originality over a historically long period of time; c) the model of economy, the cornerstones of which are the form of ownership (provided by the institute of law) and the “human factor” of labour activities. Mismatch of these factors again inevitably leads to increase of instability in the society and conflicts in social and labour relations.

At the same time, the national ethos and mental matrixes forming on the basis of psychophysical special features of the people have the biggest inertia and resistance in the environment of economic models and cultural matrixes discord. The mental matrixes are formally outside the labour market but actually they are forming its specific mental infrastructure (E. Sobolev).

It should be acknowledged that real economic upsurge in Russia is only possible in case of formation of nationally focused labour ethics based on value dominants and mental matrixes of domestic culture.

It’s necessary for the country to return to economic activities based on the moral decency concept and mutual responsibility of all subjects of social and labour relations; adapt the interests coordination mechanism between producers and consumers to the special features of Russian culture; provide harmonization of the main components of the capitalist management model at the acceptable level and increase investments into development of “human capital” as the factor of stable and long-term development of economy.

In the environment of large-scaled, global technological shifts Russia still has a “window” of opportunities for breakthroughs and making the “economic miracle” (S. Glazyev).

The humanitarian resource for solution of this task is fundamental correction of the ideology of reforms, reassessment of their results and prospects. Economic and political transformations will be successfully realized only in case if they are based on the deep-laid strata of national consciousness and essential characteristics of Russian mentality.

The present and the future of the great Russian civilization depend on the spiritual and moral potential of Russian culture being in demand by the key institutions of national economy.

Plenary Session

THE CONTOURS OF THE FUTURE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WORLD'S CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

May 17, 2018.

Andrey Petrov Theatre and Concert Hall, SPbUHSS

CHAIRPERSONS:

M. DELL'AMBROGIO	<i>Minister of Education and Research of Switzerland, Doctor of Law</i>
M. A. MORATINOS CUYAUBE	<i>Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Spain (2004–2010), Dr., Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i>
R. I. NIGMATULIN	<i>Research Advisor of P. P. Shirsov Institute of Oceanology RAS, member of the Presidium of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor</i>
M. V. SHMAKOV	<i>Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia, President of the Universal Confederation of Trade Unions, Chairman of the Trustee Council of SPbUHSS, Professor Emeritus of SPbUHSS</i>
A. S. ZAPESOTSKY	<i>President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation</i>

SPEAKERS:

I. O. ABRAMOVA	<i>Director of the Institute for African Studies of the RAS, member of the Presidium of the RAS, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics)</i>
A. A. AKAYEV	<i>President of the Kyrgyz Republic (1990–2005), foreign member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Engineering), Professor;</i>
R. Zh. ALYAUTDINOV	<i>Director of the Department for Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation</i>
E. BAĞIŞ	<i>Minister of European Union Affairs of Turkey (2009–2013)</i>
V. A. CHERESHNEV	<i>Chief Researcher at the Institute for Immunology and Physiology (the Urals Branch of the RAS), member of the Presidium of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Med., Professor, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i>
G. A. HAJIYEV	<i>Judge of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation, Doctor of Law, Professor, Honored Lawyer of the Russian Federation, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i>
H. KÖCHLER	<i>President of the International Progress Organization (Vienna, Austria), Professor Emeritus at the University of Innsbruck, Ph.D.</i>
A. V. KUZNETSOV	<i>Deputy Director of the Primakov National Research Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the RAS, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics)</i>
V. L. KVINT	<i>Foreign member of the RAS (USA), Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor, Honorary Figure of Russian Higher Education</i>
Ch. T. LAUMULIN	<i>Researcher at Centre of Development Studies, University of Cambridge (Great Britain)</i>
V. A. LEKTORSKY	<i>Chief Researcher at the Institute of Philosophy of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor</i>
A. G. LISITSYN-SVETLANOV	<i>Chief Researcher fellow of the Institute of State and Law of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Doctor of Law, Professor</i>
V. L. MAKAROV	<i>Academic Advisor of Central Economic and Mathematical Institute of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor</i>
A. S. MAKSIMOV	<i>Chairman of the Committee for Science and Higher Education, St. Petersburg Administration</i>

V. K. MAMONTOV	<i>Director General of the "Govorit Moskva" (Moscow Speaking) radio broadcasting station</i>
J. A. MARCH	<i>Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Kingdom of Spain to the Russian Federation (2008–2011)</i>
G. METTAN	<i>President of the United Chamber of Industry and Commerce "Switzerland – Russia and CIS States", Executive Director of the Swiss Press Club (Geneva)</i>
N. S. SAFRONOV	<i>Academician of the Russian Academy of Arts, Professor at the Ulyanovsk State University, Honoured Artist of the Russian Federation, People's Artist of the Republic of Dagestan</i>
J. A. SCHOLTE	<i>Professor of the Peace and Development Department at the University of Gothenburg (Sweden)</i>
P. P. TOLOCHKO	<i>Member of the Presidium of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Honorary Director of the Institute of Archeology of the NAS of Ukraine, academician of the NAS of Ukraine, foreign member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i>
Zh. T. TOSHCHENKO	<i>Chairman of the International Editorial Board of the RAS journal "Sociological Studies", Chief Researcher of the Institute of Sociology of the RAS, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor</i>
J. WIATR	<i>Minister of National Education of Poland (1996–1997), deputy to the Polish Parliament (Sejm) (1991–1997, 2001), Dr. Sc. (Sociology), Professor</i>

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues! I'll traditionally say a few words on behalf of the Organizing Committee of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference. I'd like to mention with satisfaction that this year 24 members of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 26 leaders of academic research institutions, more than 200 Doctors of Sciences, Professors from different parts of our country, outstanding politicians, honored scientists, prominent figures in the fields of culture and education from 25 countries of the world take part in the Likhachov Scientific Conference.

The University carries on the traditions established by academician D. S. Likhachov in 1993, when the Days of Science were for the first time held in the SPbUHSS. In 2001, this tradition was legally fixed by the decree of the President of the Russian Federation V.V. Putin that gave the Scientific Conference the name of Likhachov. It delights us greatly that there were not enough places today in this hall for all students who wanted to take part in the work of our forum. Only the best of the best are present here – and that certifies that the Russian Humanities have a bright future that is embodied in the present. There is the future while we have outstanding, non-indifferent, talented young people.

A big number of reports were sent to the 2018 Likhachov Scientific Conference. I'd like to emphasize in this regard that the Likhachov Scientific Conference that has been held at the SPbUHSS since 1993, has turned into the biggest annual world forum of humanitarian knowledge over these years. The reports sent to the Likhachov Scientific Conference are only published in collected works and on the SPbUHSS website for more than 10 years already. We had to refuse reading reports from this rostrum and at the meetings of our sections because we physically do not have time to listen to them. Nevertheless, there will be a number of speeches presented today at the Plenary Session. Why do we need it if all the reports are on the website?

I'll remind you about one incident with Albert Einstein as a lyrical digression. After Nazism was established in Germany, he moved to the United States of America where he lectured a lot. He was paid good money (more than one thousand USD). The television age had not come yet, because of that very few people knew how he looked. And once his driver said indignantly, "You are saying the same things at different universities, and you're paid big money everywhere. Anyone can give a lecture". Einstein answered, "Well, if anyone can, I offer you to give a lecture next time". And suddenly it turned out that the driver had a phenomenal memory. He stood in front of the audience and told everything Einstein had said before at the other universities he had visited. After that he was asked questions, and the driver said, "Your questions are so simple that even my driver can answer them". And he pointed at Einstein.

I would not like our young people to receive us as Americans received Albert Einstein in the 1930s not knowing how he looked. Our outstanding intellectuals should be known to young people. And scientists should know each other not only by their academic papers. Besides, the first-rate scientists should have an opportunity to attract attention of the audience to their most outstanding, key ideas while speaking.

I'd like to quote parts of some welcoming addresses to the International Likhachov Scientific Conference as the Chairman of the Organizing Committee.

The Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation D. A. Medvedev mentions in his welcoming address that "the interest to the Likhachov Scientific Conference has been growing from year to year, the number of participants is increasing. The issues discussed at this unique humanitarian forum are important not only for today's Russia but for the whole world as well. A vivid example is the topic of this meeting – The Contours of the Future in the Context of the World's Cultural Development".

It is said in the telegram sent by the Chairman of the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation V. V. Volodin that "...exactly mutual respect of nations and humanitarian cooperation can become the basis of international stability. I'm sure that scholarly and creative comprehension of academician D. S. Likhachov's legacy will allow to work out specific recommendations for the future development of our country".

The Minister of Culture of the Russian Federation V. R. Medinsky: "I'm sure: meetings as a part of the Conference will not only help to strengthen spiritual and moral foundations of the society but also to preserve inter-national and inter-cultural accord inside the country".

The Minister of Labor and Social Security of the Russian Federation M. A. Topilin thinks that "the issues and topics discussed at the forum touch upon contemporary global challenges and national interests of Russia and are of big importance for peace and progress on the globe. I'm sure that the participants of the forum will offer specific initiatives to advance social and labor relations".

The Director General of UNESCO Audrey Azoulay mentions in her welcoming address that "the International Likhachov Scientific Conference is of great importance for understanding the evolution of educational, scientific and cultural aspects of globalization".

I ask academician R. I. Nigmatulin to speak on behalf of the Presidium of the Russian Academy of Sciences and read the welcoming address by the President of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

R. I. NIGMATULIN: – The President of the Russian Academy of Sciences academician Alexander Mikhaylovich Sergeev noted in his welcoming letter that "the Likhachov Scientific Conference has become the recognized and important venue over the years for scholarly discussions of the main issues of our times.

"The urgency of the issues discussed, the impressive participants, variety of topics made the Likhachov Scientific Conference a kind of mobilization of the scholars' intellectual resources, a festival of humanitarian views and ideas, a significant event in the scholarly life not only in St. Petersburg and Russia but also on international scales. I'm sure that your forum will make a considerable contribution to development of stable future models and establishment of the unity of human culture".

Dear colleagues! Currently, many of the global problems are primarily related to socioeconomic and humanitarian sciences. This is especially important for our country that asserts its place in the world. The special place of our civilization is brought about by its development in extremely severe climate (7–8 winter months), and in a more severe environment modern civilization can't evolve unassisted.

Notwithstanding the fact that Russia always followed Europe in culture and science, adopted European values, we made a considerable contribution to the development of the whole global civilization, which is impossible to imagine without Leo Tolstoy, Tchaikovsky, Dostoevsky, Chekhov, Mendeleyev, Pavlov, Mechnikov, Landau and Lifshits and many others.

The world has changed a lot in the last 30 years. Russia has left its leader's positions in this environment mostly because it lost its technological advantages, greatly weakened its productive forces, destroyed its education and sci-

ence systems. What is the way out? I hope that discussions that will take place today as a part of the Likhachov Scientific Conference will give fresh food for scholars from Russia and other countries who understand the issues Russian people have to deal with.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The co-founders of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference are the Russian Academy of Sciences and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation. The floor is given to the Director of the Department of Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation Rinat Zhafyarovich Alyautdinov.

R. Zh. ALYAUTDINOV: – Allow me to read the welcoming address by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation Sergey Victorovich Lavrov: "The annual meetings at the St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences have become a good tradition. They have been established over nearly two decades as a competent discussion venue, where representatives of academic, expert circles, political scientists, civil society representatives from Russia and a number of other states assemble. Efforts directed to the non-charged politically discussion of contemporary urgent trends in various fields, in the current turbulent environment in the world, acquire special importance.

"The topic of this meeting sounds especially urgent. It's difficult to overestimate the role of culture in strengthening the foundation of inter-state relations, maintaining trust and mutual understanding on the international scene. Russia will go on promoting cultural and civilization variety, expansion of inter-civilization and inter-confession dialogue as a consistent supporter of respect and originality of nations and their right to independently determine the models of their political and socioeconomic order. There is no doubt that your Conference will make a useful contribution to common efforts in this direction".

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia is the founder of our University. The floor is given to the Chairman of the Federation Mikhail Victorovich Shmakov.

M. V. SHMAKOV: – I congratulate all the participants with the start of the forum, which is held for the 26th time already. The International Likhachov Scientific Conference has already become a good tradition not only at our University but also in the public life of our country. This area – social sciences and cultural traditions of our country, nations living in it – is one of the main focal areas today, it should be developed further. There is no science without culture. Development, performance of tasks set by the society, the leaders of our country, breakthrough in all areas of science, technology, public life are impossible on the whole without humanitarian education, humanitarian approach, working out common cultural and national traditions and looking for directions along which our society should develop.

The Likhachov Scientific Conference makes an invaluable contribution to looking for directions of development as no other venue in our country does. I'm sure that the principles for further development will be worded at

the Conference 2018 as a part of the public views and ideas represented here.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – 37 Honorary Doctors are a part of our University history. Many of them are in good health and are still a wonderful example of life and activities for our young people. I ask the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Spain (2004–2010) Miguel Angel Moratinos Cuyaube to speak on behalf of Honorary Doctors of the SPbUHS.

M. A. MORATINOS CUYAUBE: – Zdrastvuite, dorigiye druzia, my dear friends! I am taking the floor for many reasons. The first reason is due to my friend Alexander Sergeyevich Zapesotsky. Thanks to him I was honored to be awarded the doctor honoris causa for this important University of the Russian Federation. Thank you Alexander, thank you to all of you. I'm representing you in all my activities and that's one of the reason I'm addressing to you on behalf of the laureates of this award. But I'm also taking the floor because you have already listened to the director of the academy, you have listened to the scientific, you have listened to the Foreign Minister of Russia and now it's my turn, I'm coming as a politician and a diplomat. It is my sixth participation in this Likhachev Conference. The sixth time I'm taking and sharing with you some analysis, some prospect and some engagement mainly to you: the students. Of course, the professors receive all my support and my friendship but my intervention is addressed to you, the students, the new generation, the generation of the 21st century, the generation that can be overwhelmed by this confusion what I call, the "C" syndrome of today: crisis, conflict, catastrophe, contradiction, chaos, etc. If you ask anybody in the street about the situation of the world today, he will answer most surely that we are living in the most unbearable world in the history of humankind. At the same time, my dear friends, never humankind has been presented, has been achieving such a degree of progress and new discoveries in all fields: in science, in new technology and what they call artificial intelligence, even if I personally prefer human intelligence. But anyhow never in history the GDP has increased as much as the last year, never in history tourism has increased from *3 million in 1900 to one billion and a half in 2015*. Never transport and planes had been crossing the oceans as much as today. Today we are addressing the main challenges of world community: poverty, hunger, education, gender equality and that is the strengths of the new generation. So my dear friends don't be overwhelmed by this chaotic environment that we are living in. For the moment we, politicians, have not been able to solve all these challenges but we believe we could achieve it in the future. Believe in your present, prepare yourselves, equip yourself with science, with knowledge, with capacity to address the challenges of today.

There are two worlds that confront us, and there are two ways to react to this challenge. One is the people who think that big data will solve everything. They say that "big data" is the oil, the energy for the future, like the petrol and oil were in the 20th century. The machines will give us all the answer, no need to read, no need to have a book like here in the University of Saint Petersburg. You only have to press a button and you know everything. Be careful, okay, big data but for what?

The other answer is citizenship, it means: people. They are the one to decide what should they want to do. You are in the faculty of Humanities and Social Affairs, you have the chance that Humanities and Social Affairs are the answer to the New World. Yes, there are two concepts that have to be addressed in today world. One is identity and other is inequality. We cannot continue with this disparity between the wealthy people and the poor people. You know that two thousand people in the world have more than 13 trillion USD and there are people that are starving. People that they cannot succeed to eliminate hunger. So "equality" needs to be addressed. And also "identity". This clash of civilizations have no reason for the future, we have to respect all kind of civilizations. My dear friends, all these issues are going to be addressed during these two days and I'm sure that you as students will be the one to understand better the new goals of this new generation. But be a positive generation, do not be frustrated, please be the generation that are ready to fight for a better world and you will overcome and you will win. Thank you very much.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The floor is given to the State Secretary for Education, Research and Innovation of Switzerland Mauro Dell'Ambrogio who takes part in the Likhachev Scientific Conference for the first time, but I hope that this is the start of a good tradition.

M. DELL'AMBROGIO: – Rector Zapesotsky, uvazhaemie dami i gospoda, dorigie druzzya. Bilshoe spasibo za vashe priglasenie na otkritie konferentsii v Sankt Peterburge, eto chest' dlya menya govorit' pered takoy zvynoy publikoi.

Today we are discussing the question: "what does the future hold in the context of the world current cultural development". The answer is particularly difficult because the term 'culture' is very broad. When we speak of 'culture' in the traditional narrow sense, then is to a certain extent universal. An example for this is art. You have a wonderful school of art here. Whether it is the music of Bach, Tchaikovsky, Shostakovich, or is the literature of Molière, Dostoyevsky: we talk about the universally recognized and lasting work of genius.

Research and science are on a similar level to art. In their quest for new knowledge and verifiable truth they are by their very nature safe and universal parameters. And just like art, science and research transcend border and unite nations.

At the same time ideological concepts and worldviews are another expression of concrete manifestation of 'culture'. Such concepts find their expression for example in social sciences, in business administration, in economics and above all in politics.

This ideological form of 'culture' is not universal, it changes with the time and locations.

In principal change and difference are not bad things. However I would venture the following thesis: With the ideological form of 'culture' we do not steadily move forward. Instead, we take two step forwards and one step back. Over and over again.

I see the decades after the end of the Cold War as two-step forward. In the sense of a common understanding developed. This understanding included peaceful interactions between countries, open borders for peoples, ideas and goods.

It's not my intention to look at these decades through rose-colored glasses, but it feels that what is happening today is a step backwards. In the context of globalization, the cards are being reshuffled in a wide range of areas.

It is almost frightening, for example, to see how scientific knowledge is called into question today for political reasons. In fact a fundamental anti-scientific attitude is spreading: alternative medicine, New Age thinking, sectarianism instead of hard facts, climate change and its already emerging consequences are seen as fake news.

The international community is in a difficult situation, their commonalities of counties under the umbrella of the United Nations and its Millennium Goals are increasingly taking a backseat to nation-state arguments.

It's clear: in an increasingly globalized world, the nation-state is straight forward. The nation-state creates an identity that people find easier to relate to. The concept of an international community is a lot more complicated. But how far can this constant competition between nation-states take us? For those who win this competition, things may initially seem to be positive. But world history teaches us that tensions between countries underpinned by nationalist tendencies are an extremely explosive expression of different 'cultures'.

I tell this as a representative of a small and multicultural country. For us, dialogue is the necessary instrument for success at the national and international level. And is precisely with all of these in mind that I expressed my hope that we will soon be able to take two steps towards again towards a common universal 'culture'.

I'm convinced that the Russian and in particular Saint Petersburg humanities and social sciences will make a significant contribution to this.

Here in this city several generations of people have had extraordinary and very hard experiences. These experiences predestine you to help reduce tensions and to actively participate in open dialogue. A dialogue about universal human values and a broad based, common 'culture'. A certain degree of national pride must and should be permitted of course. But when pride turns into an expression of the Latin word "superbia", it becomes, if not sin, then at least a danger.

In any case I hope that the future will not bring us a world of small competing islands, but rather a large, interconnected world with differences and dialogue.

Uvazhaemye dami I gospoda, bolshoe spasibo za vashe vnimanie.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – I invite outstanding Russian lawyer, judge of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS Gadis Abdulayevich Hajiyevev to the microphone.

G. A. HAJIYEV: – Recently the Chairman of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation Professor V. D. Zorkin said that "The world is tired of peace". I associated these words with Leo Tolstoy's novel *War and Peace*. Proudhon's book under the same title had been published before it. L. N. Tolstoy met Proudhon in 1861. But if war and peace in case of Proudhon are an antinomy, Tolstoy speaks about the world as the main ontological category, everything that surrounds us. A common soldier Platon Karatayev lives in the big world, he is dissolved in the nation, he

does not feel himself an individual. This image is in Jung's style, when an individual is subjugated to the idea of collectivism.

I read Proudhon's book *La Guerre et la Paix* (War and Peace) when I was a student and it amazed me by its paradoxicality. The phenomenon of war and peace is explained by Proudhon as two functions of the mankind that should alternate, repeat in history as vigil and sleep alternate in individual's life. That is, war in Proudhon's opinion is something common and even productive. Proudhon's idea of war is first of all the idea of power, which is one of the principles of movement and life. Power generates antagonism and antagonism generates the necessity of accord and agreement. Paradoxical reasoning and discourse lead to the conclusion that justice appears in this straightening spiral of discourse about power – as practical mind and the highest ability of the soul. The balance existing in nature demonstrates itself in justice. In my opinion, balance is justice and fairness.

So, war is antagonism. But exactly antagonism helps origination of the international law, appearance of balance. Foreign policy knows the idea of European balance. Later the idea of balance expanded so much that now it is one of the main ideas of the age of rationalism. Besides, there are many other balances in foreign policy: trade balance in national economy, attraction of balance and repulsion in space, Malebranche's balance of passions and even Moser's balanced diet.

War is a continuation of antagonism, its culmination. But sometimes as Proudhon forecasts, cessation of antagonism may lead to universal hierarchy, which will mean universal enslavement. Because of that Proudhon comes to the conclusion that the political system supposes the general balance of states that should mutually limit each other. This is manifestation of justice, and balance in this sense is justice.

One of dangerous illusions is some system of universal values that may replace all the rest. It's a pity that the system of universal values is advocated by the nation that sentenced people to capital punishment in many of its states in the second half of the 19th century for teaching slaves to read and write. Forcing one's own system of universal values upon the rest of the world is worrisome.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Unfortunately, politicians sometimes make nations quarrel. But even in the most difficult historical periods scholars create the environment for nations to be friends and work jointly. The floor is given to outstanding Soviet and Ukrainian scientist, foreign member of the RAS, Honorary Doctor of the SPbUHSS Petr Petrovich Tolochko.

P. P. TOLOCHKO: – In addition to what I have already said in my report, I would like to share some doubts that I have regarding the role and place of culture in defining the future contours of our planet. Unfortunately, at present it has little influence on the historical process. The contours of the future are determined by economic interests and military might; in fact, it has always been that way. There are many examples to that effect in human history. The most recent example is the military doctrine of the United States which does not preclude using nuclear weapons in ordinary military conflicts and sets a list of US enemies as consist-

ing of Russia, China, Iran and North Korea. Such contours of the future cannot satisfy the international community. They are apocalyptic. But nevertheless we hear few, if any, protests against such a scenario of the future from the said world community.

Meanwhile, only very recently in terms of history, workers of culture had voiced their strong support of peaceful development. They were renowned scholars and writers, politicians and statesmen. They included reputable international organizations, such as the World Peace Council, which had offices in many countries. They included such organizations as the Non-Aligned Movement, which was in fact the third world power that could not be ignored. The Movement had been critical of the US war in Vietnam and the Soviet troops entering Afghanistan. These powers had definitely held the world away from the thuggish chaos in which we find ourselves today. These institutions these days are purely nominal, and have to deal with many internal contradictions. Their voice is not heard. There exist no more such moral authority figures as Joliot-Curie, Pablo Neruda, D. S. Likhachov, Jawaharlal Nehru, De Gaulle, Josip Broz Tito, Fidel Castro.

It is as if the world today has gotten smaller, pettier. The political figures in NATO, the only military bloc in the world, in their willingness to dominate over everyone else had completely forgotten about such notions as honor and decency. They come up with various fake legends about their competitors and based on those legends make decisions on how to punish them. They can deprive a country from taking part in athletic competitions, as had been the case for Russia recently, they introduce economic sanctions and start wars. At the same time they never even attempt to find any confirmation for their fake accusations. It is only after some time that we find out that Russian athletes had not taken any doping, that there was no chemical attack in Douma, and that the Novichok gas with which the Skripals reportedly were poisoned was made not only in Russia but in NATO countries as well. More conscientious statesmen like former British Premier Tony Blair would then recognize their mistakes and backtrack, and those with less conscience, like the IOC Chairman Thomas Bach, would continue proving their case even in the face of a court order to the contrary. The honest admission of Czech President Milos Zeman that Novichok gas had been produced in small quantities at military labs in his country caused a storm of indignation in the West, and he was even accused of being pro-Kremlin.

But what are these delayed admissions worth if tens or hundreds of thousands of people (as in Iraq) had already lost their lives, had their states destroyed (as in Libya), and their economies damaged?

I must also separately mention the destabilizing role of smaller nations that had previously been a part of the Soviet Union or the socialist commonwealth. They made a myth of a supposed Russian threat as a foundation of their international policy, and like petty salesmen, now are trying to sell it, for a good price, to their current partners in the EU and NATO. For that they get financial assistance, and have US military infrastructure placed on their territory. One thing they do not consider is that should a global military conflict occur, they will become its first victims.

There was a time when in the post-Soviet space the following joke was popular: "When will it become better? –

Better already was". We know that we, indeed, already had a better world when two poles, two centers of world development – the USA–Europe (NATO) and the Soviet Union (Warsaw Pact) – balanced each other.

This experience should definitely be returned into global relations. It will make the world more stable.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, Peter I is sometimes criticized for selecting the marshy delta of the Neva river to build a city here. It's not accidental that well-known Russian poet Sasha Cherny wrote 100 years ago:

Peter the Great, Peter the Great!
You alone are guiltier than all the rest:
Why did you commit the sin
Of rushing to the wild North?
Eight winter months, cloudberry instead of dates.
Cold, sludge, rains and darkness – I long for jumping down
From the window to the pavement my wild head first...

Let poets go on lodging complaints to Peter I if they want to. We on the contrary can rejoice that 92 years ago, in 1926, trade unions decided to establish their educational institution exactly here. St. Petersburg for our University is both the Motherland and excellent means to bring up young people, providing an opportunity to get a feel for the great culture. We engage in this work jointly with the whole St. Petersburg and we are surely supported by the Governor Georgy Sergeyevich Poltavchenko, the Government of the city, the Committee for Science and Higher Education.

It's a great pleasure for me to give the floor to Andrey Stanislavovich Maksimov, the Chairman of the Committee for Science and Higher Education, St. Petersburg Administration.

A. S. MAKSIMOV¹: – Allow me to perform the honorary mission and read the welcoming address by the Governor of St. Petersburg G. S. Poltavchenko to all participants, organizers and guests of the XVIII International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

"Dear friends! I'm happy to welcome all of you in St. Petersburg – the city where the great scientist, outstanding culture and art expert, academician Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov lived and worked. The International Likhachov Scientific Conference is highly reputed in the global academic community. The large-scaled discussion venue, dedicated to many issues of civilization development, traditionally unites the leading scholars, statesmen and public figures from various regions of Russia, CIS states and other foreign countries. The participants of the Scientific Conference will have to outline the contours of the future in the context of the world's cultural development basing on academician Likhachov's ideas that are becoming especially urgent in the contemporary world. According to the academician's deep-rooted conviction, it's culture that is the essence and the main value of the mankind's existence. I'm

¹ Chairman of the Committee for Science and Higher Education, St. Petersburg Administration, Cand. Sc. (Engineering), Honorary Figure of Higher Professional Education of the Russian Federation. Full state counselor 1st class of St. Petersburg. Author of a number of papers, including "Training Personnel for St. Petersburg Research and Production Complex", "Information System for Analysis and Management of Flow of Commodities in the Region" (co-author), "The St. Petersburg Higher School: Modernization Course" and others. He was awarded the first-class and second-class medals of the Order for the Service to the Motherland.

sure that the forum's work will help further strengthening of humanitarian ties and search for ideas for new educational projects. I wish the participants of the XVIII International Likhachov Scientific Conference fruitful contacts and dialogue as well as vivid impressions of St. Petersburg!"

I would also like to thank Alexander Sergeyevich and all the organizers of the XVIII International Likhachov Scientific Conference on behalf of the City Administration and on my own behalf for the wonderful organization of the work and high level of the Conference maintained every year. Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov was sure that humanitarian education was an important way for humanization of the society. His ideas are especially urgent in the today's turbulent and unpredictable world. I wish all the participants of the Conference interesting discussions and fruitful work!

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, the man, whom we consider an eminent representative of Leningrad intellectuals and with fairly good grounds, is taking part in our work not for the first time. He and I graduated from the same higher educational establishment – the Institute of Fine Mechanics and Optics. Today he works in Moscow, at the Moscow State University. This is outstanding scientist and statesman, foreign member of the RAS Askar Akayevich Akayev.

A. A. AKAYEV: – In the end of the 20th century, the mankind entered the period of a new historical rift – profound, long-drawn-out global crisis brought about by the change of long-term civilization cycles. First of all, there is decline of the two hundred-year-old industrial and capitalist civilization. The 500-year-old life cycle of the fourth generation of local civilizations that took place with complete domineering of the West, is ending. Today, we are watching the rise of the fifth generation of local civilizations led by Eastern local civilizations, first of all Chinese, Indian and surely Eurasian with great Russia at the head. This exactly explains the growing political tension in the world in recent decades, geopolitical conflicts that became more frequent and are threatening to grow into a conflict of civilizations. As the current crisis is of civilizational character, the way out of it can also be only on the civilizational foundation. And that way was pointed at – transfer to the humanistic, noospheric, integral civilization, worked out by great Russian scholars of the 20th century Vladimir Vernadsky, Pitirim Sorokin and finally academician Nikita Moiseyev.

The President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Russia Sergey Lavrov carry out exactly this kind of foreign policy. And scholars and diplomats that met two years ago in Yalta, established the Yalta Club to help politicians work out the strategy for formation of the new world order – multipolar and sustainable as the Yalta world and after-war multipolar world order as a result of the Yalta Conference held in 1945, are fully destroyed by the efforts of the West with the United States at the head. I think that the last stone from the Yalta world foundation was taken out by the President of the United States Donald Trump, unilaterally withdrawing from the Iran international nuclear deal, fully ignoring decisions of the UN Security Council and even the allies of the United States. Because of that we think that the time has

come for us to make our contribution and help politicians of the leading powers, who are striving to do everything to establish the new world order, overcome the today's global chaos and turbulence.

We worked out a project – the roadmap for establishing the new sustainable world order. This 700-page document is presented on the University website in the section "D. S. Likhachov square". I call upon all participants of the Likhachov Scientific Conference to familiarize themselves with it. The project will be handed in to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia. After Sergey Lavrov familiarized himself with the document, he approved it and recommended to discuss it. I think that the Likhachov Scientific Conference is the best venue for such a discussion. Later it will be presented to ministers of foreign affairs of the member states of the United Nations.

What are we offering in our roadmap? We think that when the 75th anniversary of the famous Yalta Conference is celebrated (in 2020), it's necessary to convene the Civilization Summit. As local civilizations will be playing the main role in the nearest future on the geopolitical field, we offer to announce the 2020s the decade of dialogue's and civilization partnership's strengthening to establish the new multipolar and sustainable world order, for the 21st century to become the age of the mankind's flourishing and not its annihilation.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, a big group of outstanding economists is taking part in our forum – world-class scholars and practical workers. Academician Glazyev, advisor to the President of the Russian Federation V. V. Putin, will be the moderator of one of our sections tomorrow. Academician Nekipelov, a well-known organizer of science, Vice-President of the Russian Academy of Sciences (2001–2013), will be the chairman at another section. And now the floor is given to academician of the RAS, Doctor of Sciences (physics and mathematics) Valery Leonidovich Makarov.

V. L. MAKAROV: – I'll speak not about economy but the trend not directly connected with economy – about our entering the so-called digital world. Though we often hear the word combination "digital economy" today, the digital world is a wider and more precise notion. Knowledge in this new reality is acquired not exactly like in the past. There were creative people and geniuses who acquired this knowledge somehow. In particular, their genius was their ability to choose the closest to the reality variant out of various options though they themselves generated various options.

Currently, the world changed cardinally. There are opportunities to generate a giant number of variants in any field – in science, painting pictures, composing music, writing novels, poems, etc. And a new type of people appears who may not be geniuses but they choose the closest to the reality variants out of many options. They may even be not individuals but population as a whole. How are proverbs and sayings born? Their author is the people. And the fact that is even more important is origination of the tool to generate various options, and that happened only now. Because of that people are needed (especially young people are the great hope) that will not only generate variants but will also choose the best from them.

It's possible that a part of these tasks will be performed by computers but in any case people should review them, research and choose the ones that will be better and more useful than the others. I repeat that these are completely new opportunities, which the world did not know in the past. I call upon everyone to pay attention to these contemporary realities.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – It's a pleasure for me to announce that notwithstanding some difficulties in international relations, a wonderful group of scholars from the United Kingdom is taking part in our forum. The floor is given to a representative of the University of Cambridge Chokan Laumulin.

Ch. T. LAUMULIN: – The relations of the University of Cambridge and Russia, including St. Petersburg, have been historically established, they are good and fruitful. And today I'd like to begin my very short speech with the quotation, which in my opinion is appropriate.

The thought about the unity of science, its being nearly unique means for interaction of nations and cultures at the time of conflicts and wars, permeates our forum. I'd like to remind you of the words by the father of quantum physics Max Planck, written by him in 1916, when World War I was in full swing, to his colleagues from other countries that became enemies in no time: "There are such notions in moral and ethical intellectual life that are beyond the fight of nations".

Exactly science and culture are such phenomena that are beyond inter-national struggle, economic rivalry, etc. And what is more, they overcome all contradictions and serve as the basis for economic and social development. When we put economy in the first place, we forget the basic postulates as technologies start from philosophy as my colleagues said rightly. There are culture and science in the beginning, and applied designs and developments, technologies, innovations become possible only based on them, and economy and finances are the next step. We can respond to demands and challenges of the new industrial revolution only keeping in mind the cultural and scientific unity of the world.

I'd like to recall the experience of the greatest scientific power of the 20th century that broke the record in financing science and research. In 1980, expenditures for science in the USSR exceeded 5% of GNP, and even the leaders of today – Israel and the Republic of Korea (4.25%) – still have not approached this figure. Today's figures are a striking contrast: 1.16% of GDP in Russia, they are no better in the other countries of the Eurasian Economic Union (0.6% in Byelarus, 0.16% in Kazakhstan). Evidently that's not enough. Looking at the growing economy and influence of China – the new superpower, we should remember that the recipe of that upsurge was invented in the USSR. In recent years, China considerably increased investments in science up to 2% of GDP, and the world already sees results. I think that Russia, first of all as the leader of the Eurasian Union, has everything required for scientific breakthrough – scientific expert examination, competence, qualified personnel. Human capital is the decisive factor that is difficult to overestimate. The intellectual potential of the Russians is unbelievably high. I hope that Russian young people will get good prospects in the field of science.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The floor is given to academician of the RAS, world-known philosopher Vladislav Alexandrovich Lektorsky.

V. A. LEKTORSKY: – Is it possible for us to outline the contours of the future? Can we foretell what awaits us? The mankind has to deal with two challenges common for all, independent of contradictions and conflicts, dividing the today's world. I called them the *challenge of indefiniteness* and the *challenge of super-definiteness*.

There has always been indefiniteness in our life, the mankind's development would have stopped without it. No action is predetermined beforehand, an individual takes decisions himself. We are free in this sense. The consequences of our actions cannot be known for sure, because of that we answer for our decisions.

But at the same time it's impossible to live in an unpredictable reality. And the degree of unpredictability today is higher than ever. There is a whole number of reasons for that. First, relations of the main players on the international scene are changing, at the same time many rules of the game are not observed. The international law is violated more and more often, because of that the world in some sense is becoming chaotic. Economic, geopolitical and other factors have an impact on that. Second, the human civilization entered the information development stage, when events and their consequences become less and less definite. We live in continuous information flows that are often used in the interests of big players on the international scene. It's known that information wars are going on now, in my opinion, the definition "disinformation" would suit them more. People live not so much in real space as in information space. Information "reality" can be rather far from the true reality. How can we know what really takes place when we are surrounded by wild information flows coming from mass media, the Internet, from everywhere? The reality is forged artificially, and consequences are sometimes very serious, even catastrophic.

Social institutions are becoming more unsteady, ephemeral. Prominent figures in the field of arts are speaking about that in particular. French director Jean-Luc Godard presented his film at the International Cannes Film Festival: the world fell into pieces and nothing can be understood, and especially forecasted. We'll be running across that more and more, because we can't refuse information civilization.

Valery Leonidovich said that we are entering the digital world, and that is really interesting. But how to live in this world, how to behave? It's possible to plunge into adventures, not knowing how everything will end, it's possible to hide behind fundamental ideas, and there are such movements. But neither are the solution, on the contrary, these variants are dangerous. There is another variant: to make the world more definite. But how? With the help of digitalization – and not only of economy but also the other areas of life. For an individual not only to just wait for the future but also to strive to create it by himself, to actively influence it. Such an opportunity is provided by new technologies – information, nano and biotechnologies. The answer to contemporary challenges can lie only in creation of the future with the help of cultural essences, about which Askar Akayevich spoke. The way out is only in culture, otherwise it's impossible to do anything.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Prominent statesman from Turkey Egemen Bağış, the Minister of European Union Affairs of Turkey from 2009 to 2013, is taking part in our work not for the first time. Mr. Bağış, you are welcome.

E. BAĞIŞ: – Thank you rector, distinguished guests, dear panel. I bring you greetings from my country Turkey. Last year when I was speaking on this podium the relations between Turkey and Russia were getting warmer and better, but today compared to a year ago I can easily declare that the relations between our two great countries and our two great leaders are much better and getting even better. It's a privilege to attend this very meaningful conference for the second time and I thank our rector Alexander for his gracious invitation and to my dear friend former Foreign Minister of Spain Miguel Moratinos for making me a friend of the St. Petersburg University of Humanities and Social Sciences. I'm proud to be a friend of this organization.

I've been asked to talk about culture and transformation in this conference. We are seeing major shifts of populations throughout the world. Not voluntary but a forced migration. As we speak there are more than 3.5 million Syrian refugees in my country alone. There are more than half 1 million Iraqis in Turkey as well and many other groups, because of oppression, because of torture from dictators, innocent civilians are forced to migrate and this is changing the culture. Right now Arabic has become almost a second language in my country and you can see signs because with 3 million – 4 million Arabic speaking refugees it becomes a very important marketing tool as well. And we see their culture, arts, literature becoming a part of our daily lives. In one way, it's enriching our culture but in another way it's a pity that they had to abandon their homes. But as we speak today there is another atrocity that I have to mention. People of Palestine are suffering immensely under the very cruel and inhuman practices of the Israeli state. It is time to raise our voice no matter what religion we believe, in no matter what citizenship we belong to, no matter what ethnicity we represent it is time to become humans and as all religions teach us to love each other, it is time to support each other and it is time to stop killing each other. Thank you for giving me a chance to speak the truth from the platform of St. Petersburg University of Humanities and Social Sciences. I hope to have a further discussion on this issue later today, thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, one of important traditions of the Likhachov Scientific Conference is participation of not only leading scientists and public figures but also honoured arts workers. I invite Honoured Artist of Russia Nikas Safronov to the microphone.

N. S. SAFRONOV: – Dear participants and guests of the Likhachov Scientific Conference! Dear Alexander Sergeyevich, allow me to thank you for the opportunity to speak at this outstanding scientific and public forum. Scholars and politicians, public figures and creative intellectuals find a common language on this venue. Writer Daniil Granin, musician Mstislav Rostropovich, poet Andrey Voznesensky, composer Georgy Sviridov, choreographer Boris Eifman and many other outstanding figures in the field of arts of our times spoke at the Likhachov Scientific

Conference in different years. It's a great honour for me to find my name on this list.

The topic of this forum – “The Contours of the Future in the Context of the World's Cultural Development” – is very urgent. Any our actions are the reason and a draft for the future. We act proceeding from rational considerations but later it often turns out that our actions were erroneous. All processes in the society are non-linear. Linear connections are when everything is preordained: water boils at 100 degrees Celsius, the angle of incidence is equal to the angle of reflection, etc. And non-linear is when, according to Edward Lorenz, a butterfly flapping its wings in China can start a hurricane in America. Even the term “butterfly effect” originated.

Unfortunately, the range of tools to foresee the future is not large: either extrapolation or scenario planning. Extrapolation is continuation of the observed trend in future. There was a forecast made in the middle of the 19th century based on this method that London would be fully covered by manure in 50 years. They counted how many horses lived in the city, how many of them were added every year, how much excreta were “produced” by each horse on the average – and they got impressive figures. The forecast did not come true. Cars, trams, subway, etc. appeared.

The efficiency of scenario planning – suggesting variants according to the principle “if that way, then...” – is determined by the volume and quality of available information. However, even if it is available, the increasing dynamics of the contemporary world leads to the fact that individuals, whose actions are unpredictable even for themselves, turn out in power, and that shortens the horizon and depth of foretelling to the minimum.

There is the third method as well, absolutely unscientific, but that does not make it less precise than the methods mentioned above. I'm speaking about the artist's insight. The arts sometimes cognize the world even more effectively than science. For example, Leo Tolstoy wrote: “The best man is the one predominantly living by his thoughts and the feelings of others, the worst kind of a man is the one living by the thoughts of others and his own feelings. All differences of people, the whole complex music of characters come from various combinations of these four foundations, motives for activities”. That was written in 1901, long before fundamental scientific research on psychology of individuals.

The shipwreck of the RMS *Titanic* was described in detail 14 years before the event, in 1898, by Morgan Robertson in his novel *Futility, or the Wreck of the Titan*. Social upheavals were foreseen by artists as well who reflected them in their works: Goya's series of etchings, Picasso's *Guernica*, Kustodiev's *The Bolshevik*, Yuon's *New Planet*, etc.

But the role of the arts does not come down to the function of a kind of time machine allowing to look into the future. The arts perform the mission of providing the dialogue of cultures and civilizations. The arts carry this mission on even in the darkest times in the history of international relations: the diplomacy of the arts goes on.

The Americans built their military bases in France after World War II, and the French looked upon them as national humiliation. But cultural cooperation continued. The famous *La Gioconda* by Leonardo Da Vinci was presented at the exhibition in the United States where it was seen by

more than 10 mln people. It was a sensation. Public moods created such a background that the Americans had to withdraw their troops from France.

In the end I'll say a well-known phrase: beauty will save the world. And though the Dostoevsky's character says it with some irony, people all over the world are intuitively pulled to beauty and they try to save it. Peace and accord are required for that as beauty dies first in any conflicts. It is not always evident, because of that an artist is required to show it to people by his creative work. As a result, beauty saves the world, including with artists' participation.

Meeting of representatives of science, culture, politics and authorities on one venue gives grounds to believe in positive prospects for all. The arts should take their place in this dialogue. As one of my acquaintances says, "My neighbour over the wall has his perforator, and I have my trombone. But repairs will stop some day and the arts are eternal".

Thanks again for inviting me to the Conference! I wish success to all participants!

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, we continue the work of the Plenary Session, and I have the pleasure to give the floor to academician of the RAS, outstanding Russian scientist-immunologist Valery Alexandrovich Chereshevnev.

V. A. CHERESHNEV: – Good day to you, dear Alexander Sergeyevich, members of the Presidium, dear colleagues and friends. Really, the topic of this Likhachov Scientific Conference – "The Contours of the Future" – is very interesting. I understand fairly well that not only cultural future but any future is impossible without science. I'd like to say several words about that and start from the lines by our great poet Alexander Sergeyevich Pushkin, who very accurately forecasted the possible variants of scientific search in his poems. Do you remember?

O, how many wonderful discoveries
The spirit of enlightenment prepares for us,
As well as experience, the son of tough mistakes,
And genius, the friend of paradoxes,
And chance, the god-inventor...

Surely, the most pleasant for perception by the Russians is "Genius, the friend of paradoxes", because according to some calculations, Russia gave the world the biggest number of geniuses in the field of science. And the second matter of interest is that many of these geniuses had prognostic, futurological capabilities. Dmitry Sergeyevich Likhachov presented the comprehensive picture of culture as it is and as it should develop. But Nikita Nikolayevich Moiseyev, whose one hundredth anniversary was celebrated last year, our outstanding researcher, mathematician, ecologist, is especially notable for his forecasts. He worked out numerous forecasts – about the coming nuclear winter, about events that were to take place on the Earth in the next years. He also made his contribution to the science of noosphere, "the sphere of human thought" (that in his opinion was to replace technosphere), developing the theories by Teilhard de Chardin, Leroy and Vernadsky. He created his own theory of interaction of strategies and utopias, proceeding from the fact that most scientists treated the noosphere teaching

as a strategy for the world, and the second – smaller – part thought that to be utopias that would never come true. He said: here are two concepts – utopias and strategies, from different worlds. Strategy is the real world, utopia is an illusionary world. But when we are speaking about big social projects of transdisciplinary importance and evoking strong reaction, the borders between these worlds blend. And the reason for that is the bravest ideas, rejected by the scientific world, called "clear utopia" by it, and sooner or later they become the most fruitful. Besides, no one is to know beforehand how utopia will end and what it will transform into. And a fruitful at the initial stage strategy often turns into utopia.

N. N. Moiseyev demonstrated in his book *The Civilization's Destiny. The Way of Mind* how one turns into the other, and introduced the idea of "constructive utopias". What are they? They are utopias that should answer the main matters domineering in science. First: if you're forecasting something, never write in detail how it will take place. You will be always wrong. Second: always follow the dynamics of the strategy or utopia – how it develops, what should be done and what should not be done referring to that, what it possible to do without.

The reform of the Russian Academy of Sciences has been going on for five years already. And it's clear already what was not to be done – transfer the Academy into the "club of scientists" as it has been a state institution from the time of its foundation and will never become a private club. It's also clear what is impossible to do without – the Academy of Sciences can't do without institutes as it realizes its activities through them. How is it possible to break these ties? Everything taking place leads to the result about which Kudrin spoke recently: none of the 23 concepts, strategies, economic development programs were fully brought into life from 2000 till the present day, during 18 years. There are eighteen months left to the end of the Strategy 2020 realization, at the moment it is 30% fulfilled, but it should be 75% fulfilled. That is, it's already clear that it will not be fulfilled by 2020. That's what the wrong monitoring and erroneous use of correction mechanisms lead to. It's possible to speak on the topic for a long time but I'll say just one more thing in conclusion – about which Nikita Nikolayevich Moiseyev said regularly: any big strategy is human strategy. There can be mistakes, rises and falls in it, but the better it is scholarly checked, the least is the probability of crises and other negative aspects. I'll quote the words by another outstanding man of the Russian science of the 20th century and good friend of Nikita Nikolayevich Moiseyev – Nikolay Vladimirovich Timofeyev-Resovsky, well-known "Bison", who liked to repeat addressing his students and post-graduates: "And remember: life like everything else in the world is not starchy jelly, not some continuity, but a discrete state, including good and various periods".

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, Mr. Köchler, Ph.D., a wonderful philosopher from Austria, sends us very interesting reports and comes to us to take part in discussions for a number of years already.

H. KÖCHLER: – Distinguished Rector, Professor Zapesotsky, Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen! I would like to make a distinction, which I consider vital in a conference that is dealing with the role of culture in the fu-

ture development of the world. This is the distinction between the notions of *universality* and *uniformity*. The human mind is universal. By mind I mean the capacity of reflection, or self-reflection, of critical analysis, and assessment of the facts. This capacity is inherent in every human being – irrespective of cultural tradition, ethnic affiliation or religious belief. Universality of the mind in this sense must not be confused with uniformity. In regard to culture, namely the way the human being organizes the circumstances of his life and perceives reality, there is indeed vast diversity. It would be almost totalitarian to assume, or state, that the development of the world should go in the direction of uniformity as far as cultures and civilizations are concerned. However, the pressure towards uniformity is one of the major challenges of our time as far as the political system and the power constellation are concerned. In periods of history when there was an imbalance of power, an overwhelming influence of one particular political entity or community over all the others, the most powerful entity was often tempted to impose its culture and lifestyle upon the rest of the world, proclaiming the universality of its particular culture. This is the real threat the world is faced with today. In an era of rapid technological development and economic globalization – where, due to information technology, every culture and civilization can instantly be present all over the world, there always is the risk that the most powerful actor exploits the situation (in terms of globalization and global interconnectedness) and enforces a trend towards uniformity. We must not be naïve about this development. Allow me to recall one historical fact: In the middle of the Second World War, in the year 1941, the American author Henry Luce wrote that famous article in *Time Magazine* in which he proclaimed the dawn of the “American Century”. He mentioned four characteristics of that new era – related to *economy, technology, art and humanitarian commitment*. He argued that the beginning of the American Century, defined by these four aspects, was based on *measures of defense*, i.e. on the military might of the United States at that time. Many decades have passed since then, and the bipolar balance of power, with the rivalry between the two major players, has disappeared. What we should be focusing on in the present situation is how the gradual emergence of a new *multipolar* constellation, or balance of power, can also foster a development towards cultural diversity at the global level – how it can be avoided that every culture or civilization that differs from the so-called Western or Anglo-American civilization is being marginalized. I shall conclude, Mr. Rector, on a cautiously optimistic note. I hope that recent political initiatives of countries, which now again are able to cooperate with one another – the Russian Federation, China, also Turkey, have been mentioned here – will make it possible that this trend towards uniformity and marginalization can be reversed. I thank you for your attention.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The next to speak is our colleague representing here both Russia and the United States of America, foreign member of the RAS Vladimir Lvovich Kvint.

V. L. KVINT: – Events held as a part of the Likhachov Scientific Conference are always interesting and educational for me. This is a real forge of transdisciplinary

knowledge, new understanding of the world and our future. There is the expression “the contours of the future”. Who outlines them? Some time in the past they were mostly people called prophets, visionaries. From the point of view of contemporary scientists studying the theory of psychology, psychological logic and behavioral economy, the visionaries are people who perceived whole, complete or fragmentary complete pictures of the future originating in subconsciousness or, in the best case, on the border between the rational and the irrational, where science, religion, theology, etc. meet and partly blend. Such pictures could appear in front of an individual who had never analyzed the future.

Professional skills, knowledge and branches of science that engaged in foreseeing and studying the future appeared gradually over the centuries. Forecasting, long-term planning, strategy-building methods originated. But these sciences are still in “childhood”, they should be perceived as sciences “*in waiting*”, in the process of formation of their new methods, theoretical foundations for these methods and tools. In the end the 20th century, scientists from various fields of science such as psychology, mathematics, economy started analyzing and researching these various areas of research that were connected with the limits of conscious and subconscious. In the end of the 20th century and the early 21st century, academic journals finally started printing papers by these scientists, they were awarded Noble Prizes.

I spoke several times to the scientist who was the first to be awarded the Noble Prize in behavioral economics (in 2002) – Daniel Kahneman. He created his works with a co-author, outstanding mathematician Amos Tversky. Originally the area of Daniel Kahneman’s activities was psychology (he told me that he had not read a single book on economy before he was awarded the Noble Prize). He and Amos Tversky worked out a new psychology of thinking about the future, which they called “Prospect Theory”. I can’t present the methods of this school in my short speech, I’ll just quote one Daniel Kahneman’s phrase: “We think of our future as anticipated memories”.

Another Noble Prize winner (2005) Robert Aumann was a mathematician whose works were dedicated to analysis of today’s conflicts and partnerships from the point of view of their impact on contemporary life and future strategies. One of his conclusions was as follows: the more we are focused on long-term and not momentary effects in our investment activities, the more successful is our strategy.

And finally, very recently, in 2017, the Noble Prize was awarded to Richard Thaler – also for research in behavioral economics. I want to call upon my colleagues once again not to be afraid to research issues on the border of the rational and the irrational as the future is determined not only by economic interests and military power. Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – I invite a corresponding member of the RAS Irina Olegovna Abramova to take the floor.

I. O. ABRAMOVA: – Alexander Sergeyevich, thank you very much for the opportunity to speak at the Plenary Session. As we are speaking about the formation of the contours of the future, it should be noted that there is a gradual transfer from the Western civilization to the Eastern civilization, from the unipolar world to the polycentric world,

accompanied by the change of the priorities. This process goes on without stopping, and at the same time with speaking about players that recently emerged in the global economic and political space (about whom we already spoke today – they are the rising China and India), it's possible to speak about completely new players, including new continents that are appearing in this space and will play a new role in the world politics and economy in the nearest future. I'm speaking about the continent of Africa.

In the opinion of many international experts, the continent of Africa now occupies the same position as China 30 years ago and India 20 years ago. It's a rising, very successfully developing continent, with the high rates of economic growth, but it will also play the new and very considerable role in the world economy because of its demographical dividend. The contours of the future are first of all developed by people. And if we just think about the fact that from 25% to 30% of the world population will live in Africa by 2030, maximum by 2050, we'll understand that Africans will be changing the contours of our civilization to a considerable extent. The role of Africa is understood all over the world: the United States, the European Union, new players actively cooperate with Africa and engage it in the new alliances and convergent geo-economic edifices – assumed the name of “economic megacollaborations” in the western specialized literature – which include high-potential fast-growing regions of the developing world. A new phenomenon is seen in the West as one of the fundamental innovative characteristics of the world economy transformation and international relations as part of the “Next (New) Production Revolution”, NPR, Next (in other documents – New Production Revolution).

Unfortunately, the Russian Federation is a little bit falling behind here. We considerably curtailed our relations with the continent of Africa and we are not using those evident profits that cooperation with African countries can bring, including for development of Russian economy. It is said in recent Presidential orders presented in May that we have to increase non-raw export, and non-raw products to African countries amount approximately to 80% in the export structure, including 14% of machine building products. Therefore, the Russian – African economic cooperation can play an important role in the long-term support of the Russian economy diversification, “to prettify” the export structure through the establishment of a stable guaranteed market for the Russian-made industrial products.

There is one more point to which I wish to address your attention. As we're speaking about the contours of global transformation in the cultural aspect as well, that it's very important for Russia to maintain cultural cooperation with Africa, and first of all in the sphere of education and training, as thus we will form those African elites that will be taking political and economic decisions in future. If future African ministers and politicians study at our universities, that will give us a number of advantages in prospect. Thank you for your attention.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Allow me to give the floor to one of the most successful foreign diplomats in Russia if we mean modern history – public figure, writer who worked in Russia as the Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Kingdom of Spain for a number of years, good friend of our University Juan Antonio March.

J. A. MARCH: – Zdrastvuite gospodin rector Alexander Sergeyevich Zapesotsky, zdrasvuite studenty. We have been called today to give some hints on the evolution of our world towards the future. We have just five minutes so we'll try to be very specific. The main element to take into mind is that at present the evolution, the speed, the vertiginous rate at which we are renovating knowledge is incredible. It has been calculated that in the last 18 years we have produced as much knowledge as we have produced in the last 15,000 years since we invented the wheel. So we are going at incredible speed, but the question is where we are heading to. I like very much the theory of the great scientific man Hawking who says that we are going to be the bees of the pollinating process of the universe. We're going to be the element, we are going to disseminate intelligence into the universe? Okay that is very nice but the issue is: are we going to do that because we are going to escape, to run away from our planet or are we going to do that after we have been able enough to build a very wise civilization in our planet that what we are exporting is the model to the universe? For you, the new generation, I think this is a key issue: are we going to run away from our planet or are we going to be the great element that we bring safe soft intelligence to the universe? So in these circumstances this is in my view the key thing for the new generation. Science is progressing very much but we are not progressing at such a speed integrating the architectural political order for the understandings of civilizations. So what can be the main path to go there? The thing that we have to take into consideration is that the 21st century is the century of the individual people, each of you is individual. In the previous centuries man was a kind of animal workforce. In 1900 we had factories with 20,000 people repeating the same process. Now this is done by robots, this is done by machines. So at that time there were maybe only 20 people who were thinking how to run the factory, now we are on the contrary, we have 20,000 industries run only with 10-20 people who are the thinkers. So the thing is considered that in 21st century each and every individual is an important pillar of building the future. This is the future of the creativity of the intelligence, so no more estates, no more empires, no more groups, the thing is to develop the system on the planet that allows each and every individual to be extremely creative. The time is for you, estudiante! Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The floor is given to Vladimir Konstantinovich Mamontov, a wonderful journalist from Moscow.

V. K. MAMONTOV¹: – I'm very happy to receive the invitation and I think it a great honor to say something important here. We are constantly thinking about the future within the framework of our profession or our views and convictions. Everyone draws his picture of the future proceeding from that. It seems as follows to me as a journalist. One of the main dangers lying in wait for us in the future is humans disappearing from the true reality. I mean not so much the material, objective reality as the whole aggregate

¹ Director General of the “Govorit Moskva” (Moscow Speaking) radio broadcasting station, Director of the “Razumny Internet” (Sensible Internet) web initiative endowment. Mamontov is the author of the books “Seven Dreams in September: social fantastic fusion”, “How to make a newspaper that will be read?”.

of interpersonal ties – economic, social, spiritual that make the basis of our civilization. Every sign indicates that the reality will exist by itself more and more, and humans respectively will exist by themselves.

I'll give one example to compare with the past. We know that the results of the Patriotic War of 1812 were differently interpreted. As a result, there are monuments erected both in Russia and in France to their heroes – winners of the war of 1812. Thus the history in the 19th century was built – based on real events, then they were interpreted and later myths were formed. Most likely, the Battle of Borodino will not be studied in detail and analyzed in the 21st century. It will just be mentioned that it took place, but everyone will determine the winner on one's own, according to his wishes. They will think in France that the French won, we'll think that we won.

None of us can say definitely what really took place even about recent events. How many missiles were launched at the time Syria was bombarded? One hundred? And how many were brought down? Seventy? No one knows. Did bombing take place at all? Were the Skripals poisoned? Either they were, or they were not. And a lot depends on such things in future. Unimaginatively big changes can take place as a result of events about which no one knows anything for sure – if they took place, how everything took place, who won, etc. All that seems a very serious challenge for me.

And a little bit more about the problem of humans disappearing from the reality. Humans have been living in a more and more comfortable environment in the course of civilization development, they have to do less and less themselves. Soon we'll stop driving cars, they will be self-driving. Even KamAZ is intending to robotize its trucks. And had it happened already, how would the opening of the Crimean bridge have looked, for example? It's a joke but there is a part of truth in it. The new generation, for example, my grandchildren normally exist in two realities already. They are ready to play a little in the yard for me but later they go to their computers, and that's a completely different life already, in which I don't exist. It worries me. Thank you that there is such a forum at which I can say about such things. Thank you, everyone.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Allow me to give the floor to outstanding Swedish scholar, Professor Scholte.

J. A. SCHOLTE: – Zdrastvuyte – and now the rest of my remarks will come with the cultural imperialism of the English language. Uzhasno!

World cultural development is not in a very happy place at the moment. Many people are setting Russia against the West, Christianity against Islam, indigenous peoples against modern culture, and so on. There are a lot of tensions around cultural differences, a lot of conflicts, a lot of difficulties.

In this situation we need positive ways to deal with cultural diversity and cultural difference. By "culture" I mean the ways that people construct and communicate their experiences of life. Cultures – in the sense of life-ways, life-worlds, and life-styles – are diverse. Sometimes culture involves not only *diversity*, but also *difference*, in the sense that it becomes difficult for people to understand and respect each other across their diversities.

How should we respond to cultural diversity and difference? Four general approaches can be distinguished: multiculturalism, monoculturalism, interculturalism and transculturalism. My remaining remarks will briefly describe and evaluate each of these approaches in turn.

One way to handle cultural diversity and difference can be called "multiculturalism". This view says that humanity divides into separate cultural groups which have very different values. Multiculturalism advises that, as a result, cultures cannot integrate and are therefore better left to themselves, leading separate lives. The groups may tolerate and respect each other, but they also get along by limiting their interactions with each other.

Yet multiculturalism does not work in practice. In today's globally interdependent world it is not possible to separate cultural groups from each other. Indeed, "cultures" are not neatly distinct groups of people at all. Cultures overlap, even in a single person. So we have to live with each other amidst all of our diversities and differences. Culturally diverse people have to interact, have to co-exist, and have to cooperate on global problems. The multiculturalist formula is not really feasible in practice.

A second approach to cultural diversity and difference can be called "monoculturalism" (or "assimilationism"). This approach says, in a culturally imperialistic way, that the way to deal with cultural variety in the world is to get rid of it. Assimilationism seeks to dissolve cultural diversity and absorb all of humanity into a single life-world, into one life-way. That one way is usually assumed to be the western-liberal-modern way, with the erasure of all other cultures.

Yet monoculturalism, too, is highly problematic. After all, no culture – including the Western way – can provide all the answers for societal problems. Indeed, Western culture can sometimes be the problem (for example, in relation to ecological destruction). Meanwhile cultural diversity can be a resource, providing more answers for humanity's challenges. Moreover, not everyone wants to be pushed into a uniform cultural mold, as an earlier speaker has mentioned.

A third approach to cultural diversity and difference can be called "interculturalism". This philosophy urges that all humanity lives in harmony across cultural varieties. Interculturalism says that people of all backgrounds can interact in peace and live together positively.

Yet interculturalism fails to appreciate that people do actually have some deep cultural differences that can be difficult to negotiate. Moreover, relations between cultures take place amidst power inequalities that give some life-worlds a dominant position over others, and these power inequalities have to be addressed openly and honestly. Also, people are not always comfortable with cultural differences. For example, many cultural positions cannot accept the death penalty or female genital mutilation.

A fourth and (to my mind) more attractive alternative is "transculturalism". I elaborate this approach in the paper that I prepared for this conference. The word transculturalism was coined by the Cuban anthropologist Fernando Ortiz in the 1940s. My own conception of transculturalism suggests that cultural diversity and difference can be positively handled by appreciating the complexity of culture. In addition, by in principle celebrating cultural diversity, this variety is seen as an asset rather than a problem. Transculturalism also urges that people approach cultural differences with humility: after all, each of us knows so lit-

tle of the world. We barely know ourselves, let alone other cultures. So we should hesitate to assert our superiority over other cultures. Instead, transculturalism prescribes deep listening to cultural others – actively trying very hard to understand where another person is coming from. Deep listening in turn can promote mutual learning across cultural differences and indeed positive mutual change of cultures. After all, cultures are not static but dynamic. Cultures are always moving, and we can anticipate a future world in which the cultures of today have been transformed into something quite different.

Transculturalist approaches to cultural diversity and difference can perhaps move us beyond the current unhappy world cultural situation. Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Allow me to give the floor to a corresponding member of the RAS, Doctor of Sciences (Economics) Alexey Vladimirovich Kuznetsov.

A. V. KUZNETSOV: – When we are speaking about the contours of the future, we are first of all discussing economy and politics. But we should not forget that there are many non-economic factors in economy. Cultural aspects of economic development have been studied for several decades already, including those that have an impact on transnationalization of business, which became one of the main elements of contemporary globalization. The world is changing all the time, it's required to enter new corrections in the results of research. For example, Geert Hofstede's ideas about cultural special features of conducting business and perceiving economic life on the whole were developed and supplemented by research by the Uppsala school of the internationalization process of the firm. That school arose in Sweden in the 1970s, where in particular the effect of proximity in the geography of foreign direct investment was revealed. Currently, there is a lot said about the investment climate, criteria to assess countries most attractive for investing. When we see where investments come from to one or the other country, we understand that language closeness and other ethnic and cultural factors play a very big role here.

It's fairly enough to give one or two examples. If we are reviewing European regions, where Austrian investors' influence is manifested most of all, the borders of the former Austro-Hungarian Empire appear in front of us as if magically. The same with the former Swedish Empire – the growth of Swedish capital is viewed exactly in the Baltic Region countries, where the Swedes dominated in the past, several centuries ago. This is not statistic juggling – the companies themselves look upon not only their native countries as home markets but neighbouring countries as well.

There is the factor of political expediency in economy besides language and cultural factors. It's interesting to review its impact with the help of examples of Russian business, Russian foreign economic relations, including for the reason of us having a rather limited historically period of very active and large-scaled transnationalization of business. Actually, we started entering foreign markets and at the same time wide involvement of foreign business to Russia only after disintegration of the Soviet Union. This is a giant field for research. I'll again give just a couple of examples.

First of all, the role of our companies' capital investments is especially great exactly in the countries close to us in culture. It's the biggest in Belarus, and that is logical, but at the same time, notwithstanding all political frictions, it is also big in other post-Soviet European countries – first of all, the Ukraine, Moldova and Latvia. As for beyond the post-Soviet space, that's Bulgaria, Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and that is also consistent with the pattern.

There are other examples as well, when we start developing relations with the regions, with which we had no ties in the past or they were politically brought about – in particular, African states, which Irina Olegovna Abramova already mentioned today. It would be interesting to follow (and that will be the task for future researchers) the impact of cultural and political aspects on one another, their stimulating or on the contrary freezing economic interaction. Over the ten recent years, Russia actively developed economic relations with Asian and African countries. It's interesting what priorities it will be governed by in future when choosing partners – their economic importance for us or cultural proximity. Here is also a lot to do for researchers, especially young people. Notwithstanding the already existing works on the topic, there is still more to do. Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – It's principally important for us that outstanding scholars from Poland have been taking part in the Likhachov Scientific Conference for a number of years already. Poland is our neighbour, the culture of this country is close to ours. I think that scholars should do their duty and overcome frictions and disagreements originating between their countries. I have the pleasure to give the floor to Doctor of Sciences (Sociology), who in the 1990s was the Minister of National Education of Poland, Jerzy Wiatr.

J. WIATR: – Dear Alexander Sergeyevich, dear colleagues. Thank you very much for giving me the floor, it is my seventh conference, Likhachev confidence and I always come here with great pleasure.

Let me make one general comment on the present situation. We are living in a very dangerous world now, more dangerous than the couple years ago and the question is why. When the Cold War ended there was a gate wave of optimism. We in the West and in the far more East believed that the worst, the most dangerous stage of international relations has been put into the past. 28–29 years later we realize that things are much more complex and the question is why. My interpretation is, that we are still confronted with ideologization of international relations. Something that characterized the cold war but didn't die with the cold war. And there're two versions of this ideologization. One very widely commented, very obvious, is the radical Islamic fundamentalism which transforms relations into various parts of the world, particularly in the Middle East, into a very dangerous complex situation. But the other not less dangerous but maybe less obvious is a tendency to subordinate international relations to ideological dictates of liberal democracy. Let me make one thing clear I believe liberal democracy to be a great innovation in human history, a very important and valuable set of values. But in the same time I think that the policy of imposing liberal democratic values on other nations, exporting liberal democracy is now one of the main dangers of the world. And it's symbolized particularly by the policy of the United States under George

Walker Bush, but it didn't end with the Bush presidency. The alternative is making foreign policy on the base of national interests. Now national interests also can collide, but they offer the possibility of finding compromises so basically one thing, which I think we should learn from the difficult years that we are living now, is that compromise in international relations has a very great value, compromise is not an ideal solution, compromise as Henry Kissinger once said "is a solution that leaves everybody partly unhappy". But if we think about the alternative, the only way to make our world better and more peaceful is through practicing the art of compromise. And for this meeting of minds such as these important gatherings that bring people from various countries of various cultures together are important because they create a climate, intellectual cultural climate conducive to the policy of compromises. Once more thank you very much for giving me the floor and inviting me to this important meeting. Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – I give the floor to outstanding Russian sociologist, corresponding member of the RAS Zhan Terentyevich Toshchenko. Zhan Terentyevich is a Professor, heading a number of educational academic institutions, he is also known in the global community of sociologists as the head of the brilliant journal *Sociological Studies* that is much quoted abroad.

Zh. T. TOSHCHENKO: – I'd like to present several theses related to the agenda of this Likhachov Scientific Conference. First. Putting questions about the future is a very important aspect of scholarly and practical efforts of both the academic community and the people managing various social and state processes. Second. The future can't be forecasted, ignoring the events of the past and the present. We can judge about what we have to realize in the future only in unity, and sometimes contradictory unity. When we are speaking about the past, memories are important for us, the meaning of what we, our country, our people lived through is important for us. When we are speaking about the present, it's very important for us what values exist for us now, in the present. When we are speaking about the future, the goal is important for us, what we want to achieve. And – the next thesis – there are three objectively acting factors in this interlacing of the past, the present and the future. The first is strength, when the society is imposed a willful, forced solution of some or the other problems. The second aspect is related to capital, which also plays an enormous role, determining the paths and forms of development. And the third aspect is ideas, even ideology about which people are sometimes ashamed to mention, but that's what becomes a decisive force at the particular stages of the historical development.

If we review all of these three aspects on the whole from the point of view of the future, I'd like to emphasize that the ideas in public consciousness, especially the new ones, are becoming more and more important. Recently we celebrated another anniversary of the victory in World War II. Probably you'll agree that at the time we were inferior in military and economic aspects to the united force that opposed the USSR. But I'm really sure that in the end the ideas won that inspired our soldiers, the whole nation to win. It's the ideological factors related to public consciousness that acquire a bigger and bigger role and not only pos-

itively but negatively as well. The basis of political events that are taking place or recently took place in a number of countries – for example, "color revolutions" – is the ideas which became dominant in the society, often as the result of their imposition, that reflects an enormous impact of such methods as manipulation of public, group and even individual consciousness. This factor – the role of ideas, ideology – acquires a very great importance not only in national but also in geopolitical terms, because for various reasons they find their implementation (often decisive) into economical, political and social practices.

In connection with that I'd like to say that personally I do not agree with the clause of our Constitution saying that we must not have state ideology. I think that each nation, each state has such an ideology, independent of its being proclaimed officially or not. And as a sociologist I can add that the results of research conducted by us and our colleagues show that such an intellectual – ideological notion as justice takes the first place in the society. That is, the society, state, organization, environment should be just, though in all those cases there are various meanings of justice. This idea doesn't come from the top, it is present in the society, in the public consciousness at the moment. Once again it demonstrates the steadily increasing role of this particular understanding of both the essence of life of our society and the private life of every Russian citizen, which must become an ideological approach or a national idea.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Our next guest to whom we give the floor now has come from Geneva – this is Mr. Guy Mettan. I'd like to call him a scientist, but Mr. Mettan calls himself a journalist, though his brilliant book translated into Russian, *La Russophobie* (Russophobia), is a real work of a scientist.

G. METTAN: – Dear rector, dear guests, it's a pleasure to be here for the second time and have the opportunity to speak with you.

Since roughly 25 years we have entered into an era of postmodernity, since a few years we are in era of post-truth and post democracy. On the international level we are supposed to live in an era of post-hegemony in order to enter into a multipolar world. Maybe that's possible that the scholars who are inventing words to describe our new reality are right. But for me these are only new words concealing all the realities behind a cloud of dust. In fact the sad reality of our times despite all we can say about IT revolution, about new industrial transformation, economy 4.0, digitalisation and robotizing. The only could reality is that we are entering in a new merciless competition for the world domination. The planet is limited, its resources are limited markets for international corporations are limited, climate is changing underdeveloped peoples as well as more powerful nations aspire to be ruled by themselves. The Western hegemony and the United States leadership are under high pressure. In that context the tensions and conflicts between people's religions, ethnic groups, social classes can only go on the long-term. Culture, science and information become more and more instruments of power, they are embedded in the global fight for world dominance. This trend exists in all countries. Culture, science and information are more and more weaponized, militarized. In my view we are indeed in the period of transi-

tion between what I call “Western imperial republic” and “the new American Empire”. The terms are important because the goals, ambitions and resources of an imperial republic are quite different than the goals of an Empire. The goals of an imperial republic are unlimited, unrestricted, and the imperial republic is aimed at a total hegemony over the world. After the self collapse of the Soviet Union the Western liberal republic as known a brief decay of complete hegemony under the United States rule. The neoconservatives and liberal Democrats in Washington have briefly thought that they had won the Cold War and had imposed a liberal democracy and free markets to the entire rest of the world. As Francis Fukuyama wrote in his book on the end of the history and the triumph of the liberal democracy values “President Bush the first and Bush the second, President Clinton the husband and would-be-President Clinton the wife as well as President Obama were the interpreters of this imperial hegemony will”. But the election of President Trump has broken this old imperial and well ordered narrative. Trump selection has announced a big shift in the American policy. This big shift is renunciation of the goals of the imperial republic [inaudible] total hegemony of the world for more pragmatic and convenient domination, unlimited portions of our world. Trump has recognized the rising of China and reemergence...

I will conclude. So now we are in a transition between the old order of democratic imperial order and the new imperial empire order. And it will be the pleasure to develop these ideas afterwards. Thank you very much

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, before presenting the speech concluding our Plenary Session, I’d like to say that I regret having no time to give the floor to many absolutely brilliant participants of this Likhachov Scientific Conference, even several academicians and corresponding members of the Russian Academy of Sciences as well as a number of our foreign guests who came from afar – the United Kingdom, Iceland, Slovenia, Bulgaria and other countries. Please, forgive me for that. I think that our guests, who were not given an opportunity to speak now, will have an advantage at panel discussions and meetings of the sections. Dear colleagues, in conclusion of the Plenary Session I give the floor to outstanding Russian lawyer, academician of the RAS Andrey Gennadyevich Lisitsyn-Svetlanov.

A. G. LISITSYN-SVETLANOV: – There are numerous research works on what the law is, how it functions, what the prospects of its development are. It is quite evident that the definitions and assessments of the law might have a culturological dimension as well. What is the law from this point of view? It is the reflection of all the ideas existing in the society – philosophical, social, moral and ethical – as well as, surely, cultural traditions.

We often make judgments on the level of the law system development in this or that state., say that there is high or low legal culture in this or that society, search for the solution of related issues. But the matter is that the law is the reflection of some life standards related to the particular state, particular society. All of us remember the saying: if an ugly image appears, you should not blame the mirror. The matter is that the law is national in essence. If some idea fairly quickly catches and rules the minds of masses of people, you may agree with it or not agree but it exists objectively. The law exists in certain forms and acts within the framework of a certain state. The law will be the same as social relations in a state, as its culture. It also exists objectively, no matter how strange it may sound. Recently we are speaking more and more about our national interests.

But the national character of the law should not be understood straightforwardly; states interact with each other and form the international law. And what is the international law? This is not only the right to wage war or make peace, sign and break international agreements, determine diplomatic protocol. The international law from the point of view of culture is an ability to hear each other. It will be formed at the level of ability to hear each other. Currently, we find ourselves in the environment when the international law is actually breaking down, the UN principles, international agreements, rules set by the international organizations are violated, armed conflicts are unleashed, however, members of the world community assess the same events differently and do that more and more often. Determining who is right is difficult: each state has a fairly enough number of professionals, the same lawyers, who substantiate this or that stand. Consequently, the main problem is in the sphere of culture: in reaching a common understanding. It is possible if we assess everything taking place objectively and hear each other.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, thank you for your interesting speeches!

Panel Discussion

THE FUTURE OF THE WORLD ORDER IN THE 21st CENTURY

May 17, 2018

Andrey Petrov Theatre and Concert Hall, SPbUHSS

SPEAKERS:

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY	<i>President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation (moderator)</i>
R. Zh. ALYAUDINOV	<i>Director of the Department for Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation</i>
Sh. AZIZ	<i>Prime minister of Pakistan (2004–2007)</i>
E. BAĞIŞ	<i>Minister of European Union Affairs of Turkey (2009–2013)</i>
P. BÜLBÜLOĞLU	<i>Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of Azerbaijan to the Russian Federation, Professor, Azerbaijan SSR National Artist</i>
Al. A. GROMYKO	<i>Director of the RAS Institute of Europe, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Political Studies), Professor</i>
G. W. KOLODKO	<i>Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of Poland (1994–1997, 2002–2003), Director of the Research Institute at the Kozminski University (Warsaw), foreign member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor</i>
M. A. MORATINOS CUYAUBE	<i>Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Spain (2004–2010), Dr., Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i>
A. MOUSSA	<i>Minister of Foreign Affairs of Egypt (1991–2001), Secretary General of the League of Arab States (2001–2011).</i>
V. V. NAUMKIN	<i>Research Advisor of the Institute of Oriental Studies at the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor, Chief Editor of the “Vostok-ORIENS” Journal</i>
M. SANAYEE	<i>Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the Russian Federation, Cand. Sc. (Political Studies)</i>

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear friends, I'd like to mention that each one of those who will now come up on this stage can grace any scientific conference at any university with his presence. There are many world-class stars here. I offer Vitaly Vyacheslavovich Naumkin to start the discussion. He is an expert in oriental studies, one of the leading Russian experts in the Arab world, who is at present in the thick of world events, where the East – “a delicate matter” as we remember – is closely contacting with the West. I'd like to ask Vitaly Vyacheslavovich two questions. What, in your opinion, is now taking place in the world? And what events are you forecasting in the near future?

V. V. NAUMKIN: – Currently, the notion of megatrends is in fashion with political scientists. What does it mean? I'll name just several phenomena that, in my opinion, play the determining role in the world politics and because of that can be considered megatrends. For example, they are erosion of collective institutions, particularism, national selfishness. It's enough to see big rifts formed in the Euro-Atlantic community, even in the European Union – they are Brexit and everything taking place

now on the Euro-Atlantic track. A lot of attention is still paid to culture, the role of culture – that was said by many of my colleagues, including in their speeches today. But at the same time it's impossible not to notice that a certain part of the modern community is at the stage of going wild culturally to a certain extent. The gap between generations is increasing no less evidently. There was nothing like that before. My colleague Mamontov spoke about that today – his grandchildren are living in the virtual space where there is no place for their grandfather. Surely, culture is a bridge, including between generations and nations. But it seems to me that today it is coming apart at the seams. It has no strength to unite nations that have entered the period of armed conflicts, coups and intensified rivalry for resources, power and all the rest.

These are the main political megatrends in my opinion. It's difficult to forecast what will follow. It's evident that national selfishness, disintegration of collectiveness, disintegration of the system of the international law and all the rest we are witnessing today, especially in the Middle East, are capable to plunge the world into even more dangerous conflicts.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – I ask prominent expert in the issues of Europe Alexey Anatolyevich Gromyko to continue.

Al. A. GROMYKO: – I'll speak shortly about the megatrends, elaborating what was said. First, I think that constructing international relations is fairly promising. The means at the disposal of those forming the public opinion today – diplomats, army men, those who shape the economic reality – give more than ever ample opportunities for such constructing. This may refer both to the strategy of fact and the strategy of virtual reality, about which it was said today and not once. The subjective factor comes to the foreground like never before. If you are guided by the strategy of virtual reality and think that there is no presumption of innocence in international relations in principle, then by throwing something into the public opinion, forming it as required, it's possible to take large-scale actions concerning not only the lives of individuals or groups but also countries and even regions, and we are witnessing that, for example, in the Middle East or on the territory of the United Kingdom.

Another megatrend is the ability for strategic thinking. The state of affairs here is ambiguous, and more and more subjects of international relations will be losing this ability in the course of time. The today's state of affairs in the European Union shows that attempts to acquire strategic thinking still have no clear prospects. The United States have this ability – to the extent they can have an impact on other regions on the globe. China, partly Russia, India have it. But the matter is that polycentrism has been formed not as a beneficial, well-ordered environment for cooperation between states, nations, their organizations. At the moment it's a kind of chaos in which there are no rules. All are saying unanimously that they are safeguarding rules, but really they are breaking them as the idea of national selfishness is more acceptable to everyone than compromise.

And the last in the list of the megatrends are archaization and modernization. In my opinion, archaization encompassed a considerable part of the contemporary world. At the same time, there is a lot said about modernization, innovative breakthroughs from the technological point of view. It seems to me that this is the feature of the 21st century exclusively, that was never manifested in history in the past. The clash of different ideas, one can say different realities may become the consequence. This state of affairs poses a lot of risks.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The floor is given to prominent Polish scholar and economist Grzegorz Kolodko.

G. W. KOLODKO: – The only sensible thing which remains is an escape forward. There is no room to move backwards and there's nothing we have to miss from the past. The most important challenge is that many things happen at the same time and there is not much good news now. Aside of technological progress which most of the time is the good news and catching up of some developing countries with a richer part of the world, most of the time there are negative tendencies. We have entered already the second Cold War, the first was over generation ago with a great contribution of my small country Poland. We have entered

already very nasty trade war, which started from the White House, very many things have started from the White House under the wrong... the most ill-advised presidency in the United States during my lifetime. There is the crisis of immigration, there is the crisis of demographic process in some places of the world, too many people especially South Asia and Africa, in some of them including Russia or European Union are not enough of us, an aging society and then warming the climate, and then inequality, and then disintegration of the Western, which may be to some extent welcome, be welcome in Beijing or in Moscow, but I don't think it is a good recipe for the future. Now, for very many Western European countries, also to some extent Japan, South Korea, American policy against the rules, trade war, sanctions, militarism and so on is like an enemy. So I think that we have the new enemy which is the new nationalism, which is a negative answer for the compromise of some negative process which we did have before, that was neoliberalism. Enemy of my enemy doesn't make my friend, so now I have two enemies, this is neoliberalism which works on the enriching the few at the cost of many and that was made in America. And now we have the new nationalism which has different faces and this is somehow different when they are screaming "viva la France" or "alternative fuer Deutschland" or "Poland for poles" or "America first" and so on, but it is not going to be a recipe for the future, only an escape for world. And I think theoretical ground for that supposed to be what I call in my theory new pragmatism, triple, not only economic, but social and ecological long-term balance, which calls for, yes, a new institutionalization of globalization. Because last sentence is – that despite all this new nationalism, this new second Cold War, trade war globalization is irreversible and the question is how to take it to one's advantage, it can be Russia or China, Germany or US, Poland or Ukraine, together with a positive synergy, with the others not against the others as it is being dictated by this stupid short-living and ill advised new nationalism.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – I ask Mr. Mehdi Sanayee, a very well-known scholar and humanitarian from Iran, to speak.

M. SANAYEE: – We all know that the state of affairs in the world politics is not simple now. In my opinion, its characteristics are as follows. First, there were just a few populists among politicians in the past. Unfortunately the proportion changed in recent years – as it was already said earlier, the elites' influence weakened, the populists' influence became stronger. Second, there are still many "phobias" in international politics, though their contents change: at the moment Islamophobia, Iranophobia, Russophobia are "trendy". Diplomatic achievements of recent years are still insufficient for dialogue. Economic sanctions reached unprecedented scales. The capital's interests replace any other values to a bigger and bigger extent – moral, cultural, environmental, etc. The international law was discredited as a result of the West's actions, and its positions are considerably weaker. The UN influence became weaker. Unilateral use of force by the West, especially the United States, is becoming tougher every year. On the whole, the world situation is more like the one after World War II than the one in the beginning of the 20th century. A lot is said now as it was said then about the necessity of culture's, philosophy's

impact on the processes taking place – as contemporary political culture is at a very low level.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The floor is given to our big friend from Azerbaijan, famous in Russia figure in the field of arts and outstanding intellectual Polad Bülbüloğlu.

P. BÜLBÜLOĞLU: – As a man from the field of culture, I often think about the place of culture in development of the society, technical progress, international relations, about its correlation with changes taking place in the world, the contemporary trends in transformation of the very notion of culture, its today's tools and its role in the modern society.

The most important issue is if culture can play the decisive role in harmonization of relations in the global community, in preventing world wars, in reaching mutual understanding. Joseph Brodsky said in his famous Noble Lecture when he was awarded the Noble Prize, "I believe... that for someone who has read a lot of Dickens to shoot his like in the name of some idea is more problematic than for someone who has read no Dickens". To put it differently, an individual choosing values of culture is more elevated as a person than the one to whom culture is unavailable or incomprehensible. It's more difficult to deceive this individual, it's more difficult to manipulate with him and it's not so easy to engage him in mass psychosis. And it's exactly mass psychosis that we are witnessing today in the society, which is thrilled with self-destruction. Brodsky's words are often attacked by opponents, but surely I am on Brodsky's side in this discussion.

I presented my vision of multiculturalism, globalization and the role of state in establishment and realization of cultural policy in more detail in my report posted on the website of this Conference. As Karl Marx, whose 200th anniversary is celebrated as a part of our meeting today, said, if culture develops spontaneously and not directed deliberately, it leaves a desert after itself. As the Minister of Culture with 18-year experience in the most difficult transition period, I fully agree with this thesis by Marx. Academician Sergey Kapitsa also agrees with us, he said that "Culture should be spread even by force, otherwise we can expect a collapse".

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Rinat Zhafyarovich Alyautdinov, a representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia, will continue our discussion.

R. Zh. ALYAUTDINOV: – I can say that we also analyze contemporary political trends, megatrends. We think that one of the key megatrends of the modern times is the change of the global balance of powers. Everybody knows that globalization brought about the upsurge of many emerging states, China and India noticeably moved to the forefront. As the Director of the Institute for African Studies said today, African states can be soon added to them. Entering the global foreground, new leader states are surely for strengthening their role in the global governance institutions. And this brings about very strong resistance of the West, first of all the United States. The West understands that it is very seriously challenged, and it feels that it is losing. Surely it takes steps to answer. Some of them are adequate to the situation, some look, at least at first

sight, senseless. In many cases the West is trying to change the trends that are already irreversible.

Our opponents are saying that if we refuse the mechanisms of the global political system in the forms they exist now, this will lead to chaos. In particular, they are saying that the principle of multilaterality, multipolarity is already present in the activities of international organizations, including the United Nations. But the matter is that it operates only according to the rules set forth by the West. I can mention here another political "megatrend", evident for all – double standards. And it should be said in conclusion that the contemporary world order's restructuring is a very long and painful process. No one can forecast how long it will take. But, as the phrase goes, "the process is under way".

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The floor is given to our colleague from Spain, world famous diplomat Miguel Angel Moratinos Cuyaube.

M. A. MORATINOS CUYAUBE: – Well, it is my turn to comment, one about global governance, the second about the future of Europe. Global governance. Everybody's at war, all leaders are at war, that the world has changed, that we have to adapt the former institutions of 1945, institutions that were established after the second world war. Everybody's aware that we have come a long way to abandon the traditional way to guide the world, that was mentioned this morning, the balance of power, 3–4–5 countries deciding for the rest of the world, it's over. And after World War I President Woodrow Wilson said, now let's go for the collective security system, let's go to have a collective responsibility to really make peace and have a better life for all humankind. Well, my dear friends, we are now confronting these two approaches, either we want to be unilateral like President Trump, bilateral like also President Trump, we can make even a deal with Korea, we can make another deal with Russia, we can add other one with Mexico or we go and we continue to reinforce multilateralism. Our friend from the Russian Federation has made this reference. Multilateralism is the key answer to the key global challenges. The point is that we have to make multilateralism to be efficient, to be respected, to be credible and that is the main concern. The problem, my dear friends, is that everybody knows that, the all leaders know that. But instead of saying, "let's sit down", "let's organize ourselves", "let's discuss how we organize and how we respect each other" and "let's make the new multilateralism to work", they are not doing anything, they are not doing so. So we hope that at G20 or another setting once we will say – stop and think about the future!

Second comment about Europe. Well, the general trend about the future of European Union is that we are in decline – Brexit, attitudes of Eastern European members, migration, etc. All that could give a gloomy look to Europe. There are some Polish friends here with us, and I'm telling you: you cannot be a member of the European Union and reject refugees, you cannot be at European Union having, you know, your concern about the money in Brussels, but the strategy in Washington. No, you have to be a really full European. And this full Europeans are going to rebound, they're going to resist, the old Europe is going to become the new Europe, and the new Europe is going to be extremely important actor in the new future. But the one who

wants to share with us this integrated world will be much welcomed. But the hour of truth for Europe is coming and we will have to decide if we want that a supranational European Union or we want to have a kind of inefficient, an old museum, a fortress that the rich people come to see, museum and beauty of the “Riviera”, or the “Spanish coast”. No, Europe must be a strong actor in the new world, but for that we need to be integrated and to have all the same principles and values.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The topic will be continued by our guest, famous politician from Egypt Mr. Amr Moussa.

A. MOUSSA¹: – Well, thank you very much. I believe that is a consensus around the world now, that we are moving from a system to another. I just would like to warn that what was said today, that now we are moving and a new superpower is emerging and another one is departing, that this is not the issue of today and tomorrow. It will take decades, it will happen gradually and in saying that we have to realize that certain things, that the matters, problems, progresses of the current system will continue in the next system. Also the many of the problems that we are facing, like poverty in particular or racial discrimination, or religious intolerance, will continue. Therefore we have to get ready and we have the time to prepare ourselves for the next phase of international relations while trying, and I believe some of the speakers said that in the morning, to be very vigilant that certain problems should not continue with this world. Poverty is one, climate change it is another and also certain regional problems, like the Palestinian question, the Israeli occupation etc., this has to come to an end and many other problems in the Middle East or elsewhere.

Now, the point of unilateralism. Of course we see policies that call for isolationism, unilateralism or bilateral arrangements. In the age of artificial intelligence, in the age of the future, the economics, the intelligence, the advances in science we should not leave that or let it coexist with isolationism and the nationalism and populism. This has to be a matter for global cooperation and global benefits for all. So it is either multilateralism, globalization and science for all, chances, opportunities for all or – the other side – the isolationism, unilateral approach and science for the few. This is the challenge before us, in particular before the next generation. And one observation I heard this morning from the distinguished colleague from Sweden when he described the currency situation as the contradiction between rich and poor etc. and Christianity and Islam. In fact there is no contradiction, no conflict between Islam and Christianity. It is between the radicals in both societies, and the moderates and the correct people. Because this discrimination, this kind of conflict between ideas is not only in the Christian society, or Muslim society or Hindu society. It is across the board in the world. So don't believe that there is an animosity between religions, but it is between those radicals and those who want to use force and those who want to live in peace and prosperity.

¹ Minister of Foreign Affairs of Egypt (1991–2001), General Secretary of the League of Arab States (2001–2011), presidential candidate of Egypt (2012). He was the Chair of the Committee of Fifty which drafted the current constitution of Egypt. Awarded with several high orders of Merits from Egypt, Germany, Brazil, Jordan, Sudan, Qatar, Argentina, Venezuela and Ecuador.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The floor is given to outstanding representative of Pakistan Mr. Shaukat Aziz.

Sh. AZIZ: – Thank you very much, sir, ladies and gentlemen. It's a real privilege to be here, we are short of time so I will go straight to the point. We live, ladies and gentlemen, first of all, in a globalized world and in a globalized world everything is interconnected and you cannot hide behind your borders because there are too many other channels working now which link to the whole world. In order to really emerge as a global part or a strong part you cannot be isolated and you cannot just have aspirations, you must have the ability to compete and get the best for your people in today's environment and tomorrow's environment. You need economic strength. Economic strength comes with a clear policy of how the economy of the country will grow but most importantly through structural reforms. Structural reforms modernize your economy, they can also be painful. People can sometimes pay a price in the short term to get a bigger, longer-term result. That can happen only with strong leadership. If you don't have strong leadership economic reforms become a nightmare and you cannot reach your true potential. So the first point, summarizing what I just said, is: economic strength is key to your success and if you have a strong economy you can build defense, if you have a strong economy you can build social programs, but if you don't have that and the kitty is empty, then you are in trouble. So you need to focus on that and put your best people in a team to look after the economic side.

Now the other thing is that you also need military clout. Your security, internal and external, has to be at a level, so people don't bully you, people don't push you around, people don't take you for granted. That itself requires the serious effort on the country's part which can be done and is being done by many countries, many other countries haven't done it. However you must recognize that the world is moving from a unipolar world to a multipolar world. A multipolar world for all of us is a better disposition than a unipolar world. So we must be multipolar, you must have strength with many countries, that's why you see today new countries emerging, take the example of China. But some countries are not happy with that, as a result it gives rise to tensions and Thucydides trap, which you've read about; if not, please read it. That creates conflicts because new emerging parts coming and they take the space of other parts.

The other factor to keep in mind, ladies and gentlemen, is the excess or the advent of technology. This is changing clearly the life ahead of us and we haven't seen everything. I know a little bit about banking, having done that for 30 years, the banking system is going to change drastically. Branches would be a thing of the past, it'll all be through your phone and electronically and you will have to be as equipped to handle that or you will just fall behind.

So, in conclusion let me say that there is no reason to get alarmed or be nervous about what's happening in the world, but staying still is not the answer. Every country must have the clear strategy, economic, geopolitical, defense and take that forward and take the people along, your lives will be better, different, if you go along with the well-crafted well-designed reform agenda for any country. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Now, if you allow me, I'll also present my concept. Only two types of civilizations existed in the world till now: traditional and technology-related. At the moment, 90 percent of India, half of China live in the traditional civilization. After the disintegration of the Soviet Union, we also partly live in the traditional civilization but already more in the technology-related one. The West was the first to enter the technology-related civilization that gave it enormous advantages. And now this kind of civilization, which developed for a very long time and successfully, has exhausted itself.

If we look attentively at everything taking place in the world, we'll see that chaos has been incessantly growing over several recent years. The state of affairs is only getting worse. Residents of Western countries are becoming more and more convinced over the recent 20 years that they are living worse and worse. Most Germans, if we exclude representatives of elites, think that they live much worse than 20 years ago. The similar state of affairs is in all industrial developed countries of the West. I think that socialism was not defeated, it just outran its time by several decades – in the Soviet Union and a number of other countries. And capitalism in the form it is possible at all has now come to the final stage of its development. Currently, it is a completely different capitalism from the one in the time of Karl Marx.

First, free market as the game of productive forces, as competition disappeared. Development of all Western countries slowed down because of that. Production moved from factories into the heads of people with the help of mass communication means. There is already no free competition in the traditional form now, there is enormous influence of big corporations that are doing what they think is required. Second, Western democracy stopped being real democracy, it is for sale and can be bought as Mr. Dutkiewicz very well worded in his report at one of the Conferences – the leadership institutions in the West fully degenerated, manipulative management is widely introduced. Practically all values promoted by classical capitalism are lost. The development type that was characteristic of the West, stopped being efficient. Because of that China easily overtakes the West, and soon it will be overtaken by many others as well, those who will be able to rightfully choose advantages of both socialism and capitalism for themselves. Who will they be? The ones who will best adjust the elements of these two types of development, two economy regulation systems to special features of their countries, nations, cultures.

Unfortunately, destructive phenomena in the West will only grow, and the West will quickly lose its leading positions. New power centers will originate. This is inevitable. The matter is not only in multipolarity but also in the fact that capitalism in its present form has reached the final stage of its development.

Now, I'd like to offer all the participants to add something to their previous speeches if they wish to do it, and our audience to ask them questions. Academician Naumkin, you are welcome.

V. V. NAUMKIN: – I'll present two theses in short. The first thesis is: a lot is being said about hyperglobalization now. But it seems to me that globalization is in crisis as three main global flows – capitals, people, ideas – run

across big difficulties. Capitals are protectionism and sanctions. As for people, currently, we, for example, have to wait for visas, even interviews in the American Embassy with Russian residents for 300 days. Refugees are a separate problem. And there are also limitation mechanisms in all countries for spreading ideas. That is, all kinds of limitations are only expanding.

The second thesis I want to present is: currently, we are living in the world of total hypocrisy and blunt lies. We have to study this world, study real events. A small example. The most important thing happening now to the United States is their turning into the main power producing energy resources. They have already outrun everyone in gas, soon they will start outrunning in oil. It's important to understand what the consequences of that will be for us. The news which is both good and bad is that both we and the Americans are similarly interested in the growth of prices. Probably, this is one of positive consequences.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – I'll add that the United States are the world leader in garbage production, they are producing more than one third of the total garbage in the world. Mr. Sanayee, you are welcome.

M. SANAYEE: – I'll speak about two aspects in addition to my main report. First – new ideas are required, new theories to restore the balance of international relations as well as development of political culture. Second – the role of regionalism is increasing in the context of the multipolar world. Respectively, it's required to apply more efforts for development of cooperation exactly on regional scales. It's possible to give the Iranian and Russian cooperation in the issues of Syria as an example. There are problems in Syria now, but imagine what could have happened without joint struggle against terrorism. We're seeing in two recent years that notwithstanding the differences in the stands of Russia, Iran and Turkey, these regional leaders can cooperate and achieve successful results. Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Mr. Aziz, you are welcome.

Sh. AZIZ: – All I would like to say is about globalization, since that was mentioned by more than one speaker. In my humble view globalization is about striving for excellence, globalization means you do whatever you do with the highest standard possible, globalization means – don't be stuck in mediocrity, do what the world does and do it well. That is what globalization really is. So it is not a threat, globalization creates optimum performance in whatever you do and if you have that mindset, especially with digitalization coming now, you frankly if you're not global the gap between the best and the worst will be even bigger, because the world is getting very connected. So don't be afraid of globalization, use this as an opportunity, as a target to get excellence in what you do. Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Mr. Aziz, allow me to mention that globalizations differ. For a long time, the West understood globalization as the system in which it lives wonderfully at the expense of all the others. And it turns out that "the golden billion" has not managed to keep monopoly on world resources. Currently, China is already approaching it in consumption standards, India will be the next. And

when 7 billions start consuming at the United States' level per person, it will turn out that there are no resources at all. Because of that the most serious issue is not globalization as itself, but in what exactly it is manifested, because if it develops further as now, the mankind will eat itself up, and the new generations will have neither clean water, nor oil, nor wood, nor energy left – nothing at all. Today, looking at the United States and Western Europe with their high consumption standards, no one wants to stay at the level of Africa. Everyone wants to live as the Western world.

Sh. AZIZ: – I totally agree. I'd say again globalization is not a threat, it's an opportunity. If you can get to the best level in what you do, that's what will give you the ability to compete and ability to take on anybody who threatens you. Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – You are welcome, Mr. Moussa.

A. MOUSSA: – Thank you. I'm addressing the students here. On the question of globalization and the new world. It is not necessary that the new world would be the same as the old one, meaning that there is one superpower succeeding another superpower. It could be, and I believe it will be, several centers of power rather than one power just following the other. That is first one.

The second one is about Syria. I believe that the destruction of Syria and the casualties, and the people that have been scattered around the world, will not go unanswered. Regional or none regional, Syria is a situation that has to be reconsidered totally.

The third point is about Jerusalem and what happened in Jerusalem three days ago. I would tell then, that this is not the end of the story, this is not the end of history, history will continue and Jerusalem and the Palestinian question will continue to haunt the region and the world.

The last one is about the intervention of our colleague, distinguished colleague from Turkey. When he referred to the migration and affects, the cultural effects of migration, that it is now because of the prevalence of Syrian, millions of Syrian refugees, Arabic language has become the second language in Turkey, Arab songs, Arab literature. Therefore I believe if this continues, we shall welcome Turkey to the Arab League. Thank you very much.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Mr. Moratinos, please.

M. A. MORATINOS CUYAUBE: – Yes, we were talking about global governance. Unfortunately, it's not coming. So what to do in the meantime? Somebody has to take the lead and I will propose that finally Russian Federation and European Union could be the two main actors to address the main issue and to take the Middle East as an area where we can make success. Instead of making war and expanding instability, let's work together. China has its global interest, while other countries, like Iran, the gulf countries, and Turkey, can be addressed by Russia and Europeans in order to solve the problems. If we get this strategic dialogue between Russia and Europe I think we can succeed. Making that possible, like Amr Moussa was saying, it's unacceptable what is going on with the Palestinian people, it's unacceptable what is going on about Jerusalem, it's unacceptable

that international community remained shy, silent, it's unacceptable that four members of the European Union went with the American administration to the USA Embassy in Jerusalem, that is unacceptable. So we have to work together between Russia and European Union. It can be done, we have to re-engage again, we cannot continue with this break between Russia and European Union, the historical rendez-vous is between Russia and Europe.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Mr. Kolodko, you are welcome.

G. W. KOLODKO: – One answer and one argument. The answer is, there are many definitions of globalization but from an economic viewpoint globalization is liberalization and integration of thus far to the extent separately performing national economies into one interconnected market, economy. And this is based on market mechanism and this is irreversible despite all nationalism, xenophobia, perfectionism and ill-advised policies here and there.

And argument is with other chairmen. Of course, if you declare the death of capitalism, you do it a little bit too early and if you're talking about resurgence of socialism you must be damn wrong! I think that both, capitalism and socialism, they are spent force. You cannot analyze, describe and theorize on the contemporary world in the future using the older notions of capitalism and socialism, because it is neither capitalism, nor socialism. We have non-liberal democracy, but manipulated democracy, we don't have a free market capitalism, but we have protected capitalism, we don't have socialism, but have state capitalism, even in China it looks more like state capitalism, than socialism.

In my newest book, which is called 'Will China save the world?' I'm introducing the new term for China reality, which I call 'chinism'. So one more time, there's only escape forward war and I don't agree that the global governance is not coming. G20 is a proposition for multipolar world, so the question is what role will be played by Russia, which is too much inward oriented in the global economy questions. I think that if there is the alliance between China and Russia, the next stage of redesigning of global economic and political order may be very big step forward. This is the end not of capitalism, but this is the end of the supremacy, supremacy of so-called West. And you don't know what is West, what is East, because in Poland we believe that we are West, but somebody else says, that we are East. This division for East and West also doesn't hold the test of the time.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Mr. Gromyko, please.

Al. A. GROMYKO: – A lot was said about globalization, and I think that no one doubts that globalization as increase of the world's inter-dependence is an objective phenomenon. Globalization entered its ultra-stage (it is now usual to call it the global world) in recent 20–30 years. It seems to me that it is useless to argue about that, but there is a point in discussing globalization models. The neoliberal globalization model, its principles, its methods first appeared in the 1980s only. And the global economic crisis of 2008 demonstrated that this model was beneficial for the countries that had chosen it. But it exhausted itself in

the beginning of the 21st century, and now it's necessary to look for something new.

Here we have two very important factors. First, this is stress resistance. Any society in this world, which will be no less tough and competitive than the world of the 20th century, should be very stress resistant in the economic sense as well as socially, politically, ideologically. And second, this is political leadership. This does not mean that some persons, taking masses after them should be necessarily formed. I am speaking about political leadership as a project. The party and political system, other political superstructures of any state should be strong and stress resistant. The way to do it is the issue for future discussions.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, now we'll answer questions. Your question, Mr. Bağış.

E. BAĞIŞ: – Minister Moratinos, when you were serving as Foreign Minister, you were pioneer in establishing the Alliance of Civilizations as a UN organization and I know that your personal involvement with that organization still continues and you are pressuring the United Nations secretary-general to prioritize that project. Can you tell us if that organization, where your country and my country were pioneers in establishing, can help solve some of the problems raised by the panel?

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Unfortunately, speaking in detail is too long for this meeting. If you can answer in short, you are welcome.

M. A. MORATINOS CUYAUBE: – Thank you, my dear friend Egemen. Alliance of civilizations, that the Russian Federation supported from the first day is the answer, it's the appropriate answer to this concept of clash of civilizations. We were discussing this morning cultural aspect, that culture is an instrument for diplomacy, if we don't recognize each other and we express mutual respect and if we don't have this kind of attitude to tolerance in the new global government we will have serious crisis. We should start to change our minds how we should work. It's not the question for the West, it's not for the East, it's not for the North, it's not for the South, it's a question for all of us. We cannot have left anybody behind us, we have to respect everybody and to create, yes, not a dialogue, because a dialogue is okay, you have an exchange of views, and then you go back to your place and you continue to do the same thing. No, Alliance of civilizations is to change the mindset in order that everybody worked for a "living together".

There is a magic word in the Spanish language that is 'convivencia', it has no translation into English, I don't know if it has translation in Russian. Convivencia means leaving together and convivencia...

– Coexistence!

– No, coexistence, you are obliged to coexist. It's not the same, you coexist because you have a neighbor and you have to coexist. Convivencia is that you want to leave together and that's a difference and that is what means the Alliance of civilizations.

Question from the audience: – The question is first of all to Alexey Anatolyevich but actually to anyone ready to answer. What is the today's status of the international law, its role? If I understand it correctly, the flourishing of the international law in the 20th century was related to the balance of powers. If we have misbalance now, if the practice of political fake's constructing is expanding, is existence of authoritative international law as a universal mechanism possible in principle? To what extent is it well-grounded?

AI. A. GROMYKO: – This is a giant stratum for research, it's very urgent, it should be obligatory studied and realized. We often hear the thesis, which is usual to consider nearly commonplace, not requiring proof, that the Yalta-Potsdam system of international relations, which we inherited as a result of 1945, is nonexistent any more. I think that this is absolutely wrong as the foundation of all organizations helping us to manage with the today's chaos was laid in that period of time: the United Nations, the Security Council with the veto power as the tool to force a compromise and making peace, BRICS states, G20. In my opinion, it's possible to try to form a new balance of powers of the 21st century with the help of these global regulation tools, a new mechanism of the "Concert of Powers" but not local as in Europe in the 19th century but on a global scale.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Do you think that this is real?

AI. A. GROMYKO: – I think that if we work on it, it's fairly real.

A. P. SADOKHIN, *Professor at the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration (Moscow), Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Honoured Worker of Higher Professional Education of the Russian Federation:* – Alexander Sergeyevich, I have a question to you. Do you really think that contemporary capitalism is incapable of vital innovations, of any rehabilitation variants? But during the after-war period capitalism managed to work out the system for resisting crisis phenomena. There were no deep capitalist crises in the second half of the 20th century. Currently, this potential is reaching its limit according to your statement. Or did I understand you wrong?

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – You understood me absolutely right. I think that capitalism can exist further but in a completely different form, at another level, synthesized with socialism. The today's contradictions have been accumulated for a fairly long time. I've just finished a big article on the civil unrest in France in May, 1968 – the 50th anniversary of the events was celebrated recently. Capitalism was at the crossroads then: it could take the way of humanization of relations, let's say appeal to the human spirit, and it could take the way to the consumer society. It chose the second, and a number of crises became the result of this choice: the crisis in human genetics, the environmental crisis, the crisis of insufficient resources, etc. Now, the capitalist world is at a deep dead end. Surely, it will get out of this dead end in this or that way: America will not die, Western Europe may disintegrate but it won't die

either. However, all the resources of capitalism in its present form have been exhausted, it regenerated from the inside so much that there are no powerful movers in it left, no “drive”. I repeat: exactly because of that China is overtaking the West, and later it will be overtaken by many other countries that will rightly combine elements of capitalism and socialism. But China is already doing that better today than Sweden, Germany, where the social security system is degrading. Other questions. Yes, Henry Markovich, please.

H. M. REZNIK, *Vice-President of the Federal Chamber of Lawyers, Cand. Sc. (Law), Honoured Lawyer of Russia, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS*: – How can you explain the following contradiction – the whole world is cursing America, but for some reason more and more people from various countries are striving to emigrate there?

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Yes, Henry Markovich, this is absolutely true. Economic migrants are running away from countries that are poorer developed. People are naïve. America is a bloodsucker that draws the last strength even from Western Europe. People run there not understanding what will happen to them later. And unfortunately, there

will be nothing good later. And you and I are not running there. And that is not accidental.

A. N. CHUMAKOV, *leading researcher at the Institute of Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor at the Lomonosov Moscow State University*: – I’d like to address my question to Dr. Sanayee. The Huntington’s idea about the clash of civilizations has been popular for nearly two decades already. How do you look at this idea today and what the Islamic world represented by you can offer instead of it?

M. SANAYEE: – Unfortunately, politics helped the clash of civilizations more than organization of dialogue between them. Exactly in the year that was announced the Year of Dialogue among Civilizations – 2001 – infamous events took place, followed by civilization rift. First of all politicians and not common people from various nations and confessions contributed to it. The following events demonstrated that the world is not ready for dialogue yet. But that does not mean that we should not strive for it. There is no other way in any case.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Thank you, participants of the discussion.

Panel Discussion

RUSSIA IN THE GLOBAL WORLD: CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS

May 17, 2018

Andrey Petrov Theatre and Concert Hall, SPbUHSS

SPEAKERS:

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY	<i>President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation (moderator)</i>
A. A. AKAYEV	<i>President of the Kyrgyz Republic (1990–2005), foreign member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Engineering), Professor</i>
A. A. GUSEYNOV	<i>Principal Adviser for Academic Affairs of the Institute of Philosophy of the RAS, full member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i>
A. M. KRAMARENKO	<i>Director of Development of Russian International Affairs Council (RIAC), Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Russian Federation</i>
A. D. NEKIPELOV	<i>Director of the Moscow School of Economics at the Lomonosov Moscow State University, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i>
R. I. NIGMATULIN	<i>Research Advisor of P. P. Shirshov Institute of Oceanology RAS, Member of Presidium of the RAS, Academician of the RAS</i>
H. M. REZNIK	<i>Vice-President of the Federal Chamber of Lawyers, Cand. Sc. (Law), Honoured Lawyer of Russia, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i>
V. T. TRETYAKOV	<i>Dean of the Higher School (Department) of Television of Lomonosov Moscow State University</i>
M. V. SHMAKOV	<i>Chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia, President of the Universal Confederation of Trade Unions, Chairman of the Trustee Council of SPbUHSS, Honorary Professor of SPbUHSS</i>

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, please, focus your attention on the topic offered for discussion: “Russia in the Global World: Challenges and Prospects”. I think that the reason of all Russian troubles is our copying Western patterns, and there is nothing left there already that should be borrowed. Henry Markovich, what can you say about that?

H. M. REZNIK: – Actually no country is recommended to copy the experience of others thoughtlessly. Alexander Sergeyevich, the Russian Constitution adopted in 1993, gives the answer to your question. This Constitution is the greatest achievement of our country. In that period, we still had not gotten out of the turbulent state (the well-known events that ended in bombardment of the Parliament House took place in 1993). But as a result, the document was born that is fully in accordance with international acts adopted before it: international pacts on civil and political rights, the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms and others.

For some reasons, our reactionaries and political intriguers are against the norm, according to which the generally accepted principles of the international law are a component part of the Russian legal system. They think that

it should be eliminated from the Constitution. If there is a contradiction between an international agreement and home legislation, the rule from an international agreement is applied. These people are not accepting freedom, law and they want to plunge the country in chaos, which we already had. Many people did not even comprehend it then as propaganda worked excellently in the totalitarian country, where there was no choice and people did not imagine that it was possible to live differently.

For that reason, Alexander Sergeyevich, it's possible to blame our Constitution for copying and noncritical borrowing of the legal norms achieved through suffering by the mankind. All these norms are the reaction of the countries that won over the Hitler coalition, to the horror, the state of affairs that showed how effective such management methods as violence and lies can be in totalitarian states.

I am happy that human rights and freedom, division of authorities are the development trends in our country, and they can't be doubted. And revealing various interests and several countries, including the United States, behaving unceremoniously on the international scene, is another matter. Let's not confuse disagreements that are temporary, and value norms and assessments. Here I am fully on the side of the Constitution of the Russian Federation.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – As for the Constitution – I agree, Henry Markovich. But why does blind copying of Western traditions and phenomena, for example, introduction of the Bologna system, Skolkovo, regulation of the Internet according to the Western pattern (this list can be continued) lead to troubles? Askar Akayevich, speak your mind, please.

A. A. AKAYEV: – Russia has always (at least in recent centuries) played the leading role in the world order's formation. The Yalta Peace, the destruction of which we are witnessing today, was initiated by the Soviet Union. Then the USSR played the key role. Today, we can state that the Yalta Peace is destroyed.

Alexander Sergeyevich characterized the state of affairs in the world precisely: chaos and turbulence. A new world order is required, which is possible thanks to establishment of the humanistic, noospheric and integral civilization, the basis of which was worded by three great Russian scholars of the 20th century: Vernadsky, Sorokin and Moiseyev. But exactly Russia can give the best answer to this challenge.

The 75th anniversary of the Yalta Conference will be celebrated in 2020. Russia could initiate the convening of a new conference. A. Gromyko reminded about the “concert of the great powers”, nations, but in my opinion that is left in the past, in the 19th–20th centuries. Currently, new powers are appearing in the foreground – the emerging civilizations: Chinese, Indian, Iranian and Persian, Eurasian, etc. Russia could convene a civilization summit, with 22–24 countries making 12 local civilizations, and thus launch the process of a new world order's formation, the world order capable to provide human civilization's flourishing in the 21st century and the following centuries. This is a serious challenge for Russia, to which it can give a worthy answer.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Vitaly Tovievich, what do you think about it?

V. T. TRETYAKOV: – I would divide everyone who spoke today into optimists and pessimists. It's easy to see that there are many more pessimists among those who spoke from this stage. I myself belong to pessimists, that is realists, and I'll present several theses from this stand (you can familiarize yourselves with the ten theses in more detail in my report). First: *Si vis pacem, para bellum*, i. e. if you want peace, prepare for war, or accept a compromise. My answer is: it's better to prepare for war because no one will compromise. That is the real practice of recent millennia.

Second: fear and suspicion determine a lot in contemporary politics. How and why it happens is another matter. Last year Piotr Dutkiewicz presented the report on the topic.

Third: many outstanding scholars thinking about the world and common benefit spoke here. I have a question: why prosperity has not set in the world yet? It means that in some other place no less intelligent but evil scholars are advising those who rule the world. Maybe, it's required to speak to them face to face and not tell each other that we are doing everything well but they are making decisions.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Vitaly Tovievich, so, the challenge is scholars and prospects are gloomy, isn't it?

V. T. TRETYAKOV: – No, evil scholars give wise yet ill advice but it is politicians who make the decisions. And it seems that they do not listen to our advice very much.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The floor is given to Mikhail Victorovich Shmakov.

M. V. SHMAKOV: – Russia in the global world is an interesting topic, but it's necessary to understand first what the global world is today. Currently, the global world has transferred to managed chaos.

Russia strived for entering the global world for a long time, for example, our country had been trying to join the World Trade Organization for 17 years, and when that happened, the WTO broke up. We should realize that this is the consequence of processes taking place in the world where we live today. The matter is if it is possible to manage chaos or not. In my opinion, it's necessary to try to do it. This can be done by the most technologically developed countries that have respective supercomputers for simulating nuclear processes (without actual tests). This is fairly complex. It is also possible to enter the chaotic world parameters into this pattern, and that will allow to manage it. The one who will be able to do it will become the leader in digital capitalism.

Digital capitalism is a new term. Capitalism will really develop digitally. Thus, the respective decision on digitalization of economy and our life was taken in Russia. But it's necessary to take into account that digital capitalism on the one hand and digital economy on the other hand, help to increase digital slavery. Ethical and legal problems, about which Henry Markovich said, originate in this case: it's required to bring the law on human rights, including our Constitution, in accordance with practice now existing in the digital world (we can mention difficulties in providing rights in this field).

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Alexander Dmitrievich, the floor is yours.

A. D. NEKIPELOV: – There is an unusually complex, unsolved problem of social choice, reviewed in economics and political science. How are we to understand the way people making a group (including state and suprastate groups) are taking decisions? Everything depends on basic institutions. Institutions are rules, some limitations within the framework of which group members solve issues, co-ordinate their interests. A closed circle originates because in order to take decisions, it's necessary to take decisions about how to do it. But this closed circle does not contradict the theory, it's a real situation. It has serious consequences meaning that the acting institutions satisfy everyone and are functioning in a certain period of time. A moment comes when the configuration of interests changes, and it turns out that the institutions no longer satisfy the players. There comes a difficult moment related to restructuring of institutions. In such periods states either disintegrate or unite. Problems like we are dealing with now originate.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The floor is given to Alexander Mikhaylovich Kramarenko.

A. M. KRAMARENKO: – I agree with the thesis that Russia can't have a permanent place in the unstable global world, because everything in the world is in the state of transition to something new. This problem has a global nature. That's why culture should be taken as a guiding principle, it is the basis of everything happening to certain countries and human civilization as a whole. For that reason I see deep sense in holding the Likhachov Scientific Conference where culture is in the center of attention.

One can agree with Leo Tolstoy, who said that all greatest truths are simple. Perhaps there are two truths, in which the main challenges to social sciences are worded. The first is Biblical: "They don't know what they are doing". The second is the words by La Rochefoucauld and they indicate that there is always a gap between how an individual assesses his condition and the real situation – it's either worse or better than it appears to him.

Discussion about globalization is indispensable. It seems that stabilization is required for globalization that was exclusively market globalization, i.e. unmanageable. As a result, first of all, the Western society suffered. Vitaly Tovievich is right that in Russia we should proceed from the fact that transition to manageable globalization is inevitable.

Culture also determines how political elites and population as a whole react to the lack of order, the atmosphere of uncertainty and unpredictability. Some are more tolerant towards disorder and confusions, the others are less tolerant, i.e. control comes in the first place there. It seems that compliance with order requires humility which has different presence in different countries. This truth also preserves its urgency.

When we are speaking about the global order, it's possible to single out two varieties of it that are sometimes confused: normative world order (represented by the United Nations and the international law established during the post-war period) and geopolitical that is really being destroyed, in particular, the United States global empire is collapsing and as if on its own initiative (Brexit, election of Trump with his "America First" slogan, etc.). In other words the USA itself 'closes its imperial project' which is now offered as 'a liberal world order' in the West. All countries will have to deal with the United States already outside the global empire in the form of the so-called two-sided 'transactional diplomacy'. I think that such self-destruction of America corresponds to the well-known universal law: after achieving a certain maturity, peak, all systems are self-destroyed if they don't transform rationally and timely. That's what happened to the Soviet Union.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The floor is given to Robert Iskanderovich Nigmatulin.

R. I. NIGMATULIN: – I'd like to start my speech with the question: why did we transfer (may be not fully and faultily) to the European norms of democracy, adopt the Constitution as a result of Perestroika (restructuring)? We are electing deputies and the President (no one doubts the results of the last Presidential election: people really voted for V. V. Putin), we switched to market economy, as if becoming closer to European norms, but they treat us worse and worse. If we threatened with world revolution in the time of Khrushchev ("We'll bury you"), there

are no threats announced now. What is the annexation of the Crimea in comparison with what took place in the past? Imagine the Crimea belonging to Russia, and the Ukraine doing the same thing Russia did, taking advantage of the situation. No one would have objected because Russia has become weak. Not in the military sense, we've become weak economically and technologically, we can't produce anything: neither aircrafts, nor cars, the so-called "screwdriver technologies" are widespread in Russia, when everything is assembled from foreign component parts.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – And why did we become weak?

R. I. NIGMATULIN: – Because we pursue the economic policy wrongly. It's inadmissible for economy to provoke such strong stratification of the society: according to my estimations, 0.5–1% of the richest people of our country appropriate RUB 10 trillion, and the whole federal budget is RUB 15 trillion. It means that they dissipate national resources. There is no economic growth in our country for ten years already under the leadership of our President and Government, we've lost technologies. Surely, nothing should be done quickly in economy, Roosevelt also acted gradually.

It's required to redistribute 3–5% of GDP for a real economic upsurge to start. The main investor of economy is people getting balanced salary. The Russians, 93% of whom get less than RUB 70 thousand per month and nearly 60% get less than RUB 20 thousand per month, do not need any economic growth, because people can't buy anything. We are proud of the produced grain but grain grows on soil, and soil is not fertilized to compensate for insufficiency of required elements, and soils degrade.

While our economic policy is following the present path defined by the Government and the President of the country, while they do not comprehend the cardinal problems, we'll achieve nothing.

When in 1992 people's incomes collapsed, death rate increased up to 16.7, though it had been on the same level as in Europe before that. Over the period up to 2015, Russia paid 15 mln lives for increased death rate, and during the whole period of the Soviet Union's existence it was about 30 mln lives. While we do not overcome this economic system, we'll be threatened with sanctions (and sanctions are a heavy burden).

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Robert Iskanderovich, I don't even wish to argue with you. But the question arises: if you were paid RUB 10 trillion, could anyone convince you that it was bad and you should refuse them?

R. I. NIGMATULIN: – That's exactly the state order, politics should be determined not by 0.5% of the population but real people. In order for the people to understand that, it's first of all required for academicians to comprehend it.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Academician Nigmatulin calculated everything and presented the results to us. Now it's clear why the Academy of Sciences, which calculates and presents results, was dissolved.

H. M. REZNIK: – Academician Nigmatulin spoke on his behalf, and it's especially valuable that he speaks not on behalf of the Academy of Sciences.

R. I. NIGMATULIN: – Alexander Sergeyevich, many institutions should be dissolved in Russia, but we should not start from the Academy.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Henry Markovich, a very big number of books were published, where the issues about which academician Nigmatulin spoke today (high mortality rate, women's alcoholism, tragedies in families, etc.), are described in detail (based on calculations, with presentation of certain figures). I took part in writing such books. Abdusalam Abdulkerimovich, you are welcome to speak.

A. A. GUSEYNOV: – Before I say a few words on the future, meaning, the future of our country and the world, I would like to talk a little bit about the very means, the methodology of talking about this subject matter. When we talk about the future, we view it as some factual state that is ahead of us, and we aspire to look into that future state and see what is happening there, where Russia's place in that future is. But in reality, the future is not something that has been set in stone, and it is not a finish line that we need to cross, with the only problem being overtaking others en route. It is not so. The future is problematic. The future is being questioned. The future is only but a range of possibilities. When I say this, I mean the future being not a part of the physical time concept but a social, historical kind of the future. Our world exists in time from the past through the present and into the future, and in the physical aspect the future is guaranteed; from the moment of our discussion that we view as our present, something will happen in the future by all means, and we can become cognizant of the future with certain degrees of certainty, but "guessing" would be a more suitable work in this context. However, in the social or historical sense the future is far from being guaranteed. It is not guaranteed when we talk about the humankind as a whole, and especially so when we talk about certain nations, states and societies. There had been many great empires in the past. There had been many great nations that disappeared or became historically obsolete and insignificant. We ourselves lived through the end of socialism and the Soviet Union, and for most people, including the scholarly community, for 99% of all thinking individuals this disaster had come out of the blue. Let us give some serious consideration to this fundamental fact, and let us understand that our attitude to the future must be more serious and responsible that if we consider the future as a fully (or mostly) epistemological, prognostic problem.

The future is open; it will become what we make it to be. The future is a free space, a tank for historic creativity. And the issue of the future is the issue of what we are doing, not about the goals of history but about the goals of our activity. This is, if you like it, the issue of our attitude to the present, if we are satisfied or dissatisfied with it, the degree of our critical attitude, our radicalism in assessment of the present. In that sense, the issue of the future is the matter of a country's, nation's spiritual condition, their value priorities and ambitions, their understanding of the essence of human existence. It is even possible to formulate this paradox: to enter the future we need to look deeper inside ourselves.

From this point of view we should review not some certain theoretical predictions or pictures of the future which are often sensible and well-grounded (we heard about many

of them today) but the real state of public Russian consciousness, and see what images of the future are present there. In my opinion we can identify three images of the future, not far-fetched, not purposely designed but absolutely real images, behind them there are powerful flows of human energy, big masses of people.

The first is satisfaction with the present. We are speaking about satisfaction in principle. Surely, it's considered necessary to improve something (to a bigger or less extent) for example, in order not to have so many poor people in the country, to reduce corruption and etc.

This variant is realized by the government. It is supported by the majority of population. On the whole, with all incorporated or possible critical ideas, attitude and actions, we are speaking of the future as the extension of the present.

The other two variants – the really working ones, massive, effective and having the force of a historical motive, is the future understood as the past. In one case as the Soviet past, in another case as the past of the tsarist empire, in the third case as pre-Peter I Russia.

Our problem is that there is no real striving for the future, understood as qualitative renewal of forms of life. That is, we've lost taste to historical being, interest to our existence's being historical. This is a deeper problem than separate solutions referred to some or the other aspects of economy, culture, etc.

As if we don't believe and don't want the future where there will be no violence, no social injustice. Even the bourgeois – democratic slogans of liberty, equality and fraternity are not taken seriously. In a word, we have to confess: we are having difficulties with future.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – In my opinion, people speaking today on this stage, have superpowers. It's difficult to argue with any of them. Henry Markovich is absolutely right that we have a wonderful Constitution, Robert Iskanderovich is right in the analysis of the economic system. Mikhail Victorovich is right in everything. At the same time, I know that there are very big problems in the country. The Presidential orders, for example, presented in May, will be brought into life in the same manner as previous ones. For example, it was ordered to increase the salary of lecturers at higher educational establishments. The salaries were increased but at the same time the workload was increased twofold. Now, the retired people are being promised pension increase. If the retirement age is increased up to 80 years, then it will be possible to increase pensions even tenfold. That's how our economy works.

I think that Russian economy is much worse than the Western one because we are copying what is already rotten. And when you start copying without thinking, it gets much worse, as Henry Markovich rightfully said, our capitalists, our mass media, our bureaucrats, etc. are much worse. Henry Markovich, what do you think about that?

H. M. REZNIK: – The longer you live, the more careful you become, because you understand: the number of questions increases, and there are less and less answers to them. I never tire of marveling at the wisdom of the ancients who thought moderation to be the most important philosophical category. Actually politics and especially economic policy is a complex matter where you have to take

responsibility. If you press too hard somewhere, change your priorities – life begins revenging you. Do we want to live like in America or Western Europe?

V. T. TRETYAKOV: – No, we don't.

H. M. REZNIK: – Vitaly Tovievich doesn't because he already lives like that. It seems to me that there should not be such a country as Russia. It should have disappeared long ago. No other country had such a strong impact of such factors as giant territory, severe climate, authorities, permanent external threats. Currently, the policy pursued over the recent seven years both on the international scene and inside Russia is oppressing – it has become flat.

I think that all real is sensible, all sensible is real and is manifested via necessity. Let's imagine the 1990s (though they were naturally determined but still the costs were great). The first steps made by V. Putin were absolutely right. Then, in the "sovereignty parade" period, 18 regions announced that their Constitutions had priority over the Constitution of the Russian Federation. Gorbachev said in his time, "We won't part without blood spilling". Thank God, there was no big bloodshed. But the state of affairs has not changed: the giant territory is preserved, there are national problems originating all the time, a national card can be suddenly played. Russia is a complex country. I don't know what we should do in economy as I am not an expert in this area.

It's clear that paternalism should be overcome. The state of affairs when everyone fed from the hand of the only owner – the state, formed the psychology of individuals that are actually deprived of a possibility to take the initiative. As a result, the state completely went out of economy in 1990, then tried to restore its presence there in required proportions. Then the state's presence in economy started growing. Currently, only 17% of jobs in America are created by the state, and 70% in Russia. What budget can carry this load?

The brought into life policy should be professional. Today, the same takes place as before: people are subjected to emotions, hence the demand for the country's greatness, people live in illusions, they are susceptible to promises, support such populists and demagogues as Zhirinovsky. And the law-governed state within the framework of democracy is to be built with such people.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Mikhail Victorovich, you're welcome.

M. V. SHMAKOV: – Currently, most jobs in our country are created by the state. Neither small, nor middle-sized businesses can develop in the established economic environment as there are no loans, no solvent and effective demand from the people. And if we do not overcome this, we won't have progress. Currently, the most successful enterprises are those financed by state orders and from the state budget. This is one of the ways for economy's development. There is no doubt that the state of affairs should be changed. The law-governed state and abiding by laws will help us with that.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – The floor is given to Alexander Dmitrievich Nekipelov.

A. D. NEKIPELOV: – Dear colleagues, we spoke a lot about globalization today. But if we are objective, there has never been a bigger globalist than Karl Marx. He said that there were as many nations in the world as people. The idea of world revolution is fairly in accordance with the global vision of the world. By the way, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin was a globalist too, he foresaw the global society in the far-off future, though principally different, to wit, the cooperative of nations.

Currently, we are witnessing that there are no one-line processes. It is related to the fact that market economy is a powerful integrator. But the market reveals only a part of individual preferences of the people, to wit, the selfish part. The market is not a tool to reveal altruistic moods of the people. Had everyone agreed with giving everything for the market to take complete control of, there would not be any problems with creation of a united world economy and management of a common monetary system. These are issues that can be easily solved from the technical point of view. The problem is that those who recently discoursed about what was the mover of market globalization, suddenly found out that it turned against them after the 2007–2009 crisis.

In my opinion, it's a mistake to just pay attention to Trump's personality, his traits of character. After all, half a country voted for him, and many of the things he said are now brought into life in economy and are received with a lot of enthusiasm.

As an economist, I oppose the economic policy carried out in our country over the whole period of reforms. There is a question: why are there so many opponents to the pursued policy? Actually, there are people representing one school of views and ideas in power, no matter what happened over the whole period of reforms. And here we are returning to the issue of the quality of our Constitution (and not so much to the environment when it was adopted, and if it was adopted at all – there are various opinions on the issue). The matter is that we do not have the mechanism for a natural change of teams expressing various views on the policy that should be promoted. This, in my opinion, is one of serious vices that we are having and that we can't still overcome, unfortunately.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Robert Iskanderovich, you are welcome.

R. I. NIGMATULIN: – Alexander Sergeyevich, I'd like to answer the question you touched upon – about socialism and capitalism. Figures are important for me as for a technocrat and a mathematician. What is a socialist state? I'll present one of indicators: expenditures for human development (education, health, science, culture) in Europe amount to 25%, and they amount to 9% in Russia, because of that there is much more justice and socialism there than here. Another matter is that I don't want to live according to new European trends (there are marriages between two men allowed there, etc.). Russia should resist this onslaught, this is one of its main functions.

Everything in the world is conducted from the position of strength. We do not have this strength, because of that we are suffering. On the whole, economy develops quicker in places with economic justice. There is no justice in our country, and we'll be paying for that until we understand that.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Vitaly Tovievich, you are welcome to speak.

V. T. TRETYAKOV: – Now I'm addressing those who repeated many times today that culture would save the world. Do not set hopes on culture, it (many artists in particular) also worships and admires weapons.

It was already said here that hierarchies had always been and would always be. There is struggle going on inside them, and conflicts originate inside countries as a result of it. Thrones fight each other, hence external conflicts. National hierarchy (only it should be really national) either wins or loses, and the whole nation loses together with it.

Is it possible to forecast the future and plan it? We can test it. In 1985, Gorbachev came to power and promised that everything would be fine: we'd adopt the best from socialism and capitalism. Six years later he lost his power, and the country broke down...

Basing on the recent past, it's possible to say that plans do not necessarily come true. But it's possible to do something with the past. The first variant: if Gorbachev had not come to power, it's possible that the Soviet Union would still exist.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – If Grigory Romanov had come to power, the USSR would still exist and develop no less successfully than China.

V. T. TRETYAKOV: – I don't know... The second variant: in 2000, Putin came to power. At that time, Russia could really disintegrate. But it consolidated. That is, the future is planned and it is designed, often by the efforts of a single person.

I'd like to address young people: now you can often hear that life should be comfortable. Beware of people who promise to create comfortable environment for you, send them away. Life can't be comfortable. Life is a struggle, there are always difficulties, you have to overcome them, then life becomes interesting. The one who wants to enslave you will create comfort for you for several days or months but later on he will make you kowtow.

H. M. REZNIK: – Be poor but happy!

V. T. TRETYAKOV: – Really, the poor are often happier than the rich.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Please, questions from the audience.

Question from the audience: – Vitaly Tovievich Tretyakov started his speech from the words "If you want peace, prepare for war". I'll give the following fact: the 2017 Nobel Peace Prize was awarded to the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN). This organization (with about 100 countries in it) tried to sign an agreement on abolition of nuclear weapons. What's your attitude to it?

V. T. TRETYAKOV: – In my opinion, it is ridiculous to discuss the decisions of the Nobel Committee. There are so many Nobel Prize winners in economics that residents of all countries should wear gold, eat pineapples from morning till night and drink champagne. Where is that flourish-

ing world? We should seriously treat history that is the past already, and the future is a continuation, not transformation of the history. Continuation of the history is the fact that people waged war, are waging war and will be waging war.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Next question, please.

Question from the audience: – Alexander Sergeyevich, aren't we simplifying the problem thinking of the West as a homogeneous system? Possibly, something was not to be borrowed and something was to be adopted, right? Can it be that we are now trying to borrow from the West the very things they previously borrowed from us?

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Several years ago, Chinese academician Jingjie Lee spoke at the Likhachov Scientific Conference. He heads the institute researching how not to repeat the mistakes made by the Soviet Union. He said in particular, "Russia should get rid of the left-wing errors made at the USSR period and the right-wing ones of the 1990s". His report had an eloquent title: "Adoption of the Western Culture: No Bias Either to the 'Left' Or to the 'Right' Can be Allowed".

The Soviet Union rejected everything positive that existed in the West. We had immature socialism, because of that it was possible to adopt a lot of Western experience. Currently, there is a bias to the right seen in today's Russia: everything done in the West is good because of that it should be copied. In my opinion, adoption should be selective.

Jingjie Lee gave a wonderful example, confirming that borrowing should not be mechanical. The matter is that sweet tangerines grow to the right of the Hwang Ho River, but if they are planted to the north of the river, the fruit will have a strong odor and will be unsuitable for eating. The reason is different conditions on the two river banks.

Capitalist experience should be adopted with the knowledge of what you are doing, about which Henry Markovich said. Currently, Russia should adopt the experience of Chinese socialism combined with capitalism, because there are a lot for us to borrow. While we rushed from one extremity to the other – from the ultra-left-wing stand to the ultra-right-wing one, China implemented the capitalist experience starting from the 1970s. Something might have gone wrong, but they kept going. Today, the Chinese can feed their country and are already competing with the United States. Chinese GDP is more than 20% and Russian GDP is 2%. Thirty years ago everything was vice versa: GDP of the socialist bloc countries amounted to 22%, and Chinese GDP amounted to 2%. That's what we've come to.

Academician Makarov, your question, please.

V. L. MAKAROV, *Academic Advisor of the Central Economics and Mathematics Institute of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor:* – Askar Akayevich, what would you do if you became the President of Russia?

A. A. AKAYEV: – After World War II, the world flourished for 25 years thanks to three factors: the Yalta Peace, strong trade unions and the socialist bloc. There is no socialism now and no Yalta Peace (I hope that Yalta Peace-2

is possible). Russia has preserved strong trade unions with their active leader. We are having a discussion at the University of Trade Unions, the best university for the humanities and the think-tank of Russia.

If I were the President, I'd first of all give support to trade unions, in particular strengthen the University of Trade Unions. Social inequality will grow in the digital era. Russian trade unions are standing guard over the interests of working people. The West has lost this institution. Strong trade unions are Russia's answer to contemporary challenges. I call from this rostrum upon everyone to join trade unions.

M. V. SHMAKOV: – Askar Akayevich, thank you. There are three words crowning the logo of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia: “Unity. Solidarity. Justice”. Currently, trade unions of the whole world (the day before yesterday I came from the Congress of German Trade Unions) think that their main task for the next four years is strengthening solidarity in the society.

H. M. REZNIK: – Allow me to answer academician Makarov's question. If I became the President, I, first,

would not react emotionally to some irritants from abroad, including from former Soviet Union republics, I would not frighten anyone with statements about restoration of “the Russian world”, sacred millennium-old values, which we should base on. Second, I would not make ill-considered statements on the international scene. Besides, I'd show the place that special services should occupy in the society, because now their powers are too expanded, they actually rule the country, controlling everything. Third, I'd concentrate on the solution of the issue, which the President successfully emphasized – fighting poverty. Poor employees can't provide economic progress of the country.

V. T. TRETYAKOV: – In my opinion, everything said is right. These are a kind of pieces of advice to the American President: do not frighten other countries, do not allow special services to rule the country and fight poverty.

H. M. REZNIK: – Advising anything to the American President is useless.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear friends, I thank the participants of the discussion and the audience.

Round Table PROBLEMS AND WAYS OF SETTLING CONTEMPORARY INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS

May 18, 2018
Conference Hall, Radisson Royal Hotel

CHAIRPERSONS:

S. Yu. GLAZYEV	<i>Academician of the RAS, advisor to the President of the Russian Federation V. V. Putin, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor (moderator)</i>
Sh. AZIZ	<i>Prime Minister of Pakistan (2004–2007)</i>
M. A. MORATINOS CUYAUBE	<i>Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Spain (2004–2010), Dr., Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i>
A. MOUSSA	<i>Minister of Foreign Affairs of Egypt (1991–2001), Secretary General of the League of Arab States (2001–2011)</i>
V. V. NAUMKIN	<i>Research Advisor of the Institute of Oriental Studies at the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor, Chief Editor of the “Vostok-ORIENS” Journal</i>

SPEAKERS:

I. O. ABRAMOVA	<i>Director of the Institute for African Studies of the RAS, member of the Presidium of the RAS, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics)</i>
R. Zh. ALYAUTDINOV	<i>Director of the Department for Humanitarian Cooperation and Human Rights of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation</i>
E. BAĞIŞ	<i>Minister of European Union Affairs of Turkey (2009–2013)</i>
H. de CHAVAGNAC	<i>Consul General of France in St. Petersburg (since 2017)</i>
V. A. CHERESHNEV	<i>Chief Researcher at the Institute for Immunology and Physiology (the Urals Branch of the RAS), member of the Presidium of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Medicine), Professor, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i>
L. L. FITUNI	<i>Deputy Director of the Institute for African Studies of the RAS, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor</i>
Al. A. GROMYKO	<i>Director of the RAS Institute of Europe, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Political Studies), Professor</i>
V. INGIMUNDARSON	<i>Professor of Contemporary History at the University of Iceland (Reykjavik), Ph.D.</i>
G. W. KOŁODKO	<i>Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance of Poland (1994–1997, 2002–2003), Director of the Research Institute at the Kozminski University (Warsaw), foreign member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor</i>
H. KÖCHLER	<i>President of the International Progress Organization (Vienna, Austria), Professor Emeritus at the University of Innsbruck, Ph.D.</i>
A. M. KRAMARENKO	<i>Director of Development of Russian International Affairs Council (RIAC), Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Russian Federation</i>
A. V. KUZNETSOV	<i>Deputy Director of the Primakov National Research Institute of World Economy and International Relations of the RAS, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Economics)</i>
V. L. KVINT	<i>Foreign member of the RAS (USA), Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor, Honorary Figure of Russian Higher Education</i>
Ch. T. LAUMULIN	<i>Researcher at Centre of Development Studies, University of Cambridge (Great Britain)</i>
R. LEWIS	<i>Founder of the International Institute of Language and Cross-Cultural Training “Richard Lewis Communications Ltd.” (Great Britain), Professor</i>
V. L. MAKAROV	<i>Academic Advisor of Central Economic and Mathematical Institute of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor</i>

J. A. MARCH	<i>Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Kingdom of Spain in the Russian Federation (2008–2011)</i>
R. MATTHEWS	<i>President of the International League of Strategic Management, Assessment and Accounting, Professor Emeritus at the Kingston University (Great Britain). Professor at the Moscow School of Social and Economic Sciences</i>
G. METTAN	<i>President of the United Chamber of Industry and Commerce “Switzerland – Russia and CIS States”, Executive Director of the Swiss Press Club (Geneva)</i>
D. V. MOSYAKOV	<i>Head of the Center for Southeast Asia, Australia and Oceania Studies at the Institute of Oriental Studies of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor. Head of the Department of Regional Studies of the Moscow University for the Humanities</i>
R. I. NIGMATULIN	<i>Research Advisor of P. P. Shirsov Institute of Oceanology RAS, member of the Presidium of the RAS, Academician of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor</i>
H. M. REZNIK	<i>Vice-President of the Federal Chamber of Lawyers, Cand. Sc. (Law), Honoured Lawyer of Russia, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i>
P. P. TOLOCHKO	<i>Member of the Presidium of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Honorary Director of the Institute of Archeology of the NAS of Ukraine, Academician of the NAS of Ukraine, foreign member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor, Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS</i>
J. WIATR	<i>Minister of National Education of Poland (1996–1997), deputy to the Polish Parliament (Sejm) (1991–1997, 2001), Dr. Sc. (Sociology), Professor</i>
A. S. ZAPESOTSKY	<i>President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation</i>

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear friends, outstanding scholar, economist, advisor to the President of the Russian Federation, academician Sergey Yuryevich Glazyev joined us and will be the moderator of this discussion. The topic of our today’s meeting is “Problems and Ways of Settling Contemporary International Conflicts”. Sergey Yuryevich, the floor is yours.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – Today we are witnessing the escalation of international conflicts, and many of them are absolutely irrational at first sight. It’s difficult to explain regional wars in the Middle East from the point of view of common sense; as well as the catastrophe in the Ukraine arranged by Western “partners”, staking on the Nazis; the West making advances to radical Islam and neo-fascists.

Most people, who do not consider themselves political scientists, are perplexed. And political scientists are looking for some hidden springs. Conspiracy theories come to light. It seems to me that the issue of the international tension’s escalation as well as international conflicts should now be viewed in the context of long-term structural changes in the global economic and political system.

I’ll remind you of the works by well-known Italian scholar Giovanni Arrighi, who discovered age-long capital accumulation cycles. Studying this topic, we came to the conclusion that the basis of each cycle is the system of respective institutions, if you want it in old terms – production relations that provide reproduction of capital, and named this system the global economic pattern, emphasizing its wholeness. In accordance with Arrighi’s observations, we have to state that the change of these age-long accumulation cycles goes through the institutional revolu-

tion – cardinal change of the systems of management of economic development and capital reproduction – and unfortunately it was accompanied by world wars until now.

Thus, escalation of conflicts in Europe in the course of World War I was related to the fact that the United Kingdom trying to preserve its global hegemony, made Russia and Germany clash with catastrophic consequences for these participants of the conflict. But the United Kingdom did not manage to preserve its colonial empire. It finally collapsed after World War II as it no longer answered objective requirements of the global economic development. And the new leader appeared in the outlying regions – the United States of America that together with the revived Russian Empire in the form of the Soviet Union (with a completely different system of governance) became the leaders for the following political period.

It was the cardinal change of governance. Colonial empires of the 18th – 19th centuries traded in people. The world had never known such scales of slave trade as in that period. People became commodities, goods for sale. And hired workers were slaves in essence. No only those caught in Africa and shipped to America but European workers as well. Let’s remember Marx’s works on the history of the original accumulation of capital. Marxism became the reflection of building relations between capital and labour.

The modern times, which we called the imperial global economic pattern (“the long twentieth century” by Arrighi), are characterized by a completely different system of governance from the colonial period.

Social states originated and the international law came into being. Big corporations were set up, either ministries

of the Soviet type or the so-called Western transnational corporations. This is the big hierarchic structures pattern. The most important element of the new global economic pattern was origination of global economy divided into two parts – Western and Soviet.

Fiat money became the most important economic invention of that period. States learnt to print money, create money out of nothing, advance the economic growth. The leader countries managed to appropriate the right to emit world currencies, getting an enormous advantage. Transnational corporations that control the world today are mostly American corporations, partly European and Japanese that “stuck” to emission of the world money and are getting unlimited loaning opportunities. This period is coming to its end.

The liberal globalization period is ending as the period of colonial empires ended in its time. And we are witnessing the amazing reincarnation of socialist ideology in China that became the world leader. The new global economic pattern was formed, which we called integral after Pitirim Sorokin, emphasizing that the state unites the society and is the moderator that does not protect the interests of capitalists or workers but is engaged in integration of the society, harmonization of relations and combines the socialist ideology for the benefit of all, subjecting economic development to the upsurge of people’s standard of living, with market economy, private entrepreneurship. The state preserves control over the financial system, loans and at the same time gives private business an opportunity to develop to the extent it brings fruits for growth of social welfare. At the same time, we are seeing revival of national sovereignty.

The new concept of global economic relations is not liberal globalization as we can see, for instance, in case of the One Belt, One Road Initiative and its interlinking with our Eurasian Economic Union. We see how it works. No one is interfering into affairs of other countries, does not force liberalization of economy, refusal from currency control, etc.

The main goal of international cooperation is not creation of freedom of capital flow in the interests of transnational corporation but a synergistic effect, joint investments to combine competitive advantages. The balance of interests here is not with zero amount, but with a positive synergistic effect based on mutually advantageous cooperation.

The transition period, in which we live today, is accompanied by escalation of international conflicts. As the 500-year historical experience in the change of age-old capital accumulation cycles described by Arrighi shows, the power elite formed in the period of the previous global economic pattern, does not leave without a fight. It tries to cling to its hegemony till the last soldier in the outlying districts.

Until now, the change of global economic patterns was every time accompanied by a world war, in which the power elite of the leading country, formed by that time over dozens of years, tried to keep the previous global economic order allowing it to get enormous profits. But new leaders always appeared in the outlying districts. For example, the United States that rose with World Wars I and II in Europe.

Before them was the United Kingdom that appropriated Russia’s victory over Napoleon and actually appeared on the field of battle at the last moment, taking leadership from Holland.

Currently, the American power elite is exerting all efforts trying to cling to its global hegemony, clinging to

the unipolar world that they thought up for themselves. And as usual, the war in the course of such transformation is for control over outlying districts.

According to the Western geopolitical tradition, control over outlying districts under which they understand the whole Eurasia, is first of all control over Russia. Because of that, in my opinion, they are not restraining Russia as many people think, but they are trying to annihilate, break up and split, and then control us, which they let slip in the 2000s. The American power elite and the US partners in NATO sincerely believe that controlling Russia they will control Europe, Middle Asia and consequently will still govern the world and restrain China.

But their problem is that they have already lost geoeconomic competition to China in the amounts of economic activities, in foreign trade figures. And we see that China is quickly outrunning the United States in scientific and technological potential: in the numbers of patents, scientists, engineers, discoveries, etc.

Unfortunately, the historical experience certifies that it is impossible to teach the power elite of the leading country. They’ll be trying to keep control over the world at any price. And we have to regretfully state that the American power elite uses radical Islam, Neo-Nazism, Neo-Fascism as tool to keep global supremacy and wages hybrid war first of all against Russia and in essence against the whole world. The question is how to stop this war.

Two thoughts about how to stop this war in conclusion. We understand well that Western geopolitics recognizes only strength. I felt that when we had talks on the issue of the Ukraine. The Ukraine was forcefully made to become an associated member of the European Union and fulfil its directives today. There is no dialogue: do as we tell you. The same happens in case of China now. They are waging a trade war according to the same principles. American aggression may stop only if they in Washington understand that anti-war coalition is capable to bring them an unacceptable damage. Economists understand well that the life of American Koshchey the Deathless is hidden in the mechanism of world currency’s emission.

The amount of the dollar’s emission increased 4.5 times in recent 10 years. The Americans additionally feed their hegemony with emission on giant scales. Ninety percent of it is referred to buying US treasury bonds and consequently financing military expenditures and keeping their military bases all over the world. The only way to stop the US aggression is to cut off the sources of financing their military expenditures that exceed Russian by an order of magnitude. And also prevent the announced by Donald Trump’s administration new arms race, absolutely not required for anyone.

How to do that? It’s required to transfer to national currencies in our Eurasian space, basing on Vladimir Putin’s initiative on establishment of big Eurasian partnership, to refuse from the dollar in mutual settlements of payments, in mutual investments, transfer all our development banks to national currencies. Build all global economic relations on the basis of mutual profits, partnership, respect to national sovereignty. Create our own new currency and financial architecture in Eurasia that could be the basis for forming global financial and economic architecture as well, where countries emitting world currency should take a number of commitments upon themselves, first of all the commitment not to impose sanctions.

In particular, because of American sanctions, the American dollar cannot be viewed as a world currency in future as all savings in dollars are extremely risky for Russia today, including the state reserves.

We are seeing dollar accounts arrested, American banks block money transfers, including settlements of payments in dollars even with Chinese partners. Any transaction in dollars goes via correspondent accounts of American banks where it can be easily blocked. And these are not just fears, this really happens today. In front of our eyes. Because of that we have to switch to settlements of payments in national currencies and learn our lessons.

If we acknowledge a currency of any country a reserve currency, this country will have to take upon itself international commitments not impose any sanctions, provide complete liquidity of such currency, open its economy for acquiring any assets in this currency.

If no country takes upon itself such commitments, digital technologies give us an opportunity to transfer to a supranational currency, emitted under strict control of the international community. It may be tied with the basket of national currencies of the countries, participating in this currency mechanism.

I think that in the course of establishing the new global economic pattern, we'll transfer to creation of a supranational currency. Thus, an anti-war coalition can be built based on refuse from the dollar as the world currency. This will create a threat of irreplaceable damage to the Americans as there will be the risk of the dollar financial pyramid's collapse.

It seems to me that signing an international convention on cybersecurity should become the second pillar for anti-war coalition's establishment. The main weapon in the world hybrid war is a cyberweapon (information technologies). We saw how it was used in Iran when most likely the US National Security Agency arranged the disaster at Iran's nuclear facilities with the help of the computer worm.

Today, the only country flatly refusing to enter an agreement on cybersecurity is the United States. They have an advantage in this sphere and think that their advantage is absolute and allows them to wage war extremely effectively.

But the new nucleus of the world economic development has been formed. I am sure that there is no information technology which we can't create together with China and India. And what is more, China is demonstrating the ability for absolutely autonomous development of the country's information space, where it manages to build fences even on social networks. They have managed to provide security for their cyberspace to a large extent.

So, it seems to me that signing an international convention on cybersecurity could become another pillar for anti-war coalition's establishment. The countries not signing such an agreement shall be excluded from common information space. Import of their equipment and machinery is to be blocked, and we shall not use their software.

And this is the second element that will bring irreplaceable damage to the American hegemony, and that will make the aggressor refuse from further aggravation of international tension.

Surely, we live in the 21st century. And our time should become the period of the mind's and humanism's triumph.

In contrast to the well-known Russian legend about Koshchey the Deathless, no one is speaking about the death of the United States. On the contrary, we wish them good life, flourishing. But at their expense, not ours. We want to honestly work for our beneficial being. We just have to make Koshchey behave decently.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Sergey Yuryevich, everything you said is very interesting. Your point of view may become one of the bases for further Russia's actions on the international scene and is a real variant for the development of events. Please, take the part of the discussion's moderator.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – Thank you. Now, academician Valery Leonidovich Makarov will take the floor.

V. L. MAKAROV: – I agree with most theses presented by academician Glazyev. We are moving to the digital society. It's important that China refused from the SWIFT payment system, there is everything their own. The Central Bank of Russia is also announcing that we have to have everything our own, though that is still only intentions and plans. This is really very important because there will be no American hegemony then. I think that global faking of information will reduce as well.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – The advantage of digital technologies is that it's possible to do without banks with their help. And this also gives an opportunity to control distribution of seignorage from emission of currency.

The floor is given to Leonid Leonidovich Fituni.

L. L. FITUNI: — Sergey Yuryevich's speech was very interesting and rich in content. In my opinion, the problem is who will do all that. The will of state and its leaders – real carriers of state authority – is required to bring the offered measures into life. Can we count on the world wishing to refuse as a united front, for instance, from the technological system in the information sector that is already 92% American and start buying, say, products from Taiwan, South Korea? Who exactly will become the carrier of changes and why?

The elites of the overwhelming majority of the world's most powerful countries are fairly well in-built in the existing system. And a bigger part of those who seem as if they do not agree with that are facing the risk of losing their influence and relevance. There is no doubt of the great potential of China which nowadays is showing itself more widely and in more ways. It is difficult to say for how long this upward trend will maintain its breathtaking pace. But I'll let myself to use Marx's formula to characterize the modern transformation of the global role of PRC (with regard to celebration of the 200th anniversary of the author of "The Capital"): if China was a superpower "in itself" in the past, now China is a global superpower "for itself". And therefore, when I think about the future, about the Russian – Chinese relations and about a strategic partnership and etc., I am not sure that China will be striving to bring their actions in accordance with interests of Russia, India and other countries. More likely they will work for themselves. With a certain amount of cynicism we can't exclude a scenario, where at an appointed time we will find ourselves on the threshold of *Pax Sinica*, a unipolar world in Chinese.

What will be the place of Russia in it? And of the USA? And of the smaller countries of Europe?

The boy-winner of Dragon in the well-known Eastern tale turns into a dragon himself and takes its place. So does China pushing the USA off the world's hegemony position. In our case China will turn into the new-USA, the new City upon a Hill, the global Under Heaven with the centre in the Middle Kingdom. What will our profit be in the end?

Some ideas, in addition to the abovementioned, about conflicts in the new world. A humanistic thought was presented yesterday at the time of discussion that the world is going from the world of nations to the world of free individuals. In this respect I will refer to another Marx's quote, this time it is from "The Capital": "Between equal rights force decides". There should be a mechanism for execution of the rights' equality in the world where everyone has equal rights. Otherwise collision of forces is inevitable.

There is the grain of any future conflict in this state of affairs. Here I am speaking not only about conflicts between individuals. These are also conflicts between communities, states, etc. Conflicts will be originating always.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: I'll give the precedent created in London as a counter-example for your thesis that all elites are interlinked and in-built in the established system. The administrative procedure for arrest and forfeiture of property was introduced there. The procedure originated for the first time in history of the London Financial Centre, according to which all people coming to the UK have to prove to officials that their incomes are legal. This certifies that the system is really disintegrating.

L. L. FITUNI: — We have many myths of certain "sacred" and "unwavering" principles of law in the West, such as the Anglo-Saxon law, the "sacred" right for private property or the absolute imperative of the presumption of innocence. All this despite the very fact that real-life precedents hurt Russian citizens and testify to the contrary. Let us remember the recent story of Russian assets in Cypriot banks, the Russian diplomatic property in the US, and the ways in which Washington had made some of our oligarchs sell their quite legal property.

Therefore, the presumption of innocence is not practiced everywhere, and not at all times. Sometimes the accuser does not get to prove his or her story. But there are cases when the accused must prove that the suspicions raised against him or her are unfounded. The present-day English, Canadian and Indian laws contain the notions of the "reverse burden of proof." In most cases this refers to criminal income sources and drug crimes (in Canada). Usually this principle is used in the context of property confiscation procedures when this property is deemed as being illegally acquired. But we must also recognize that the entire system of fighting money laundering and financing terrorism in the world is based on the owner of assets being able to prove the legal origin of his or her finances. In 2000 the Council of Europe even published the review of best world practices or the reverse burden of proof that pertained to those facing confiscation of their illegally acquired property. Further these provisions were included in the documents and recommendations of FATF (Financial Action Task Force). Regarding the implementation of the concrete English Law Sergey Yurievich was referring to, the Crimi-

nal Finances Act of 2017, the whole issue is that not "everyone who is coming must prove to the officials that their income was received legally." This law is being used selectively. The burden of proof lies with those individuals who are, in the opinion of British authorities, highly likely to have acquired their assets illegally.

H. M. REZNIK: — All that can be moved to courts of law in England. Imagine that courts of law there investigate these issues independently. And there were cases when the verdicts were not in favour of the state. For example, when entrepreneurs, including big Russian businessmen suspected in certain offences, were refused entry into the country. I had one such case in my practice.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: — The floor is given to a foreign member of the RAS, Professor Grzegorz Kolodko.

G. W. KOLODKO: — Thank you. First I have a question you may know the answer, vis-à-vis, this currency issue. Out of the global currency reserves 62.7% is still holding American dollar, only 1.2% in Chinese yuan and it is not growing, so the world still does not believe in the power and the future of China's currency as the foreign reserves currency. It is a longshot, one should not expect any major position of China's currency in a shorter period than another 20–30 years, but it may happen.

So, Russia's currency is relatively small, smaller than of Saudi Arabia, matching reserves of Hong Kong or Taiwan, roughly \$460 billion right now. How much of this 460 billion dollars equivalent you keep in Chinese yuan, that is the question. Do you believe in this currency or it is just words, words and words.

My second point is about strategy and politics of solving international conflicts. I think that now we have entered exactly these months, these weeks, these days maybe new stage of the global effort, that is the split within the West, that is the split between United States and the European Union, vis-à-vis very many aspects of international politics. Now, Russia and China have much more common ground with European Union, Germany, France even Britain, despite Brexit, than with the United States. That may change the rules of the game and, looking forward into the future through the prism traditional East-West etc. doesn't make much of sense, because now I suppose that already discrete diplomacy is going between Moscow, Berlin, London, Paris etc. how to manage this President of the United States with his weird ill-advised policies. My third point is, all of us we do remember 46 years ago Kissinger and Nixon went to Russia and China and they were able to manage knocking the wedge between China of Mao Zedong and the Union of Brezhnev. And that was actually the beginning of the end of the Empire, of the Soviet Empire as you refer to it. Another part of the world game now is an attempt, especially by US, much more than by the European Union, so for that reason I'm not saying by the West, but one more time by US to knock the wedge again between Russia and China. Because if you and China, and presidency of China said recently that the relations between China and Russia are the best ever, which is very much likely, if you do not allow to knock the wedge between these two countries, with the reserves, population, technology, military arm, but first of all, econ-

omies then the world of the future would be definitely different from the world of the past. And your voice vis-à-vis solving the international conflicts, the currents which we have as it Korea's or Iran, or Syria, or Ukraine, will be much more important than just talking different stories in Moscow, than in US. And my last point is, after listening to the Professor Glaziev's speech, there is no chance for cooperation. What you're saying is 180% reverse to what your colleagues from US are saying. If I see a different opinion, what is hybrid war, what is to be blamed for Russia and what is blamed for United States from policy-makers and these lousy politicians here and there, it is not any surprise it is the business of politics. But when I hear completely contradictory opinions from professors of economics or international relations I'm really concerned that there is no ground for any substantial dialogue, you are telling your story about American hybrid war against Russia and I have here my mobile and the only message on the BC world is that we arrested yesterday in Poland some Soviet spies who are some sort of Russian people, sorry, Russian people, accusing them of hybrid war against Poland. And on Today's Economies which is a very opinion journal, which I think most of a lot of us are following, there is completely 180% difference picture, than the one you have presented. On this ground how we can work together, how we can make an influence for a pragmatic solution to solving the conflicts of contemporary world and of the future, when we are stating the facts in contradictory way. Something is wrong or everybody is wrong and for that reason I think that scientific community and intellectuals should play much more important role in this dialogue than it is so far. Because today we are representing our interpretation, maybe somewhere over there in San Diego or another New York there's another conference and the guys are talking different stories and then the politicians are quoting famous economic and political scientists and the world is going apart, instead of being able to solve the conflicts and we have only more conflicts and we don't know what will be the conflict of the future.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – Thank you very much, Professor Kolodko. It seems to me that while we are using the same terms, we have an opportunity to discuss the meaning of these terms. Currently, the state of affairs is much more positive than during the period of confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, when people spoke different languages. Now we are more or less using the same words, the meaning of these words is another matter (and in this case Mr. Kolodko's remark is right).

I invite the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Spain (2004–2010) Miguel Angel Moratinos Cuyaube to the microphone.

M. A. MORATINOS CUYAUBE: – Well, I listened with great attention what our friend Sergey Glaziev has introduced to us and going in the same line our friend from Poland. I have to say that I've been a little surprised. I understand, I fully understand the concern and what the Russian Federation had been confronted the last years and I have full sympathy, you know that my friendship with the Russian Federation, with its leadership, with my colleagues from the Foreign Ministry.

But listening to you, understanding your position I think in this forum we have to go a step forward and like my friend from Poland, we should not go back to the Cold War, we should not go back to East-West confrontation. If the Americans want, if the US administration are pushing some of you in this direction we should try to avoid that.

I remember Minister Sergey Lavrov two years ago in Munich secret in the Security Conference, he said: "the West World Order has passed, we have to create a new post West World Order". I could follow in this line, I could argue on this issue, but the new world order cannot be only China, Russia, India against the West. Let's try to create a new order that can solve the problem of global challenge of all of us.

On the national currency and the current situation, you could do if your national interest decides so, whatever you consider it's good for you. But in my opinion, it is not going to solve the problem. What we have to do is to change Bretton-Woods institutions, we have to reform IMF. Because national currency is the consequences of our system, of financial system, these institutions don't respond to the challenge of today. So don't go to the superficial element of currency, go to the heart of the economic and financial system of the world and then gather all together, the European Union and others that can contribute to that goal.

On the cyber war, cyber security and artificial intelligence. Well, as you say, we are confronted that the Americans have tap our phones, Mrs. Merkel, Mr. Berlusconi, everybody while the national security agency had been intervening, Russia, at the same time, had been accused of interfering in western elections. I don't care about that, but we have to try to create an environment, we have to regulate this new society of information at international level, not just counteract the cyber attack from Russia and later on Chinese against Russia. No! Let's put an order altogether and then create the environment to rule, you know, the world of the future.

For my final point is that while we are here trying to understand each other, trying to combine the elements of each other and trying not to say that the West, of course we have a colonial past, we have the American hegemony, okay. But as my friend from Poland says, well, the European Union is now starting a new road, we have an important strategic choice to be made in the future, what is your place, what is going to be the balance between Russia and China, how the Europeans have to play in this balance, how we are going to work with the United States in this new phase, how we are going to reorganize ourselves in this multipolar world, so let's work together and try to avoid increasing the tensions. Please don't go back to the Cold War. That is no good for you, no good for anybody. We have to create a new order and this order have to be under, you know, the respect of each other and trying to build up the new challenge in a common and collective way for all of us.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – I think that no one wants renewal of the Cold War. I am speaking about the collapse of the international law in the transition period, world organizations responsible for global stability are not working any more, including international agreements.

The floor is given to a corresponding member of the RAS, Professor Irina Olegovna Abramova.

I. O. ABRAMOVA: – We are speaking today about contemporary conflicts and the ways of their settling. It's necessary to say a few words about the reasons of conflicts in order to understand how to resolve them.

One of the most important reasons about which we have not spoken today yet is the going on struggle for resources and markets. The basis of any conflict is the wish of this or that country to get advantages. First of all these advantages are referred to either resources or markets. From this point of view, conflicts are tied to resources to this or that extent. This state of affairs is typical for the Middle East (Vitaly Vyacheslavovich Naumkin, who can speak on the issue in more detail, is present here), Russia (rich in natural resources) and Africa, one of the main sources of resources. Africa is interesting as well because resources on that continent have not been fully explored and they are not distributed. Because of that, when we are speaking about the future conflicts, we can define the main directions of their development.

The continent of Africa had their "Arab Spring". Now various players have the leading parts in various areas of Libya in the chaotic environment that set up there after the disintegration of the country: the Americans and the Swiss in the Western part, the French (*Total*), *Spaniards* (Repsol), Italians and the Chinese (*Sinopec*) in the Eastern part. The state of affairs suits them in principle.

Various conflicts have been going on nonstop for many years already in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, they are fighting not only for "bloody" diamonds but also for the resources that are important for the future technological development. First of all, I am speaking about cobalt and coltan because development of the aircraft industry, building of combat aircrafts, etc. are impossible without cobalt that can't be substituted in contrast to other metals.

There are also conflicts in the countries along the East African Rift where the richest fuel resources, big gas and oil fields were discovered recently (Tanzania, Kenya, Uganda, etc.). In 2011, Kenya as a part of the African Union troops took active part in the settlement of the conflict in Somalia, and their troops entered that country. Al-Shabaab terrorist African group is now in essence turning into ISIL on the continent of Africa, and its terrorist course is actively used by Western powers. The capital city of Kenya Nairobi, where terrorist acts took place, turned into the arena of chaos, there was carnage in Garissa, when students were murdered at the University campus. All that is related to the struggle for resources in this or that way. The Americans, who helped Kenya, including in their struggle against Somalia, occupied good positions in that country, in particular, in development of oil fields. Enormous gas deposits were discovered on the Southern Cone of Africa (for example, in Mozambique that will be also dragged into the conflict). Al-Shabaab militant group appeared in Mozambique in January, 2017, it will be used as the influence levers have already been worked out in the struggle for resources.

China that is currently aspiring to be called the economic leader, is viewing this area as the most important in communications chains – the New Silk Road in a more global sense is the Chinese dream coming true. Currently, there are already military bases of the United States, Germany, Italy, Japan, China located in the small Republic of Djibouti. And this process has not been completed. Because of that no matter what we say about modern technologies re-

placing resources, unfortunately, that will not take place in the near future.

The second resource component is the population. The African population is very young. Exactly young people are more responsive to modern technologies. The European population is getting older. The population of Africa is the youngest in the world, its average age is 19 years. People mastering these technologies will already live not in Europe and the United States, but regions with high growth rates of the population, including in Africa. Because of that Russia has to take all that into account in this situation.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – Irina Olegovna, thank you very much for reminding about the fundamental factors. The floor is given to academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences Vitaly Vyacheslavovich Naumkin.

V. V. NAUMKIN: – It was already said here that the world is entering a digital era. Russia is actively working in this direction. Actually, the idea of Russia as a country with insufficient attention paid to innovations, is wrong. I think that the innovative sector is developing here actively enough. But nevertheless there is still American dominance in this field (smartphones, the Internet, etc.).

Sergey Yuryevich, is it said about finances, the way to develop the electronic Internet sphere in the plan you presented, if you are setting hopes on the digital age, information technologies?

Our economists stopped speaking about gradual transformation of the United States as the main producer of hydrocarbons – oil and gas. It may be that the reason of the lack of adequate expert evaluations is that it is not completely clear what will follow. The amounts of gas production in the United States are approaching 700 billion cubic meters, the United States have already outran Russia, Iran and Qatar in that. The United States are also planning to outrun Saudi Arabia and Russia soon in the amounts of oil production. But even if as it is supposed, the United States produce 15–16 mln barrels of oil per day in several years, the main consumption will still take place inside this country. Our partners in the Persian Gulf are attentively following this. The main issue discussed at bilateral meetings is: "What will happen next?" What is needed today by the USA if we take into account that this country is becoming the main producer of hydrocarbons in the world? How will it affect the struggle for resources, about which Irina Olegovna spoke?

Currently, there are new tension hotspots originating in the world. There are very many conflicts in the Middle East, there are dangerous conflicts in the Asia-Pacific region (for instance, in the South China Sea area). No one could suppose that there may be a serious conflict between the states from the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf: between Qatar on the one hand, and Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Egypt, Bahrain on the other hand. Currently, there are two groups of three formed in the Cooperation Council for the Arab States of the Gulf: one consists of Saudi Arabia, UAE and Bahrain, the other of Oman, Kuwait and Qatar, each of them has its stand. Small states from the point of view of the global politics are not the main but significant actors in the sense of resources, financial potential. It's evident that big numbers

of conflicts in the Middle East notwithstanding decreased military activities in Syria and victories over ISIL will continue. Settlement of conflicts here runs across insurmountable obstacles.

In recent years, new hotspots of tension originate all the time in this part of the globe. Serious disagreements divide states with different attitudes to the Muslim Brotherhood. Jihadists still preserve their influence on the minds, radical and moderate forces continue their confrontation in the Islamic world. What economic interests are behind all that (in the sense of struggle for resources, influence on the whole)? I'd like us to speak about that.

And the last thing. Trump announced to the Americans that he would put Iran on its knees. A lot of American politicians are supporting him: we'll achieve that, the Iranian regime will be overthrown. What is it? Rhetoric before intermediate elections or the real plan and Trump will go to the end in bringing pressure even on his European allies? *The New York Times* and *New York Post* publish the roadmap today including pressure on SWIFT (Society for Worldwide Interbank Financial Telecommunications) as one of the items. If SWIFT does not make concessions, Americans will supposedly change the board of directors. What are the chances today of America's conflict with Europe? Is it a threat or a serious, well-thought of strategy to create tension between Europe and the United States? Probably, we should proceed from that when discussing different variants of the new world order.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – In connection with digital technologies I'd like to say that the Russian language is one of the main working languages in the cryptoworld, so the state of affairs is not so bad. Now, the man with a very big political experience in resolving conflicts will speak in front of the audience. The floor is given to Shaukat Aziz, who was the head of Pakistan from 2004 to 2007.

Sh. AZIZ: – Thank you for allowing me to just introduce myself, again I was the Prime Minister of Pakistan and I was before that finance minister and then I won the election to be the Prime Minister, I kept the finance portfolio with me also. Because without finance you can't control anything, so that's one lesson I learned. Secondly I worked for 30 years before joining the government for Citibank, the largest bank in the world, being part of the management board of the company. So far my comments... when I make my comments please keep that in mind that my entire life was in banking.

I think the issue, I was not here for the earlier part of the conversation, but the issue you've raised is the not a new issue as to what is the influence of any particular type of currency on global trade and global investment flows and if it comes to a crunch can that be interfered with so that the flow of funds may not reach the beneficiary. The US dollar is the international currency of the world; the other currencies are really marginal in their influence. Although the GDP of the world is not all US, it's divided much more evenly. But I think we as the world have been a bit lazy and complacent on looking at this system and making it a bit more transparent and bit more independent. That part I support, this is nothing to do with discomfort with the US I think they have positioned themselves very well in this effort and every payment which is usually a dollar payment

they have the record, they can block it, they can send it, they can ask the questions.

Having said that, what is the solution, we can keep saying that things are not what they should be. I think America is a responsible country, so they haven't really done anything which is harmful, but they could do it if they wanted to. So I think there's need for more balance in the global financial system and particularly in the clearing system. However that is not the only problem we have to worry about.

Now, in terms of dollar clearing and dollar as a role in the world. Today even if you wanted other currencies to come in they may not have the depth to cover all the financial flows of the world. So this will have to be a gradual process. I think the countries of the world sitting in this room should really make their voice known and force the IMF, and which is really the body, not the World Bank and others, this is the IMF agenda, currencies, to come up with a new paradigm where there will be more equity in global flows and the one currency will not dominate. So that is the forum. Now the problem with the Bretton-Woods institutions, I agree with my friend Miguel, I have been lobbying about this for years without success, that the framework of the Bretton-Woods institutions is flawed, it needs change and the world cannot get-together to come up with the change. For example the head of the World Bank is decided by one country, they tell others, we are doing this, unless the guy has a criminal record, it's excepted. The head of the IMF is also approved by the US, nothing wrong in that, but the fact is, it's not a global way of appointing anybody. So the Bretton-Woods institutions need immediate reform and the world, all of us, don't blame one country or two, all of us are to blame, because we've abdicated to let it go, we don't want to change it.

Only when the AIIB was formed, the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, which is a new institution, much off the Bretton-Woods game, we have provided for no restriction on who the CEO will be. Yes, it is a Chinese now and it was a Chinese initiative, but it could be anybody based on merit going forward. So when you even restrict the CEO of an institution to one nationality, to me that's a flawed institution, it is not a merit of an institution. And once you come with appointments of people which are not based on merit, you would get the lack of transparency. So this is important to understand that we are sitting on the flawed system and that it needs to change. And the world leaders, frankly, don't have much time to even devote time to it. I will tell you that in discussions I've ever had with many world leaders, they either don't understand or they have no interest in doing it. Because it's a bit technical and they say, I leave it to my finance minister or government central bank to do, but these issues can haunt us later. I think the time to move is now. How do they do that? It'll take a major effort and it will be opposed strongly, because the dollar is so strong that if you say, okay we won't do dollar, there's no real alternative today. If you ask me what is the alternative, even minor alternative, it's the euro, because it has some GDP backing to it. It is not the ruble, it is not the yuan, it is not any other currency. Sorry?

– Sterling!

– Sterling of course, yes, but sterling will always go with dollar, so no disrespect to Britain, but they're very close in these things to the US, so they'll go there. Eu-

rope could be conditioned to come up with this role. Somebody has to make the narrative, that it is an inequitable system. Once you make that narrative, then people would say, what's the solution, then you come up with one or two or three solutions, and they have to be global solutions. Part of that, as Miguel said, has to be Bretton-Woods reform. You cannot have people being appointed to global institutions without consulting anybody, just one country decides...

– Just one question! Did Mahathir try to establish something of the sort during his first term and that led to his fall? Am I wrong in that?

– You are wrong, yes. Sorry. I was the head of Citibank in Malaysia, when all this was going on. So I've been around, I've worked only in 15 countries and that's my disadvantage in the discussion like this. Because I know a little more than I should, but he believes in that. I think the answer to your question is he believes in that, but he also got gridlocked. And his own bureaucracy got scared in the central bank that, sir, if you fight the US on this, they can choke you, so you better come up with one country cannot do it. This is a multilateral issue, that's why we all failed, we think about it, we have a discussion, we'll go out and nothing will happen, because it's a multilateral issue. To tackle a multilateral issue is very different from tackling a bilateral issue, right? So you need a consensus of countries, you need the ability to deal with the US and I think that the US can be reasonable, if we have a credible narrative. We don't have a credible narrative, we have an emotional narrative. Emotional narrative will not get us there. We have to have a technically sound well-thought-out narrative which you can present through the press, through the media, it'll take five years to get acceptance even to discuss. But now we have emotional narratives that, you know, we have been exploited, this-that. That doesn't live beyond just a discussion. So it has to include Bretton-Woods institutions, it has to include some credible alternatives to be identified, you can't take away trade from the dollar, the fact is that the US has a clearing system, it has all that and the thing works and nobody's money has been sequestered or anything, it's pretty much where it should be. So we have to do a lot of thinking and it's not a political only issue and Dr. Mahathir's comments were right, and I've got respect for them, but he couldn't come up with how to. The how-to was not there, the what-to – yes. We need independence, that we can all say. So I think you need two or three senior leaders – China, Russia and maybe somebody from Europe, if you can get Germany or something, then you can get some traction. Otherwise it'll just be another debate five years from now and we'll be talking about the same thing.

And the other issue is all about bad money. Bad money in the system, which was talked about just now. You know, the money laundering and all these controls, I think that's a very good thing. That should be supported by everybody, because that money in my view doesn't deserve a home. So that's why everybody should fight that and clean up the system. There's still a lot of bad money floating around. And because there is no clarity, good money gets intercepted, bad money doesn't even come into system. So that's another whole issue which we can discuss for the next few hours, we don't have that time. But international clearing is one issue which needs serious work. The flow of bad money

is a totally separate issue and the third one, to make these first two issues resolved, has to be the Bretton-Woods institutions reform. If you can't attack these three, we will have nice conferences and discussions, but we won't get there. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

– Thank you very much, your excellency. I quite agree with you that we should be very careful and go step-by-step and smooth way. But I'd like to remind that G20 made the decision about the IMF reform about ten years ago what the electoral mind that just went to my decision about the IMF perform about 10 years ago. Nothing happened.

– That's why I sound a bit frustrated, because nothing happened.

– Yes. Unfortunately.

– The leaders of the world don't have the interest to get into technical issues. They like more glamorous issues, that type of stuff... So till they get serious, nothing will happen.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – I agree with you that we should be very careful, move forward gradually, step by step. However, I'd like to remind that G20 took the decision on the IMF reform about ten years ago, but nothing was done since then. I give the floor to Mr. Amr Moussa.

A. MOUSSA: – Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I would start by stating that the Cold War continues and we live now within that framework as our colleague from Portland has said. And I do second the opinions he voiced. I believe that the Cold War was resumed very soon after the end of the Cold War. At the end of the Cold War came two versions – the clash of civilizations and the end of history. The clash of civilization was destined to find a new enemy in your adversary for the policies, the economic policies, the armament, weapons policies etc. to continue. But the think tanks in America and the establishment in America, I believe, have realized very soon that this was not the end of history and therefore they have to continue certain aspects of their old policy. Meaning, they have to continue the Cold War, but by different means – economy, dollar etc. and also to deal with the emerging powers. First of them was China. We should not discard or believe that the world is moving in the simple way from one superpower to the other. When we say goodbye, the chair is empty, so somebody else will come and sit. This is an old way of thinking. Many believe that the world will move from this one superpower into several centers of power, China on the one hand, America on the other and the other newcomers. So do not discard America, the decline of America will be relative and the ascendance of China would also be relative. In favor of a new world that is not that simple. King has... What do we say? King has died?

– Long live the King!

– Yes, long live the King. It is not so. That is one thing. The other thing is about what we should do with the Cold War. We who? The rest. The world is going through a very strange unprecedented period of politics, of economics and of the way of living. Mr. Trump yesterday reversed the decision of his within the framework of the world trade. He punished according to his decisions of last week certain Chinese companies that were accused of dealing with North Korea and other powers. And then he decided to save them, forgetting about North Korea, forgetting about

the sanctions. That shows, that the trade war, the policies of the United States, the reactions of China and others are not final. Upon the decision taken by the president Trump to save a certain company the Deputy prime Minister of China is going to visit America tomorrow. Those are the dynamics that we have to bear in mind. It is not a Cold War the 20th century style, it's a different thing altogether.

Now, on the issue of the Arab situation and the African situation, in particular the Libya thing. There is a movement of change in the Arab world. Forget about the expressions like Cold War, the Arab spring and things of that kind, but the change is taking place and very forcefully in the Arab world. There is a rejection of the status quo ante. The issue of one man deciding the fate of a nation is rejected. It has to go gradual, it is not black and white, but this is a direction. The Arab consensus or a certain Arab consensus is growing. All Arabs refuse the idea of splitting or dividing Syria. All Arabs do not accept what happened in Libya. All of them want the kind of Egypt to the center of stage of the Arab and mideastern situation. Because the absence of Egypt led to the new trends, led by Iran and by Turkey. So the presence of Egypt would introduce a certain balance between the big powers in the region. I forgot to tell you that part of the change is what is going on in Saudi Arabia, the thinking, the new ideas, that what is past is past, we have to live in the 21st century. Cinemas have to be opened, clubs have to be opened, women have to drive cars, go and travel without the approval of their father or their husband, or their son. There is a big change. Even in the certain interpretation of the religion that has been taken up by ultra conservative organizations. Among the consensus in the Arab world comes the idea that we should not allow Muslim Brotherhood to rule in any Arab country. This is what the Egyptians are doing, what the Tunisians are doing, what the Iraqis are doing, what many are doing now, not know there is nothing of that kind. And this poses a challenge to international politics, because I believe, in such a highly informed society of people here in Russia and elsewhere, some thought that, even promoted the idea that, okay, we have a radical Islam but those people, the civil societies etc. and civil governments will not succeed in defeating them, so let moderate Islam deal with the radical Islam. Here comes the idea that Muslim brotherhood should be allowed to rule. And I believe and many believe, that President Erdogan was behind this idea, because he considered himself as the moderate leader. But moderate leader of Islam, but what about the Arab world, the heart of the Islam, so who can deliver that? Egypt. And who in Egypt? The Muslim Brotherhood. So this alliance that was promoted between the government and of the governing circles in Turkey. That helped President Obama to understand who is Erdogan, and the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt. Excuse me?

– Qatar.

– No, that's money. Qatar is not that. That's only cash. We are talking about major trends. Major trends! But the Egyptians couldn't afford to have the Muslim Brotherhood for more than one year. It is that a question of the coup or the question of the revolution. It's a question of rejection of people who think that somebody will have to tell you about what the system of taxes should be. It is a very complicated world for such a group to deal with or to rule according to it. So there is a change I hope that you would

bear it in mind, that the Middle East, the Arab world is not going to be the same.

Having said all that I want to comment, very briefly, on what was said about the neo- or the radical Islam, neo-nazism and neo-fascism. I wish you to add neo-conservatism. The neoconservatives in America have done a lot to harm the international stability and what we see today in Palestine, in Jerusalem etc. is their making. And more than that, because they believe in a world that has to be under the tight control of the certain group. And this is very dangerous, we have to have a world that is open. This is the 21st century, it is either we have it as a new century with a lot of horizons open or essentially that will repeat what we have had in the 20th century. I don't think that it is possible. This world is destined to major change. Here comes the role of Russia, here comes the role of India, here comes the role of several other centers. And, as you were talking about money and dollar etc., the big powers that would say, no we are here and you have to listen to us, how can you ignore Singapore, the little country, but a little money and a little money earned, not just coming from wells in the desert, but they worked to have it. So, we are heading to a new international situation, a new system of international relations. We cannot just talk about a reform of the international fund or the World Bank, because it is like the reform of the United Nations and impossible thing to do. It would take so many decades, that there would be no reform, there would be something else. What is this something else? This is our task to talk about it, to think about it, what is the best, is it the Belt and Road of China, is it the new infrastructure bank of China, is it something else... It is still open. Thank you very much.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – Professor from the United Kingdom Richard Lewis is invited to the microphone.

R. LEWIS: – I am the Founder of the Cross-Cultural Institute in Britain and I have also been for the last 12 years Cultural Adviser to the World Bank. If you permit me to get away from the subject of currency and high politics and look at things from a slightly more relaxed and let's say semi-serious perspective, I would like to present a very English point of view, which might be interesting for you, although it is only semi-serious.

We have heard this morning a litany of recurring problems and misunderstandings in international encounters in the fields of monetary policies, diplomacy and negotiations and political pressure. When it comes to settling disputes between nations, is there any starting point? Is there anything at all that everybody agrees about? Our colleague Jerzy Wiatr has pointed out that while it is often possible for countries protecting nations' interests to solve a dispute, be it for instance a border issue, through compromise, it is nearly impossible to do likewise when there is a clash of compelling ideologies, for instance communism, capitalism or competing religions. Can the world's two largest religions – Christianity with 2.3 billion adherents and Islam with 2 billion, ever cede ground to each other? This is unlikely in the present climate. But there is another religion even more widespread than Christianity or Islam. It is a religion with an estimated 3 billion passionate followers. Its major rituals and ceremonies are watched and promoted by

all the world's television companies. Each country has one or two Gods of its own, though some of these command international recognition and affection. This vibrant and addictive religion is called Football and its obsessive appeal unites millions of people in every corner of the world.

If we seek unity, can this obsession one day be utilized for humanitarian purposes? Football – (and indeed sport in general) – ubiquitous and compelling – transcends borders and languages and has to be seen as a culture in itself, with its own history, traditions, rules, taboos and morality. A conference such as this may not be able to ignore completely sport's potential as a unifying factor. In Likhachev's words:

“Culture...is a humanitarian touchstone...brings eras and countries closer together. Distance between cultures shrink, and there is less and less space for national enmity.”

Leaders of nations and politicians in general, have long been aware of the importance of sport in bringing people together and for enhancing national reputation. President Vladimir Putin is one such leader, as his support of the Sochi Winter Olympics and his own sporting instincts have demonstrated.

Although football's following dwarfs other sports, we have to take into account the huge impact of the Olympic Games and other world competitions: athletics, skiing, cycling and swimming, to name a few. Two striking sports events in world history are reminders of how war can be avoided. At Christmas 1916 British and German soldiers left their trenches to play a game of football in the middle of a war which brought the greatest slaughter the world has ever known. In more recent times India and Pakistan, on the verge of war over Kashmir, agreed to play a series of cricket matches to minimize tension. Thankfully hostilities were avoided and cricket took its place. More than 60 countries that play cricket cannot imagine ever going to war with each other.

How can politicians tap the huge sources of goodwill that exist between all sporting nations? It is true that incidents of hooliganism and doping can engender negative attitudes, but sporting encounters on a huge scale can only result in increased closeness at many levels. This applies particularly to the ruling bodies of sports. I, myself, have witnessed the cordial relations which have existed for many years between the English Football Association and their equivalents in Japan and Germany. The same applies to the Rugby federations in Britain, France, Australia and South Africa, as well as the skiing associations in the Nordic countries and indeed internationally. The Tour de France occasionally runs some of its stages in England and Italy; even North and South Korea fielded a joint hockey team in recent times.

It is beyond my ability to visualize how closeness in sporting relations could be brought to bear to increase amiability in international political negotiations or crises. I can only imagine that senior representatives of associations connected with football, cricket, skiing, athletics, swimming and other sports, if given a voice in the political arena, would contribute towards mitigation of hostility, would seek compromise solutions and would certainly strive, at all events, to avoid war.”

But anyway there we are. I leave this suggestion with you. Maybe someone would like to take up a point. Thank you.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – Thank you very much, Mr. Lewis. The floor is given to a corresponding member of the RAS, Doctor of Political Sciences Alexey Anatolyevich Gromyko.

Al. A. GROMYKO: – Sergey Yuryevich, you mentioned the long 19th century in your opening speech. I'll emphasize that this is the expression by Eric Hobsbawm, who also spoke about the short 20th century. But it is already possible to speak in the end of the 20th century and the early 21st century that the 20th century was really not short but as long as the 19th century, because it did not end in the 1980–1990s but still goes on. May be we are about to pass over to the 21st century, but we have to understand that it has not become history. You spoke about long (age-long) systemic capital accumulation cycles or waves, but I think that we might as well discourse about long geopolitical waves or models of management, and with the same result. The world order became Europe-centered in the 17th century, empires formed its basis. In the 19th – 20th centuries their place was taken by nation states that were finally established in Europe only in the middle of the 20th century after all empires collapsed. It seems that notwithstanding the experience of the European Union, nation states will stay the main building material and mover in the 21st century as well. The experience of the European Union is not replicated anywhere, no one intends to set up such power structures. Because of that the United States, Russia, Turkey, China, South Africa, Brazil and other countries are the bastions of national self-identity.

Sergey Yuryevich also said about cycles in economy, but cycles are typical for history as well, and for development of international relations when one model is replaced by another (though there is no doubt that political and economic orders follow one another). I'm speaking about the Westphalia (from 1648), Vienna, Versailles, Yalta systems of international relations. They can be also called upsurges and falls of great powers on the borders of various models.

We are interested in the border, junction or meeting point because now we are exactly in such a situation. Everything taking place at the junction is accompanied by violence. Unfortunately, in the 21st century we did not avoid the repetition of what already took place many times. Today, we are witnessing another upsurge of violence because one model is replaced by another, there is struggle for command. Currently, the formula used in the second half of the 20th century is widespread. Then the United States acted according to the US *in* principle in relation to Europe, Russia *out*, Germany *down*. Today, principles are reformat: the United States in Europe are *out*. The US strategy is to withdraw from the European sphere of influence, and that was started not by Trump or even Obama, but George Walker Bush. Germany and France are *in* from the point of view of strategic plans of the United States (the burden of responsibility in this region is passed over to them) but Russia stays *out*. However, there is not only Europe now but a region exceeding it in importance – Asia. When the United States left Europe, they 15 years ago launched the course in Asia to be exactly *in* China. Germany was *down* in Europe, now their course in Asia is China *down*.

The matter is that the United States (notwithstanding the regularly discussed issue if they are moving in the right

direction) continue the process of self-destruction. In 1945, the United States share in global GDP amounted to more than 40%, now it is 16%. In the 1990s, the history gave the United States a very rare opportunity to establish the unipolar world (merciful hegemon, etc.). The United States not only failed to use it rightly but performed a number of actions that led to undermining their leadership in the world that had seemed incontestable. The USA are doing everything in relation to their allies in the European Union to aggrandise the footholds that could originate for them in international relations: withdrawal from the Paris Agreement on climate, cessation of talks on the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a package of sanctions imposed on Russia and the biggest European transnational corporations in the hydrocarbons sector, transfer of the US Embassy to Jerusalem. The United States act in the same way in relation to Iran and that sets people against them in the Middle East and in Europe.

D. Trump wanted reconciliation with Russia to stop strategic rapprochement of Russia and China. He was not allowed to do it, the way he chose is directed against strategic interests of the United States and helps further rapprochement of Russia and China.

A. Isayev discourses in his book *Berlin of 1945* about the strategies of hedgehog and fox. I think that the United States strategy is the strategy of hedgehog: they react to a challenge like a hedgehog – trying to solve the issue with needles. And the fox strategy is characterized by adaptability, creative approach, creativity, etc. The United States have big problems with that.

The main players today are the United States with the reducing circle of allies; the European Union because after Brexit Europe has the chance to acquire its political subjectness over 5–6 years, delimit military and political functions with NATO, work out something of its own; China that will be rising higher and higher in the 21st century basing on the coalition principle; Russia with its concentric circles (Eurasian Economic Union, BRICS states); India that will show itself in the second half of the 21st century and now is waiting for its hour.

Mr. Kolodko asked what should be done. I advise not to read *The Economist* published in recent 15 years where they discuss Russia (everything is OK economically in the journal). The new Cold War is absolutely unacceptable for Russia, no one wants it. Now it's more likely that not the new Cold War but Phoney War – “strange war” is widespread, that West European countries waged against Germany till May, 1940.

Several words about Africa. I think that the second half of the 19th century took place under the slogan “Scramble for Africa” (division of Africa). That was the last region in the world not “pulled apart and taken” by empires. I think that Africa will show itself but not in the next 20–30 years, the Scramble for Africa will again take place in that period on the new spiral, and the tone will be set not by the players from that continent but external forces.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – The floor is given to a foreign member of the RAS, Professor Vladimir Lvovich Kvint.

V. L. KVINT: – The end of the 20th century was a temporary period when a bipolar system rapidly collapsed and the unipolar world was forming. But in the early 21st century the unipolar world started to transform. The demolition

of the Berlin Wall can be considered the starting point. In 1997, Helmut Kohl said to me once, “I united not two Germanies without a single shot but Europe around Germany”. This is true but it was true no longer than the unipolar world order existed. All of them were the realities of a quick shot and quickly damping global waves.

After 2010 the world order is experiencing, in my opinion, and as it often happens in objective processes, the increase of the role of the irrational in comparison with the rational. This trend is largely the result of prevailing of the momentary tactical successes and disregard for the achievements of long-term true national values and priorities. No country in the world except China has a well-grounded and consistently implemented long-term systematic strategy. Only China is carrying out a 100-year strategy and finishing to ground a 200-year one. Russia doesn't have a single integrated strategy, except numerous documents called “strategy” but their resourcing is also not guaranteed and, therefore, they are not strategies. It is not surprising that they ingloriously end their lives in the wastepaper bins. There are about 130 documents in America called “strategy” but none of them is realized practically.

In recent years, I worked at a number of projects in the Arab world: Abu Dhabi, Bahrain, Qatar. I must agree with our colleagues from the Muslim world: the active process of public consciousness rationalization is going on there and there is progress, and not only internal, about which Mr. Amr Moussa said, but in international relations as well.

I think that after 2014 a new Cold War is in the early stage of its escalation and it's not accidental that the UN Secretary-General actually announced that the Cold War had begun. I agree with that but I think that it won't be long. The world is more and more integrated, and the global world order today is substantiated by another substance that originated thanks to this global world order – the global community that is already influencing the global economy and relations and over time will influence the world even more than national communities.

If we are speaking about mineral resources, Trump's policy, using the “peace through power” strategy will lead to America's involving its enormous natural resources in economic turnover more and more, with some certain negative effect on the environment that Trump disregards (I'm not sure that he will not be elected for the second Presidential term – it is quite real). Together with the formation of the global society, a process, different by its nature – the fragmentariness of the world – is continuing to increase. First of all it is connected with the fact, that the global multinational institutions have no strategic interests and priorities. I've been a member of the Bretton Woods Committee for 26 years already and I can say that the states in the Bretton Woods system have no serious agenda as regards to the interaction with multinational institutions.

The national interests which countries are striving to realize on the international scene should be substantiated by true, deep values. And when interests are determined by momentary political structures or leaders' tactical aspiration, these are pseudointerests that die when the next political figures leaves the political arena and the world deals with shocks of different force and density. The most effective thing which can be proposed on the international agenda for mutually beneficial cooperation is working out

of several long-term strategies aimed at the realization of a narrow range of priorities whose nature demands multi-lateral cooperation: mass diseases control, ecological disaster prevention and management, fight against terrorism, drugs spreading and prevention of other threats common to humanity.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – Honoured lawyer of Russia Henry Markovich Reznik is invited to the microphone.

H. M. REZNIK: – I'm happy to be present today at this discussion: the futurological discourse about what awaits us in 100 years, in the 22nd century and even the 23rd century takes one's breath away! I won't look over the far-off horizon of today's life, because we know very little about that. Technologies are becoming more and more widespread, everything is changing very quickly, because of that, in my opinion, forecasting even what will happen in 10 years is fairly difficult.

I'll continue the thought presented by Vladimir Lvovich Kvint. The irrational has never disappeared from life. A lot is determined by established traditions, cultural legacy, national character, priorities that have been formed for a long time.

We are witnessing the triumph of individualism as the main value of American psychology in the United States: lonely hero Trump started fighting superior enemy forces, he was not even supported by his own party and won.

What are we dealing with in our country? By the way, S. Glazyev said about that in his opening speech: another demand is urgent in Russia – the demand for greatness, we have the winner complex. We had the theocratic country, totalitarian system, and basing on that the USSR successfully opposed the Western world. The regime collapsed, both economic and political simultaneously, but the demand stayed.

There were two poles in the time of the USSR, but now there is only one superpower, and the world run across unceremonious behaviour of the United States on the international scene. Did we really think that the West would accept everything that happened to the Ukraine and Crimea? I would have been happy with the annexation of Crimea by Russia had I not been a lawyer.

Now, it seems to me that it's necessary to find out a way to resolve the situation. I liked the panel discussion on the European law at the International Legal Forum. Representatives of the European Council, judges from the European Court of Justice, the Minister of Justice of Russia were present. I am following speeches by the President V.V. Putin with great hopes, the tone of his statements in which conciliatory notes can be heard.

I agree with colleague A. A. Gromyko that Russia is not interested in the Cold War. We should look for a way out of this state of affairs. It's a pity that there are no figures of such scales as Kissinger, Kohl, Thatcher on the international scene. The leaders mostly pursue the flat "tough guys" policy: everyone demonstrates who is tougher.

Currently, new players appeared on the international scene: India and China, but they are following Western trends. Traditional contrasting: a European – consumer, and an Eastern man – contemplator is put an end to because representatives of Eastern and Asian elites, people formed in

Western culture understood that poverty of the majority of the population is disgraceful. Because of that India and China show great economic success.

But what should we rely on? The international law is destroyed in a large part, mechanisms are in need of repair. It was the international law, pacts ratified by all countries, the United Nations, numerous conventions that became the greatest achievements after World War II.

Berdyayev said that the law cannot provide paradise on Earth but can prevent life's turning into hell. Because of that all countries should take care of advancing international legal mechanisms, observing international acts, the European Convention, covenants on human rights. I think that in this case we should not resign to catastrophic moods. Life goes on in struggle, contradictions, interests change, but the primacy stays – this is personal freedom and dignity. It seems to me that the civilization of future centuries should be built on that.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – Thank you, Henry Markovich, especially for the optimistic conclusion. I'd like to give the floor to Guy Mettan, who represents Switzerland, the country of ingenuous democracy, where it seems they found ways to settle all conflicts basing on law.

G. METTAN: – Thank you. I especially appreciate the analysis of Mr. Kolodko and Mr. Amr Moussa and Mr. Glazyev.

With so many things has been said so I wish to just limit my speech to two remarks. First of all I think we have not to underestimate the change of the structure of the power inside the United States government. For me, we are assisting now to big change inside the composition of the power in the United States. Until Obama, even with the Clintons, Bush the first and second, the Clintons and Obama we had the coalition of neoconservatives and liberal Democrats to rule the world. It was a smart way of ruling the world and to ensure the hegemony of the United States. With Trump we have complete change because now it's not more smart, but it's the brutal use of the force to ensure the United States domination. I mean we are assisting in a new merging, in a new fusion between the neoconservatives and the populist and represented by Trump. Trump has done an alliance between the lower social classes who were rejected by the globalization, were suffering under the former stage of globalization, between this kind of people with the neoconservatives. That was the reason why he was so criticized at the beginning of for his entering into power by the neoconservatives and by the Democrats, who believe, it was changing the rules. But it is not changing the rules, it is taking measures to reinforce the power of the United States. Because if he is succeeding to make this fusion between the inside the American society, between the lower classes and elites represented by the neoconservative, America will become much more stronger than now. And for me they have some signs that it begins to be successful in that work. If you can see there are less critics from the neoconservative now against him, less critics even from the Democrats. I don't speak about the internal domestics, but on the international issues. And that's why he could just the Iranian dealer, agreement so he can sit on international agreements without lots of criticism, can change the rules in Jerusalem and everywhere, because he doesn't care about that.

With Obama was so smart, so he could not do that. So that's the first remark.

My second remark is to join Mr. Moratinos statement. I think now there is a window of opportunity to change a little bit the rules. Because the world, I mean European world, Asian world, Arab world is so shocked by this change represented by Trump, change in style, but also in the ground, that there is a window of opportunity to enter, to begin, to start a new dialogue between Europeans, between all the countries, because it this shock opens an opportunity to create the conditions for a better dialogue and to change this kind of rules. I think we have to say it is an opportunity because it will not last long time. In my view I think for instance in Europe, as I am living in Western countries, now do European countries who were very close to the United States are in deep trouble because of this change. So there is opportunity to work with European Union, especially with France, Germany not so much with the Great Britain in order to try to create a new and more equitable order. But in my view it will be a question of months and not of years, because America would be strong enough to transform its allies. In that world there is no more allies or partners, only vassals, And I think the foreign minister of economy has understood what happened to Iran – sanctions, agreement collapse because he has said we have not to be transformed as vassals, that's exactly what is on the way now if we don't react and we don't seize this window of opportunity. Thank you.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – I invite diplomat Alexander Mikhaylovich Kramarenko to come up to the rostrum.

A. M. KRAMARENKO: – I represent the Russian International Affairs Council. First of all, I'd like to remind you Dostoevsky's words, who proved convincingly in his *Notes from the Underground* that rational settlement of humans in the world is impossible – something will happen sooner or later. Exactly that is taking place now: we are watching the end game of the geopolitical situation. Later everything will develop very quickly, according to the collapse scenario, not providing for any long-term strategies. The Cold War continues in the new incarnation – what other definition is possible if one leading power is imposed on sanctions by another? Surely, this is war already: economic, financial, etc. The new Cold War is much more serious than its previous stage that ended with the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

It's necessary to mention one important aspect: no one offered us to come to an agreement about anything, never – they forced their will upon us, and we could either accept it or not accept. Naturally, we did not accept. Possibly, it was exactly this stand of the West in relation to Russia that led to distortions of our domestic development. Many people acknowledge that the current course not liked by the West is to a large extent the result of the Western policy towards Russia.

On the whole, it's required to proceed from the fact that there are fundamental shifts taking place in our environment as well as destructions inevitably connected with them. We as well as other countries will get our share of "fragments and wreckage", and we have to soberly assess the future prospects already now. I think that sovereignization will be more and more developed – the majority of is-

suues of both home and foreign policy will be solved within the limits of each country individually. This process was initiated by the United Kingdom and the United States – they are now destroying the system, which they established themselves but which no longer satisfies them.

Another variant is self-destruction of empire. German and Japanese empires were defeated in the course of World War II, and now the last one is dying – the global empire of the United States: it can only be self-destroyed as war against it is impossible. These are the processes of historical development, something like that was witnessed in history not once. I think that when the last empire disappears, the very role of superpower will be annulled, and the multipolar or polycentric world will function. But as Lenin said in his time, first of all it's necessary to disperse to national apartments. And the Americans will be self-isolated but from the position of strength like they increased their forces in Iraq in the past in order to withdraw from there.

The transfer of the American Embassy to Jerusalem and the withdrawal from the Iran international nuclear deal will lead to something like that. To put it differently, they will finally destroy their current standing in the international community that in essence started breaking from the moment the Cold War ended, and will be quietly self-isolated. The previous generation of conservatives such as Jim Kirkpatrick and Irving Kristol said (however before the disintegration of the Soviet Union) that it was high time for America to become a normal country. But then the Soviet Union disintegrated, and everyone was carried away by the illusion of unipolarity. The problem is that America has never been a normal country. This should be taken into account, and it's necessary to get ready for manifestations of its inadequacy. I think that political will is to play the decisive role for our country in the next few years, will in general – in the sense put in the notion by Schopenhauer.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – The floor is given to researcher from the University of Cambridge Chokan Laumulin.

Ch. T. LAUMULIN: —I'll speak in English if you don't mind. Unlike the previous speaker I would like to pay attention to the rational side of our being i.e. science and technology. Apart from the nuclear shield and the nuclear parity, global nuclear parity, a fragile one, we can see that one of the reasons why the world hasn't yet slid into the global confrontation, is the interconnection of the technology chains. Unlike before in the past, possibly today there is no a single technological product which would be produced in one country. Everyone is aware how vulnerable Russia may be in the light of these new sanctions imposed. But Russia in turn can create a mirror response and I will give you two examples. In the United States, the leading segment of the US space programme, Atlas-5, is totally run on the Russian engines, which is the RD180. On the other hand, Russia, Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan constitute up to one third of the uranium supply for the US which in turn makes up to 20% of total electricity supply of the US. In a new war the collateral damage would be so huge that nobody is going to benefit from it. Once energy is concerned I believe that Russia can contribute a lot into the development of research of non-silicon electronics or superconductivity which is promising a new revolution in energy. In ad-

dition, as been mentioned by Irina Abramovna earlier, once cobalt is concerned, more than 100,000 tons of the global production is coming mostly from Africa. Russia produces if I'm not mistaken around 5,000 tons a year being second after Congo. Cobalt is the most important part of the lithium batteries and is important for energy storage. Already the mankind is facing demand, so what is propagated in mass media about this smart phones and electrical vehicles market growing, it is not likely to happen because the demand for cobalt has already exceeded the supply. And Russia has significant reserves, it's number four after Congo, Australia and Zimbabwe, but it would be impossible to increase the production without the development of the research base. The same is relevant for many more various industries. Unfortunately what we see in the whole post-Soviet space is the destruction of research. As a great man who is still called in Cambridge as superhuman, Pyotr Kapitsa, and who was both Cambridge and Soviet physicist, engineer and enlightener, he was born here in Kronstadt. He always emphasised that the most important sources of the global influence in the modern world are science and culture. Thank you.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – The next to speak is our guest from Turkey Egemen Bağış.

E. BAĞIŞ: – I am the former European Union Minister and Chief Negotiator of Turkey. Thank you for giving the floor. First of all I have to mention that Turkey is a member of G20, so we are a globally skilled economy, we are a founding member of most of the European institutions and a candidate for the EU membership for more than 50 years and we have been a member of NATO for the last 66 years. Turkey is a bridge. Turkey is the most eastern part of the West and the most western part of the East. And that's what we do best. As I mentioned we are in NATO and we have the second-largest military after the United States within NATO, but our trade with the Russian Federation is twice our trade with United States which is our most significant ally within NATO. Turkey is situated in such a situation that we are a European country, an Asian country, a Middle Eastern country, a Caspian country, a Balkan country and Mediterranean country and a country of the Black Sea and the Caspian regions at the same time. So we have to serve as a bridge. But I disagree with my good friend honorable former Secretary General of the Arab League Dr. Amr Moussa, because he tried to portray my president, President Erdogan, as someone who's supporting the Muslim Brotherhood. First of all President Erdogan is not a member of the Muslim Brotherhood, quite the country, he left his former party which supported Muslim Brotherhood and establish his own political movement. And every election since 2002 he has increased his votes vis-à-vis the Turkish public opinion. So he must be doing something right in Turkey, that people are reelecting him over and over with higher percentages of votes. He started with 35% of the vote and today it seems like he has 55% of the vote, so he must be doing something right with the Turkish people. However one has to keep in mind that he's not having the best time of his life right now, he is confronted with so many challenges at the same time. I wish we had the neighborhood of Switzerland for example, the same neighbors. But our neighbors are quite difficult and there are conflicts in almost all of our

neighbors. We faced several coup attempts, illegal judicial coup attempt at the end of 2013, a military coup attempt in July 2016, we are fighting with DAESH. So those who falsely claim that Turkey is supporting these radical Islamic movements are quite wrong, because we have killed more than 3000 ISIS and DAESH members in the last three years and most of those people who are talking about the fight against terrorism have not even spent a penny. Our country is facing challenges, we are being attacked by these terrorists and we are faced with a new generation of our generation terrorist organizations called FETO. These guys infiltrated in the last 50 years into our system, into our judiciary, into our military, into our diplomacy and have established schools in more than 160 countries. We spoke about currency here, if I want to send hundred dollars from here to Istanbul that money has to go to New York has to be cleared with central reserve and then go to Istanbul. But these guys have been playing with funds in 160 countries in 1800 schools. Someone had to give them a green light not only for money transfers but also the attempt to overthrow the democratically elected government through undemocratic means. So claiming that Turkey is just trying to play around and pressure the opposition is a baseless allegation. No Turkey's trying to do self-defense and we want to continue doing what we do best. We want to be a bridge as the former capital of the Roman Empire, as the former capital of the Byzantine Empire and the Ottoman Empire and I think Istanbul today is a Eurasian capital. Istanbul is the most European city of Asia and the most Asian City of Europe. We want to be a hub of peace and stability and I hope we can be of help to solving these problems. Thank you for giving me a chance to share my thoughts.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – The floor is given to academician Robert Iskanderovich Nigmatulin.

R. I. NIGMATULIN: – Colleagues, I listened to all speeches with great interest, and they brought about my positive response and understanding. But in my opinion the problem is that you first of all list various changes that should be brought into life in our country for economy's upsurge, including introduction of progressive taxation, deoffshorization – and then you say that it's impossible to realize all that and offer to focus and be guided by China. It may be right, but first of all we have to understand our place in the today's changing world. Everyone occupies the place he deserves by his strength, power, skilfulness, capabilities. We lost many previous technologies and the saddest thing is that we are not taking any efforts for their restoration. Meanwhile the United States are building aircrafts – and the whole world is flying either on Airbuses or Boeings. They are making iPhones – and all of us are using them. They have a powerful industry, they even started producing their oil. Because of that they will survive and establish themselves in the role they determine for themselves. The same refers to Europe as well. Yes, surely, the previous role of great powers will reduce, they will be forced to retreat and be outshined by the East, first of all China. And what about us? Unfortunately, we are incapable of producing anything. For example, we can't make cars ourselves – we mostly assemble them from foreign component parts. We can't make gas turbines. They are assembled in the Crimea from Siemens parts. And gas turbines increase

the efficiency of fuel's use by 40%. Iran mastered production of gas turbine blades – and this is the high-tech sphere. And we have no possibilities for anything like that. All our hopes are on the nuclear bomb on which we are sitting like on a powder keg. Surely, no one will conquer us because of it, but the world will just bypass our fortress and go on, and we'll stay with our old technologies.

We go on destroying our education. I did not comprehend that in the past, but now managers of enterprises tell me about the professional level of engineers. It's awful! The sector science has been destroyed, everyone has known that for a long time, but fundamental science is already being methodically destroyed now. I am afraid that if that continues, we'll serve as a bridge for high-speed railways between China and Europe, and we'll service these railways as we now service trade in new equipment and machinery, etc.

In this connection there is the problem of the Russian Academy of Sciences, in which there are many flaws and drawbacks left from the Soviet times. Then it often could not determine the main trends and courses in technology development, made big mistakes as it does now. The contemporary academic public should comprehend that there are many problems in the development of our country and all Russian civilization, and look at themselves very self-critically and then activate their operation. Unfortunately, the leaders of the country are unwilling to contact representatives of the academic community. This is another problem, and we should insist on being listened to – not necessarily agreed with in everything, but at least helped to arrange an expert discussion of our key problems, first of all, the low level of domestic technologies. When we were at the top, professionals working out the nuclear bomb in the United States gratuitously shared their know-how with us. And now we are not looked upon as equals. This is assisted by our way of life in general, first of all giant stratification of the society into the rich and the poor. All these issues require deepest understanding. The thinkers should comprehend their vices, the vices of their Motherland and engage in their extirpation much more actively than it is taking place now.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – Colleagues, I offer not to deviate from our topic – this is international conflicts and not domestic. I invite Valery Alexandrovich Chereshev to speak. As a representative of the academic community, he may object to something Robert Iskanderovich said or add something to his speech.

V. A. CHERESHNEV: – Dear colleagues, I'll say a few words about the aspects that we have not touched upon yet. Resources and struggling for them, currency emission are important. But it seems to me that formation of the personalities of statespersons including leaders of states is very important from the point of view of science in general, and medical and biological science, which I represent, in particular. We need politicians of Bismarck, Lenin, Roosevelt scales with all their merits and faults. In their time, the United States led by President Truman drew up the Trojan Plan that made provisions for unleashing nuclear war against the USSR, and only the nuclear parity built up by our state allowed to avoid it. But diplomacy is a no less important power than nuclear weapons. Bismarck, whom

I already mentioned, was a good diplomat, and when he was an ambassador to Russia in the middle of 19th century he not only learnt Russian, but also understood a lot about our country. In his memories he wrote, that he had been most impressed by the different meanings of the word "nichego" in cases when "normal" is meant. [Russian word "nichego" can be translated as nothing, all right, so-so, passable, not bad, not too bad, never mind, it does not matter, there is no getting out of it – translator's note.] "What is the weather like today? – Nichego". "Is the meat good at the market? – Nichego". "Is water warm in the Neva? – Nichego". He could not understand the meaning of this "nichego" for a long time – until his carriage overturned on the road to Berlin, and the coachman after pulling him out said, "Nichego: the master is alive – and that's fine". After that he ordered to engrave "nichego" on his silver signet ring, and when he spoke in the Parliament, he often looked at it and repeated, "Gentlemen, only do not make sudden movements in direction of Russia: the answer will be unexpected and most likely inadequate".

What kind of leader is required for Russia? Let's review this issue from the psychomedical point of view. First, he/she should be an even-tempered, lively sanguine person without choleric bursts or melancholic fits. Second, he/she should combine creative and rational types of thinking. Extraverts turned to the people are more preferable than withdrawn introverts thinking up something for themselves, without consulting anyone. Next: he/she should be a good family man/woman. The family makes the person level-headed and composed, and helps the dynamics of creative life. Educated person basing on science is better.

I'd like to add some words referring to changes in the academic field. I've already spoke about that at the Plenary Session and I'll repeat once again: the present reforms underrate historical process of development of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Our Academy was the fourth academic society established in the 17th – 18th centuries after the Royal Society of London, French and German Academies of Sciences. And ours was the only state academy. Now they want to turn the RAS into a club of scientists like elsewhere. But it was built on completely different principles! And our universities developed differently from European universities. How is it possible to turn the state property into a scientists' club? The whole system was being established for almost 300 years, and now all the institutes via which it had been functioning till nowadays are taken from the Academy. And now, as the Federal Agency for Scientific Organizations is liquidated, the institutes will be probably subjected to ministries – and that transfer will take two years only to draw up new papers, but in essence everything will be useless again as the rift between institutes and the Academy stays.

In short, a large-scale and urgent correction of the reform is required.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – Valery Alexandrovich, thank you for your professional medical diagnosis. We still wish for it not to lead to the fatal outcome. Colleagues, I suggest to return to our main topic and give the floor to Mr. Juan Antonio March.

J. A. MARCH: – Thank you very much. Well, I will try to be as synthetic as possible. One main issue here is

the United States now are doing whatever they want and this is affecting us. Well, the main point is that we have to take into account that the United States, they have organized themselves well. They have a political system that works, it is 45th president, they have 54 states organizing such a way that they can choose the president and they have organized world economy. So we should take that into account and the point is how we, how we organize world. That is the main issue. As far as this is based at here, Russia, and European Union is concerned, I think that we have to take into account the sentence of Amr Moussa that the past is the past and we have to go for a large Europe. Why? Because for Russia is not interested in this partnership with China. It is sad to say but the Chinese economy was six times smaller than the Russian economy in 1960. Today it's five times larger. There are 200 million Chinese living only at 30 km of the frontier between China and Russia, there are only 13 million Russians living at 3000 km from the frontier. So the big partner for Russia is Europe, not China. Because if the big partner is China in a very peaceful way you will have in 10 years that the managers of all the biggest sorts of all these shops in this Asian part will be Chinese. Look what is happening in Venice, it's fully flooded with Chinese, so for you, the Europeans are very safe. And for us the Russians are very necessary. So that is the first point.

The second is, that the eastern part of Europe – Poland, Hungary, Czech, etc. – they have to forget the difficult story with Russia. And Russia has to forget how difficult the European Union has been with the ambition of Russia. We have to go for a new space in Europe that will transform us, again, in a very promising space. Russia has all that Europe needs and Europe has all that Russia needs. So we have to be clever as the Americans are, we have to be clever and we are not going to go to... against any other space, we have to be strong again, lively again, giving a project to our new generations. Remember that the new generation in Europe has no project since 25 years ago. At the beginning was the construction of Europe, then it was the construction of the internal market, then the construction of the euro, but now what is the project? Just to survive. That is not a great project for the people who are 20 or 25. And then nationalism is going up in Italy, in Spain, in France, so we have to do a big project. Together would be the largest space in the world with cities well organized, we'll have a fantastic and tremendous scientific capacity and there is nothing that is preventing that, nothing. Russia has been always involved in Europe and Europe has been always involved in Russia. So my last thinking is: please, think in ourselves, don't think that the others complicate the life and try to be smart, clever and fast and efficient. Thank you.

S. YU. GLAZYEV: – The floor is given to Hans Köchler, Ph.D., from Austria.

H. KÖCHLER: – Thank you. I have two points on the general debate and one factual remark. Human nature will not change anytime soon – not in hundred years, not in a thousand years. So, the basic challenge in international relations is how to channel, or regulate, aggressive tendencies, namely the desire to aggressively assert one's interest at the collective level. As far as the notion “hybrid war”

is concerned, which was so often mentioned here, I would say that, in structural terms, this method of warfare is nothing new. War always has been hybrid, and had to be hybrid if those who pursued it wanted to have a chance of success. They did use all non-military means available, such as disinformation, propaganda, and so on, and they always made use of what we nowadays call “intelligence services”. That tactic would only change when – God forbid – nuclear arms are being brought into the equation. Under conditions of the use of nuclear arms – should ever a leader consider this as last remaining option – all other aspects of warfare, including so-called “hybrid war,” will become irrelevant.

I would like to make a second point – and I apologize for the telegraphic style, but there is no other way because we are short of time: The maintenance of peace in the way it was envisaged in 1945 is not possible anymore. The United Nations system of collective security has become obsolete because it is based on the assumption that the five great powers from the end of the Second World War are its guarantors and will, to that end, cooperate as equals. This joint responsibility was given as justification for their special privilege under the UN Charter, namely the veto right. The assumption was that they would act in a spirit of cooperation and would not abuse their privilege. Self-restraint is important, in that regard, because the veto makes any of these five countries virtually immune in terms of the international use of force. Such an arrangement, however, can only work if there is a balance of power among those countries, i.e. if the power of the others can deter any of the five members from abusing the privilege. At present, there is no such balance of power anymore. That is why the United States felt free to invade Iraq, why they now feel free to launch unilateral attacks in Syria whenever they deem it appropriate; I shall not go into any further details. My point simply is – and I agree here with the moderator of our session, with what he initially said – that under such circumstances the only rational alternative for leaders in all the countries that are not part of the global power establishment is, for the time being, to *coordinate* their strategies and policies so that gradually new centers of power will emerge as part of a *multipolar* constellation.

Finally, allow me to make one factual point in response to what Secretary-General Amr Moussa said – for the historical record, so to speak. I think it is of relevance here as far as debates about the secular state and the developments in Egypt are concerned. When President Erdogan, at that time Prime Minister of Turkey, paid an official visit to Cairo during the presidency of Mr. Morsi, he said in a public speech (and this is not a literal quote; I can render here only the meaning): ‘Please distinguish between state and citizen. The *individual* citizen may be Muslim or Christian or of whatever confession; but the *state*, the Republic, is neither Muslim nor Christian. The state is *neutral*.’ I well remember the response Prime Minister Erdogan got right away in the Egyptian media, also from the part of the Muslim Brotherhood (again, this is not a literal quote): ‘Do not interfere into our affairs, that's not your business; do not try to give us advice.’ So, President Erdogan understood the problem, but unfortunately his advice was not heeded. Otherwise, things might have gone differently in Egypt. Thank you.

S. YU. GLAZYEV: – Dr. Jerzy Wiatr, you are given the floor.

J. WIATR: – Let me start with saying that I fully agree with what ambassador March said a moment ago, particularly about the need to rebuild close links between Russia and European Union. Rebuilding Europe of course will be the difficult process particularly because of the strong anti-Russian, russophobic attitudes in parts of the European Union, unfortunately including my own country Poland. However, this is a very important task for both sides.

My second point is that I respectfully disagree with the view voiced here several times about the new Cold War. I do not believe that what we are now in is a repetition of the cold war. The cold war in its essence was an ideological struggle for the future of mankind. This is no longer the case, what we face now, to put it briefly, are the consequences, three main consequences of the way in which the cold war ended. The first is the hegemonic ambitions of the United States, something that has been criticized by many, but particularly by Zbigniew Brzezinski, whom I had the honor to know for more than 50 years and who certainly was both – an American patriot and very good specialist in international relations. Second, the second consequence is the way in which the cold war ended, was the way in which the Soviet Union was dissolved without preparation out of the sudden and leaving a number of unresolved problems, like for instance in the relations between Russia and Ukraine, Russia and Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan etc. etc. These problems will be solved, I hope, in the process of political negotiations, reaching compromises and so on. And finally there's a number of international issues which are remnants of the cold war, like for instance the Middle East crisis, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, etc. These are important, they create danger for the world peace, they create an atmosphere which is, well, difficult to live in, but they are not a repetition of the cold war.

So at the end I would say the following. We as intellectuals can influence international relations in two ways. One is as advisors, some of us are or have been advisors or even politicians, and we're able to make our own impact. But the other role is more, so to say, natural for the intellectuals, it is as educators. Education is a long process and of course education does not bring immediate results, but it is a way of changing the way in which people, both common people and politicians, see the world. And my last point is that many problems arise from the way in which people misperceive the relations, see the dangers where there are not, see enemies where there are no reasons of animosity etc. etc. So in this way dialogue which these meetings are all about are so important, not only for intellectual satisfaction, but also for contributing to making world a little better. Thank you

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – Thank you very much! Education is very important, you, as the Minister of National Education of Poland know that very well.

The floor is given to Professor Robin Matthews.

R. MATTHEWS: – Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I am delighted to be present at this prestigious conference and to have the opportunity to speak briefly in this session, summarising the longer piece that I sent earlier in the year. I am a professor at RANEPA in Moscow also in London.

Listening to what's been said I've heard a lot about competition, but I've heard very little about empathy, if anything at all. That's the first thing.

Second is Tolstoy and War and Peace. He writes about Napoleonic delusions. Napoleon thinks he is directing the invasion of 1812, but in Tolstoy's view, he is a puppet of tiny interconnected instances, which produce, cumulatively, all events in the world.

Which leads to third, interdependence, connectivity and empathy in business and international relations instead of competition. Maybe we live in a Darwinian interlude, focusing on competitive advantage.

And a fourth to think about; the consequences artificial intelligence. Steven Hawking saw AI as possibly the greatest threat to homo sapiens. But AI, AI+, and ever greater machine intelligence may divert humans, from seeking competitive advantage. They are out-competed. And introduce the sacred and empathy into public affairs.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – The floor is given to a representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation Rinat Zhafyarovich Alyautdinov.

R. Zh. ALYAUTDINOV: – Coming back to the topic of conflicts, it should be reminded that their reasons are numerous: social inequality, imperfection of state institutions, ethnic and inter-confessional contradictions, fighting for resources and surely the legacy of the colonial past. However, the today's geopolitical environment itself makes resolving of most contemporary conflicts difficult. Methods of crisis management, which the West considered universal, are no longer working. This is first of all evident in case of the Security Council – the international body that according to the UN Charter is responsible for peace and security on the globe. Did the Security Council manage to extinguish many conflicts recently? Is there a constructive dialogue in the Security Council when it attempts to settle some or the other conflicts? These are mostly rhetoric questions as you know the answers to them.

Unfortunately, we are often witnessing the following picture recently: domestic crises originating in various countries for objective reasons are inflated enormously, including because of interference of external players, and that, I can mention in passing, is a violation of the UN Charter. And so a country is at first threatened, then they start pressing it in every possible way. Most often the most odious variant is used – one-sided sanctions.

Various theoretical computations referring to humanitarian catastrophes, oppression of the minority by the majority, infringement of human rights, necessity to urgently take measures to protect civil population are quickly adjusted to fit the case. And finally they start speaking about "humanitarian intervention" within the promoted now in the United Nations the so-called concept of the Responsibility to Protect (RtoP). A coalition of states is formed, often bypassing the UN Security Council, and it decides what actions to take in relation to this or that country – i.e. it actually takes upon itself its functions. Can the Security Council operate efficiently in this environment? There are enough examples: Yugoslavia, Iraq, overthrow of the authorities in Libya, etc. Surely, suchlike actions lead to devaluation of the international law, weakening of multilateral institutions and at the same time increase of importance of mili-

tary power, which is recently mentioned more and more often, and which is now viewed by some countries as nearly the only effective guarantee to promote their interests and provide security.

Speaking about the necessity of international dialogue, I'd like to emphasize once again what we have been repeating for many years already: this dialogue should be honest, open and, most important, equal. We are ready to discuss any issues. But how can we discuss them when we are presented ready-made decisions instead of discussion? For example, our relations with the European Union developed successfully till a certain moment. I worked in Brussels in the middle of the 2000s and was one of those who worked out four "roadmaps" for further cooperation. It was an excellent prospect. What happened later? The European Union refused strategic partnership with Russia and froze practically all official forms of cooperation and high-level contacts. For our part we are ready to resume everything at any moment. We are ready for a pragmatic, open and equal dialogue. Addressing our colleagues from Poland present here and answering their remarks, I'd like to say that relations with Poland were always especially important for Russia. We hope very much that our dialogue and cooperation will continue. But first of all stop at least destroying monuments to Soviet soldiers. They do not deserve it. We may have different interpretations of the World War II events, including those that took place in Poland, but this is the matter for historians. We should not wage war against the past, let us look to the future.

And the last thing as a comment to some of the speeches. Yes, it's necessary to support and develop the system of the international law. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia values the European Convention on human rights, continues to work together with the European Court of Human Rights. As for China, about which one of the previous speakers said that this country is devoted to Western values, I would still advise to study the final documents of the last Congress of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – The floor is given to Professor Dmitry Valentinovich Mosyakov.

D. V. MOSYAKOV: – Thank you for the opportunity to take part in the discussion. I have two small clarifications and a short comment to previous speeches. I'll give the first clarification as an expert in oriental studies: the experience of the European Union does not spread to the whole world. Surely, it is taken into account – first of all, the ASEAN may serve as an example. It's clearly said in the Association's documents that exactly the experience of the European Union within going along the way of integration is the "roadmap" for it. Setting up the ASEAN community planned for the nearest future is carried out fully and completely within the limits of the paradigm pointed out by the European Union. But at the same time, I agree that China is completely different. Its main values are not in conformity with the consumer society, they are based on the Xiaokang principles supposing first of all control of consumption by the state and social justice also supported by the state. These are very important principles on which the future development of the Chinese society is built. That is, they do not set the goal to achieve consumption level "as in the Unit-

ed States", instead of that the average level of consumption for residents of the country is calculated. And finally a small comment. It was said a lot in the previous speeches about the necessity and ways to change the today's state of affairs in the world. But my colleagues and I, studying South-East Asia and the South China Sea in particular, are seeing barriers that originate on that way all the time. For example, Rosneft oil company started drilling oil wells in the Red Orchid field. It is of a great interest to us, we have an oil refinery built long ago in this region, there is a market, there is an oil pipeline, they brought a platform from the Far East. But now the situation of 2013 is repeating, when there were tough announcements from the Chinese side about the prohibition of this development. All our offers of the talks, prospects of joint developments were met with a definite refusal. More than two million square kilometers were announced a part of the Chinese territory, and they are not speaking about anything else. Repsol also tried to drill there but China actually drove everyone from there – the Spaniards, the Indians. At the same time, there are mutually advantageous relations developing between us and China, and I think that with this background our interests should be somehow taken into account in such local situations. This is a two-way street. We, on our part, are providing China with all kinds of support starting from joint Russian-Chinese exercises in the South China Sea and up to our, it seems to me not very right reaction when the Chinese put their drilling platform in Vietnam's territorial waters. Everyone protested then, Vietnam waited for our support, but unfortunately there was none. It turns out that the right theoretical and strategic setups are in contradiction with originating in reality conflicts and disagreements that are necessary to resolve. Thank you.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – The floor is given to a corresponding member of the RAS Alexey Vladimirovich Kuznetsov.

A. V. KUZNETSOV: – First, coming back to the discussion of conflicts, I'd like to emphasize that they can be of a different level and different nature. Sometimes even regional latent conflicts grow into international-level conflicts very unexpectedly for many observers. We saw that in particular in the Ukraine. As a result there is a dilemma for Russia: to have its own active stand referring to all those conflicts that may in prospect acquire international dimensions, or focus only on some of them, the most important for us? What should our role be, for instance, in those local conflicts and clashes, the examples of which were given by the previous speaker: Vietnam and China, India and China, and the like?

If we are choosing the first variant – to form and maintain our attitude to all conflicts all over the world, we have to be ready to numerous dangers. First, we are risking to return to the time of the Cold War, because our stand in most cases will not coincide with the stands of other, stronger players, and that will annoy them. Second, that will bring about the necessity to present higher demands to ourselves, including at the level of the strategy of foreign policy as all conflicts are more or less interlinked, and we'll have to coordinate our attitudes to various conflicts. But on the other hand, that will require stimulating economic and humanitarian research in the country, because it is really necessary to expand the analytical course to some regions of Africa,

Asia and Latin America. There is another very important aspect: it's not constructive just to announce one's attitude to this or that conflict. It is constructive to look for permanent or at least temporary allies in the current issues, and that is hardly possible if we take a strictly anti-American or pro-Chinese stand. We should solve the matter for ourselves – and at the same time try to get an honest answer to it from the Europeans – how productive and long-term can the dialogue with the European Union be? Though there are other “power centers” that originated not long ago – Brazil and China, but exactly the European Union suits Russia most as a strategic partner.

And in conclusion I'd like to say about the role of cultural barriers in resolving conflicts. There is no doubt that Russia is ready for the international dialogue, but the matter is if we understand to the end how the public opinion is formed in Western and Central-Eastern Europe. How strong are the cultural barriers between us and our partners from the EU? It's often said here about manipulating the public opinion, widespread in the West, but it turns out that those who are manipulating know which levels to press, and it is only left for Russia to feel annoyed that it again did not manage to present its point of view to Western partners. Because of that such things should be seriously thought of, and first of all we have to answer to ourselves what we really want. Unfortunately, we still can't come to a consensus even inside the country, to say nothing about the international level. Our participation in certain three or four big international conflicts is mostly reactive: we are not planning our foreign policy either for ten year or even one year ahead. This state of affairs should be changed.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – The floor is given to Mr. Hughes de Chavagnac, Consul General of France in St. Petersburg.

H. de CHAVAGNAC¹: – Yes, Hugo de Chavagnac, General *Consul* of France here. We heard this morning a wide range of viewpoints and some very grim ones with the idea of this new cold war which is a perspective or might even have started, and it reminds me of the play of the French playwright Jean Giraudoux called “*The War of Troy will not take place*” – actually, at the end of the play of course the war of Troy takes place, but I think we are in the opposite situation. Because I don't think the new cold war actually in action and I don't even believe that it will be in action, though it's true that there are very real worries about a number of issues and I think one of the most pressing ones is the issue of the cyber security, cyber sphere. It's very unregulated and it's very difficult to define rules of the game for that specific sphere, but I think that everybody has an interest in that. So we can be hopeful that there will be ways found. And beyond that the elements of inter-

dependence in our present world are much stronger than they have ever been. So we have the environment and of course because US has just gone out of the Paris agreement we might be a bit pessimistic, but what we have to see is that *there are the other countries which have all decided to remain in the Paris agreement*, which in itself was a fantastic achievement and an unprecedented level of international cooperation on the so-called global issues. And I believe that the US will have to come back to some kind of participation in the agreement sooner or later anyway, because the issue is too pressing to escape it. Then there is the issue of terrorism, it might not be actually as some say an existential issue for the world, but it's clearly something very unacceptable for all our societies and a very good reason to cooperate. And then there is, last but not least, the economy and I think that of course there are real elements of competition in the economy, but that has always been the case, that's not new. Actually, geopolitical competition is not *new* either, but *on the other side* there are very strong elements of interdependence – *first of all* if we speak of the most important single relation in the world in economic terms and actually, more and more in geopolitical terms, which is the relation between US and China. It's very clear that the trade war would be devastating for both actors. And beyond the saber rattling and tough negotiations which might be starting now I don't believe that we are going to go *towards a full trade war* now. And I don't think we are back to the 30s either, because the situation is very different in terms of economic interdependence. So, as we say in French, the worst is never sure, first, and second, I would add, beware of self-fulfilling prophecies because, speaking of cold war, all the time we tend to accredit *that it's going to take place, it's more likely to take place*. This makes it a more real prospect and I don't believe that it's a good idea. Thank you.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – The floor is given to Professor from Iceland Valur Ingimundarson, Ph.D.

V. INGIMUNDARSON: – Thank you. I just want to second here what has been said about the notion of a new Cold War. I think it's misplaced to use the term to describe the current geopolitical condition; the Cold War was much about ideology, especially in the first phases, before it became a question of the stabilization of a geopolitical bipolar system. We are not dealing with an ideological contest today. As has been mentioned here, for example by Kolodko, the West is split at the moment in many ways. And it's not only a rift between America and Europe, which, however, does not have to last after Mr. Trump leaves office, but also within Europe itself, where political identities are now being tested with the rise of populism and ultranationalist politics of exclusion. And then we should not, I think, overestimate Trump's power at the moment. Despite his shameless unilateralist actions, he has not managed to reshape, in full, the American foreign policy elite, take over the Republican Party or forge a lasting alliance with parts of the working class, as was suggested here earlier. And we have to make a distinction here between the white working class, from which Trump draws some support, and Hispanic and Black working class elements that oppose him. In addition, I'm not so sure that there is a grand American strategy to drive a wedge between Chi-

¹ Consul General of France in St. Petersburg (since 2017). Worked in the Ministry of International Cooperation and Development of the French Republic (Paris, 1987–1992), European Commission (1992–1995), Direction of Economical and Financial Affairs of the Ministry of International Affairs (Paris, 1995–1998), as a Second Councilor in the Embassy of France in Russia (Moscow, 1998–2001), in the Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations (Brussels, 2001–2005), as a Counsellor to the President of Romania on European issues (Bucharest, 2005–2007), in the General Secretariat of “Livre Blanc” Commission on foreign and European policy of France (2007–2008), as a Director of international and European affairs in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of France (Paris, 2009–2010), Councilor on cooperation and culture and Director of the Institute of France in Russia (Moscow, 2010–2013), in the Direction of enterprise and international economy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of France (Paris, 2014–2016).

na and Russia. I think the Americans are now far more preoccupied with the strategic competition with China in its own right. Finally, I want to make a point here, because there has been some mentioning of the need for more empathy and cooperation regimes in our discussion of global problems. Specifically, I want to point to one region in the world where such a state of affairs exists. That's the Arctic. It is a stable region where there is cooperation between Russia, America, Canada and other stakeholders. The current Arctic governance regime is based on international law, the UN Law of the Sea Treaty, with the Arctic Council functioning as the main regional body. There is a complete acceptance of this political order, both by outsiders and insiders. There is also an understanding among the Great Powers, notably, the United States and Russia, that the Arctic should not be treated as a geopolitical conflict zone. This lesson should not be forgotten in a time of international tensions, unilateralism and Great Power proxy wars in other parts of the world. Thank you.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – The floor is given to Professor Petr Petrovich Tolochko.

P. P. TOLOCHKO: – I have no illusions that the today's (and future) world can resolve international conflicts. It has never been so mellow before. The goal of the global community is to not let these conflicts come to armed clashes between the main power centers, because that may have catastrophic consequences for the whole planet in the environment with the nuclear arsenal. Surely, these power centers are mainly responsible for not allowing such development of events, but this responsibility should be shared by

the whole global community. It should not rely on the prudence and good sense of “the great”, but should actively assist in lessening international tensions to the best of its abilities.

Unfortunately, this does not happen always and everywhere. Some states in the grip of historical grudges for the past, not only fail to help the peaceful process but in essence are doing everything for it not to be. In this case I mean new members of the European Union and NATO – Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Romania and others that regularly escalate tensions and instil fear, assuring their older allies in evil intentions of Russia, in its nurturing plans of their conquering. The said states see saving from the “Russian threat” in military contingents of the United States and NATO and are yearning to call them to their borders. At the same time, they solve domestic economic problems getting financial aid from the collective West.

In essence, Russophobia turned for them in the means for the life of ease. The United States and old Europe willingly respond to worries and anxiety of their new allies, as a result of which a trouble hotspot is formed by the Western borders of Russia, and that does not promise anything good either for “young Europeans”, or Russia, or the European world on the whole. It's not obligatory, it's absolutely artificial and had the listed countries been more responsible to the future and more ethical in international relations, there would not be such a hotspot of tension at all.

S. Yu. GLAZYEV: – Dear colleagues, here our discussion ends. I'd like to thank everyone who spoke today for their openness, professionalism, positive constructive dialogue.

INDEX OF NAMES

Abramova I. O. 17, 200, 227
Akayev A. A. 21, 196, 215, 219
Alyautdinov R. Zh. 25, 192, 238
Aziz Sh. 28, 209, 210, 228
Bağış E. 30, 198, 212, 235
Bebler A. 32
Bülbüloğlu P. 37, 208
Chavagnac H. de 240
Chereshnev V. A. 40, 199, 236
Dell'Ambrogio M. 45, 193
Desgardins B. 46
Dimitrov I. D. 185
Dutkiewicz P. 49
Fituni L. L. 52, 224
Glazyev S. Yu. 56, 222
Gromyko Al. A. 59, 207, 211, 212, 231
Gromyko An. A. 59
Guseynov A. A. 61, 217
Gusman M. S. 65
Hajiyyev G. A. 67, 194
Harputlu M. 68
Ingimundarson V. 69, 240
Kleiner G. B. 72
Kolodko G. W. 75, 207, 211, 225
Konev V. A. 80

Köchler H. 83, 199, 237
Kramarenko A. M. 87, 216, 234
Kudelin A. B. 89
Kuznetsov A. V. 92, 203, 239
Kvint V. L. 95, 200, 232
Laumulin Ch. T. 100, 197, 234
Lebedeva L. F. 102
Lektorsky V. A. 104, 197
Lewis R. 107, 230
Lisitsyn-Svetlanov A. G. 110, 205
Littlejohn G. 113
Makarov V. L. 116, 196, 224
Maksimov A. S. 195
Mamontov V. K. 201
March J. A. 118, 201, 236
Markov A. P. 121
Matthews R. 123, 238
Melikhov A. M. 125
Mettan G. 128, 204, 233
Mironov V. V. 130
Moratinos Cuyaube M. A. 133, 193, 208, 212, 226
Mosyakov D. V. 138, 239
Moussa A. 209, 211, 229
Naumkin V. V. 141, 206, 210, 227

Nekipelov A. D. 145, 215, 218
Nigmatulin R. I. 148, 192, 216, 218, 235
Oskolkov S. A. 151
Prodanov V. 153
Rastorguev V. N. 40
Reznik H. M. 156, 214, 217, 220, 225, 233
Safronov N. S. 158, 198
Sanayee M. 160, 207, 210, 213
Scholte J. A. 161, 202
Shmakov M. V. 164, 192, 215, 218
Styopin V. S. 166
Tishkov V. A. 169
Tolochko P. P. 172, 194, 241
Toshchenko Zh. T. 174, 204
Tretyakov V. T. 179, 215, 219
Vorotnikov Yu. L. 180
Wiatr J. 182, 203, 238
Yakovenko A. V. 185
Yakovets Yu. V. 21
Zapesotsky A. S. 186, 191, 195, 206, 210, 212, 217, 219

Scientific edition

THE CONTOURS OF THE FUTURE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WORLD'S CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT

The 18th International Likhachov Scientific Conference

May 17–19, 2018

(КОНТУРЫ БУДУЩЕГО В КОНТЕКСТЕ МИРОВОГО КУЛЬТУРНОГО РАЗВИТИЯ)

XVIII Международные Лихачевские научные чтения

17–19 мая 2018 года)

Выпускающий редактор *Я. Ф. Афанасьева*
Художественное оформление *А. В. Костюкевич*
Технический редактор *Л. В. Климкович*

ISBN 978-5-7621-0992-5



Подписано в печать с оригинал-макета 28.08.18. Формат 60х90/8
Гарнитура Times New Roman. Усл. печ. л. 30,25. Тираж 300 экз. Заказ № 108

Санкт-Петербургский Гуманитарный
университет профсоюзов
192238, Санкт-Петербург, ул. Фучика, 15