

RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF EDUCATION
ST. PETERSBURG INTELLIGENTSIA CONGRESS

ST. PETERSBURG UNIVERSITY OF THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

under the support of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia

DIALOGUE OF CULTURES UNDER GLOBALIZATION

DISCUSSION MATERIALS: Vol. 2
11TH INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

May 12–13, 2011

*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*

*The conference, originally called 'The Days of Sci-
ence in St. Petersburg University of the Humanities
and Social Sciences' is the 19th in number
and the 11th in the status of the International
Likhachov Scientific Conference*

The project of 'The International Likhachov Scientific Conference'
was implemented in 2011 under the support
of the Interstate Foundation for Humanitarian Cooperation
of the CIS member states



St. Petersburg
2011

Scientific editor of the discussion materials of Plenary Session

A. S. Zapesotsky, Chairman of the Organizing Committee of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation, Artist Emeritus of the Russian Federation

Editor of the English language edition

S. R. Abramov, English Chair of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philology), Professor

Recommended to be published by the Editorial and Publishing Council
of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences,
minutes No. 15, dated from 30.06.11

Д44 **Dialogue** of Cultures under Globalization. Vol. 2 : Discussion materials of the
11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, May 12–13, 2011, St. Petersburg : SPbUHSS, 2011. — 56 p., il.

ISBN 978-5-7621-0636-8

The volume includes the information on discussions at the Plenary Meeting and the Round Table ‘International Dialogue of Cultures and Nation-States’ of the 11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference that took place at St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences on May 12–13, 2011 in accordance with Vladimir V. Putin’s Presidential decree ‘On Perpetuating the Memory of Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov’.

In their speeches the participants of the Conference touch upon topical issues of dialogue of cultures under globalization.

Among the participants of the Conference were outstanding domestic and foreign scientists, academicians and corresponding members of the Russian Academy of Sciences and the Russian Academy of Education: A. D. Nekipelov (the Russian Academy of Sciences, Vice-President), O. T. Bogomolov, A. A. Guseynov, V. A. Lektorsky, V. L. Makarov, M. L. Titarenko, A. O. Chubarian, N. P. Shmelyov, A. A. Gromyko, G. B. Kleiner, V. V. Mironov, M. B. Piotrowsky, N. D. Nikandrov (the Russian Academy of Education, President), A. S. Zapesotsky, and others; heads of Academy’s institutes and research centres; well-known political and public figures, representatives of creative intelligentsia: D. A. Granin (writer), V. Ye. Churov (CEC Chairman), G. M. Gatilov (Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation), A. L. Safonov (Deputy Minister of Healthcare and Social Development of the Russian Federation), H. M. Reznik (lawyer), and others.

The collection contains the transcripts of speeches of eminent historians, lawyers, economists, diplomats from different countries of the world; among the foreign participants at the Conference were Jorge Sampaio (High Representative of Secretary General of the UN at the Alliance of Civilizations), Felix Unger (President of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts, Salzburg, Austria), H. Nassar (First Deputy Minister of Culture, the Arab Republic of Egypt), M. I. Ilolov (President of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tajikistan), M. Ye. Shlapak (Vice-President of the Academy of Sciences of Moldova), Yu. Shemshuchenko (Academician of the Ukrainian National Academy of Sciences, Foreign Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences), M. Tili (Director of the New York University Centre for Dialogues), and others.

Volume One of the *Proceedings*, containing papers from 85 participants, was published previously.

The Conference was highly appreciated by President of the Russian Federation D. A. Medvedev: ‘I am certain that your meetings will henceforth promote humanistic values and ideas. And the initiatives set forth at the Conference will become a significant contribution to improving international and inter-confessional relations.’

ББК 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 PRESIDENT
OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION
DMITRY MEDVEDEV
TO THE PARTICIPANTS
OF THE INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV
SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE**

**To the hosts, participants and guests
of the 9th International Likhachov Scientific Conference**

Dear friends!

I should like to welcome you on the opening of the 9th International Likhachov Scientific Conference. I wish all the participants success and fruitful and prolific discussions.

Your reputable forum has always been a remarkable event, gathering the world intellectual community. Its brilliant discussions and reports on various topics, such as: the role of culture and humanities in people's contemporary life; partnership of civilizations and others arise great interest and deeply affect public life.

A remarkable event in the course of this year Conference has become introduction of a special youth programme 'Likhachov Forum for High School Students'. I have no doubt that establishing ethic and moral norms with the generations to come demands studying fundamental works and scientific heritage of academician Likhachov whose humanistic ideas have eternal context.

I should like to express my hope that the suggestions and recommendations elaborated within your conference will contribute practical activities and assist in long-term international humanitarian projects development.

I wish the participants and guests of the conference all the best.

President of the Russian Federation

D. A. MEDVEDEV

May 13, 2009

**To the participants and guests
of the 10th International Likhachov Scientific Conference**

Dear Friends!

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

This forum traditionally brings representatives of scientific and arts communities, famous politicians, and experts from Russia and all over the world.

This year the Likhachov Conference is devoted to one of the today's key issues, establishment of global culture and preservation of national identity.

Today, with convergence and interpenetration of cultures it is important to preserve original traditions, languages, lifestyle, and spiritual and moral values of the folks as a basis of cultural diversity of the world in the time of globalization. I hope you enjoy interesting discussions and fruitful communication, and wish good luck and success to the senior pupils who are participating in the Competition 'Ideas of D. S. Likhachov and Modern Age'.

President of the Russian Federation

D. A. MEDVEDEV

May 12, 2010

**To the participants and guests
of the 11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference**

Dear friends!

Congratulations on the opening of the Likhachov Scientific Conference, which has brought to St. Petersburg prominent scholars, figures and experts on culture from more than 20 countries of the world.

You are about to discuss some key humanitarian issues of the contemporary age, the main of them being the development of the dialogue of cultures. The current Conference's special feature will be an opening of the unique exhibition of Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov's works, which will be of interest to both the participants of the forum and a wide audience outside. I am certain that your meetings will henceforth promote humanistic values and ideas. And the initiatives set forth at the Conference will become a significant contribution to improving international and inter-confessional relations.

I wish you every success and fruitful work.

President of the Russian Federation

D. A. MEDVEDEV

May 11, 2011

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

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.

V. Putin

President of the Russian Federation

May 21, 2001



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.

V. Putin

President of the Russian Federation

May 20, 2004



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.

V. Putin

President of the Russian Federation

May 25, 2006



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 Sergeyeovich 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.

V. Putin

Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation

May 22, 2008



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!

V. Putin

Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation

May 11, 2010



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 Sergeyeovich Likhachov, which is as relevant and significant as before.

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

V. Putin

Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation

May 5, 2011

WELCOME ADDRESSES TO THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE 11th INTERNATIONAL LIKHACHOV SCIENTIFIC CONFERENCE

*Ladies and Gentlemen, dear participants of the Likhachov Scientific Conference,
Welcome to St. Petersburg — the native city of our outstanding fellow countryman, Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov!
For many years now St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences has been home to this prominent
Forum of scientific and social importance.*

The present Conference is devoted to such issues as multiculturalism and national states, potential and borders of cross-cultural dialogue in post-industrial society, philosophy of globalization, social and legal issues of modern world order. These issues have become burning problems of today; and we understand that many conceptions and approaches, relevant and efficient a while ago, need to be critically revised and improved.

Let me express my firm belief that Russia, with its huge historical experience of a multinational state, will remain a prominent player to solve global problems and to efficiently develop integration processes on the globe.

Dear participants of the 11th International Likhachov Conference, I wish you every success! Enjoy the Conference!

Chairman of the State Duma of the Russian Federation

Boris V. GRYZLOV

May 11, 2011

To the participants and guests of the 11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference

Dear colleagues,

Welcome to the 11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference!

For a number of years this Conference has been a forum for outstanding foreign and domestic scientists, teachers, figures in politics, culture and arts. The Conference is an important gathering to discuss the most topical modern issues. The distinguishing feature of the Conference is its interdisciplinary approach, its openness to the most sensitive and controversial problems of today, and also its invariable humanistic emphasis.

Likhachov Forum for High School students has become a legitimate integral part of the Conference. It is my strong belief that high school students' knowledge of Likhachov's works does not perpetuate the memory of the scholar, but also has a very strong educational impact.

May all the participants have most successful work, absorbing communication and creative progress!

Minister of Education and Science of the Russian Federation

Andrei A. FURSENKO

To Alexander S. Zapesotsky, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Congress of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia, Chairman of the 11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference Organizing Committee

Dear Alexander Sergeevich,

On behalf of the Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation, I congratulate the host, participants and guests on the opening of the 11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference.

The Conference is a vivid proof of academician Likhachov's ideas being alive, active and developing.

Dialogue of cultures, integration of diverse cultures within a common communication domain is a truly noble target. The absence of dialogue causes conflicts. Activities of figures of arts and science who have gathered at this Forum promote a crucial incentive — immersion in a unique world of every people, its studies and propaganda. I strongly support the idea that a true self-expression of each ethnos and a dialogue between diverse civilizations may only be achieved through culture.

The Likhachov Scientific Conference makes a valuable contribution to the development of contemporary dialogue of cultures. May the participants of the Conference have arresting work and success.

Minister of Culture of the Russian Federation

Alexander A. AVDEYEV

May 3, 2011

**To Alexander S. Zapesotsky, Chairman of the 11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference
Organizing Committee, to all participants and guests**

Dear Conference's participants and guests,

On behalf of the Ministry of Health and Social Development, I congratulate you on the opening of this remarkable forum, famous both in Russia and abroad.

Globalization puts forward an overall interdependency among countries in all spheres — politics, economics and culture. The more people in the world are deprived of decent life conditions, the more vital problems the whole international community faces.

It should be noted that over and over again the Likhachov Scientific Conference devotes much attention to social and economic issues: social and labour disputes, migration issues and social protection. The Conference's distinguishing feature is its complex approach to the studies of dialogue of cultures and partnership of civilizations.

I strongly believe that this forum will make a substantial contribution to the solution to modern topical humanitarian problems. My best wishes to you, success and fruitful discussions!

Minister of Health and Social Development of the Russian Federation
Tatyana A. GOLIKOVA

**To the organizers, participants and guests
of the 11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference**

Let me express my warmest welcome to the host, participants and guests of the 11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference!

Born on the millennial cusp, your forum has become an influential gathering to exchange opinions on a wider scope of global concerns for the humanity; it has also become a constituent part of common effort to establish a shared view on the contemporary age.

Today, more than ever, maintenance of optimal balance between cultural and civilizational identities and their openness to dialogue and mutual enrichment is a highly topical issue. It is obvious that at the present critical stage of global development we need a renovated scheme for international relations. Such scheme should take into account contemporary dramatic changes — not only in politics, economics and finance, but also in a social and cultural domain.

I am convinced that the quest of such vital issues will further harmonize relations between states, based on approximations and interpenetration of economies and cultures in the context of shaping a new polycentric worldview. My best wishes to you, success and fruitful discussions!

Foreign Minister of the Russian Federation
Sergey V. LAVROV
May 12, 2011

**To the participants and guests
of the 11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference**

Dear participants and guests to the Conference,

For many representatives of intelligentsia worldwide, the International Scientific Conference, commemorating academician Dmitry S. Likhachov, has become a chance to exchange opinions on topical issues of today. Every year fruitful discussions at the Conference attract considerable interest and cause wide public response.

It is with great respect and appreciation that I take works and honours of Dmitry S. Likhachov, outstanding contemporary scientist, philologist, historian and philosopher. Academician Likhachov's fundamental works have been recognized as classics of philology. He wrote scientific works and articles on the widest range of issues of history, literature, culture and protection of cultural and historical heritage monuments.

I believe that a dialogue of scientists, politicians and public leaders will make a foundation for making important practical decisions.

I wish the participants and guest fruitful discussions and constructive solutions, targeted at strengthening of mutual understanding among nations.

Minister of the Russian Federation for the Affairs of Civil Defence,
Emergency Situations and Disaster Relief
Sergey K. SHOIGU

**To the Organizing Committee, participants and guests
of the 11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference**

Presidium of the Russian Academy of Sciences congratulates the participants of the 11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference and also expresses confidence that your forum will witness, as before, fruitful discussions and will further develop humanitarian ideas.

We are living in the time of change: when not just details and specificity, but some basic concepts for the development of humankind are being challenged and revised. The quotas of technical and scientific knowledge of the nature and of the use of natural forces for the welfare of mankind are hard to overrate. However, Russian scientists have always attached exceptional importance to the humanitarian knowledge — a key element of spiritual culture. With every urgency of economic, environmental, social, national and state problems, the issue of cross-cultural dialogue is exclusively vital, because culture makes up an ideal spiritually meaningful component of human existence. Outside culture, science and engineering become senseless and turn into a source of danger.

You, participants of the Conference, are trying to answer numerous questions that progress puts forward to culture. In this respect, it is difficult to overrate the meaning of your Scientific Forum, devoted to the vital problem of understanding ways, resources and content matter of the dialogue of cultures and civilizations.

Likhachov's ideas on integration of science come true through the gathering of domestic and foreign scientists in different fields, of political and public figures, representatives of creative intelligentsia and journalists. Such representative forum is also a sign of wide international interest in Likhachov's ideas.

May all the participants work successfully for the sake of education and culture of Russia and the rest of the world.

President of the Russian Academy of Sciences
Yury S. OSIPOV
May 6, 2011

To the participants of the 11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference

On behalf of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia, I express my warmest welcome and congratulate you on the opening of the 11th International Scientific Forum, named after a prominent Russian thinker and citizen, academician Dmitry S. Likhachov.

The number of scientists, politicians, diplomats and cultural workers from many countries and from different regions of Russia, who are interested in Likhachov Scientific Conference, is unprecedentedly vast. This fact pleases me considerably. It is with great satisfaction that the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia, a founder of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, witnesses a growing prestige and scope of the Likhachov Forum. This year the University welcomes a true élite of the Russian and world humanities and culture. St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences is famous for its diverse scientific and pedagogical activities. It is also a leading centre of Russia for the studies of Likhachov's creative writings and topical humanitarian issues of the contemporary world, also connected with trade unions and their history. We are especially proud of the progress of the SPbUHSS new department — the faculty of conflict studies, which trains experts for economics and social sphere.

The Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia takes a keen interest in the agenda of the Conference, devoted to the dialogue of cultures in the context of globalization. In the contemporary context when relations between workers and the capital are getting worse, it is necessary that all reasonable people of the world follow principles of international solidarity and strengthen mutual cooperation and unity. Thus, social partnership and mutually rewarding dialogue are a matter of principle for the trade unions of Russia.

I wish the participants fruitful work and further progress!

Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia, Chairman
Mikhail V. SHMAKOV

**To the Organizing Committee
of the 11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference**

The theme of the 11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference, 'Dialogue among Cultures in the Context of Globalization,' carries special meaning for UNESCO.

The Organization was created in 1945 to build peace through cooperation in education, science, culture, communication and information. Our Constitution declares that if wars start in the minds of men and women, then it is in the minds of men and women that the defences of peace must be built. Ignorance of each other's ways, and prejudice against the 'fruitful

diversity of cultures' are identified as causes of mistrust, tension and conflict. The world has changed since 1945, but this mandate remains as relevant as ever.

Globalization has opened unprecedented opportunities for understanding, contact and exchange. At the same time, new questions are emerging about how to manage the deepening diversity of our societies. Increasing contacts has been accompanied by heightened anxiety from individuals and communities facing new pressures. In a context of economic austerity, it is vital for public policy to build new platforms for understanding and respect. Globalization covers the world, but it starts at home — it must begin with finding new ways to deepen understanding between peoples and to live together.

Promoting cultural heritage — from monuments, natural sites, and works of art, to intangible heritage, cultural industries and cultural expressions — lies at the heart of UNESCO's work. The Organization has developed groundbreaking international legal instruments — including the 1972 World Heritage Convention, the 2001 UNESCO Universal Declaration on Cultural Diversity, the 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage, and the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. At the operational level, UNESCO leads innovative projects to promote better understanding as the basis for respect and dialogue. The Silk Road, the Slave Route and our General Histories provide strong examples of this work. In 2010, UNESCO led the International Year for the Rapprochement of Cultures, which set the framework for more than a thousand activities across the world, involving young people and heads of state.

In all of these activities, UNESCO relies on close cooperation with our Members States and with partners in civil society and the academic community. In this respect, I wish to pay special tribute to Professor Dmitry Sergeevich Likhachov, the founder of this cycle of conferences. I congratulate also the organizers of the Likhachov's conferences and the University of St. Petersburg for their vision and efforts in mobilizing the international scientific community to explore pressing contemporary issues.

I wish you every success in your debates and look forward to your conclusions.

Director-General of UNESCO
Irina BOKOVA
May 12, 2011

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 Sergeevich 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 Sergeevich Likhachov' No. 587, May 23, 2001).

The co-founders of the Conference are the Russian Academy of Sciences, the Russian Academy of Education, St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, of the Congress of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia (founders: J. I. Alferov, D. A. Granin, A. S. Zapesotsky, K. Yu. Lavrov, D. S. Likhachov, A. P. Petrov, M. B. Piotrovsky). 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: 'Education in terms of the new cultural type formation,' 'Culture and global challenges of the world development,' 'Humanitarian issues of the contemporary civilization,' etc.

Every year greatest figures of 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, A. G. Arbatov, N. P. Bekhtereva, O. T. Bogomolov, V. N. Bolshakov, Yu. S. Vasilyev, R. S. Grinberg, A. A. Guseynov, T. I. Zaslavskaya, M. P. Kirpichnikov, A. A. Kokoshin, A. B. Kudelin, V. A. Lektorsky, I. I. Lukinov, D. S. Lvov, V. L. Makarov, V. A. Martynov, N. N. Moiseyev, A. D. Nekipelov, Yu. S. Osipov, A. M. Panchenko, N. Ya. Petrakov, V. F. Petrenko, E. I. Pivovarov, M. B. Piotrovsky, N. A. Plateh, V. M. Polterovich, Ye. 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, 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. Belayeva, M. N. Berulava, I. V. Bestuzhev-Lada, A. A. Bodalev, Ye. 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, V. G. Kineliov, I. S. Kon, A. S. Kondratyev, V. G. Kostomarov, V. V. Kravevsky, A. A. Likhanov, 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, A. Ye. Busygin, G. A. Hajiyev, S. L. Katanandov, S. V. Lavrov, Ye. I. Makarov, V. I. Matviyenko, V. V. Miklushevsky, K. O. Romodanovsky, A. L. Safonov, A. A. Sobchak, Ye. 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, 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, 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, which gathers winners of the All-Russian Contest of creative projects entitled 'Dmitry Likhachov's Ideas and Modernity' from all over Russia and abroad.

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

Since 2010 the complex of Likhachov events has been supplemented with an All-Russian cultural-educational programme for senior high-school students entitled 'Likhachov Lessons in Petersburg'.

In 2001, 2004, 2006, 2009, 2010 and 2011 the hosts and participants were greeted by Presidents of the Russian Federation D. A. Medvedev and V. V. Putin, in 2008, 2010 and 2011 — by Chairman of the Government of the Russian Federation V. V. Putin.

Every year volumes of reports, participants' presentations, proceedings of workshop discussions and round tables are published. The copies of the volumes are present in all major libraries of Russia, the CIS countries, scientific and educational centres of many countries in the world. The Proceedings of the Conference are also available on a special 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 PRESIDENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION Dmitry Medvedev to the participants of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference. | 4 |
| Greetings of Vladimir Putin to the participants of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference. | 6 |
| Welcome Addresses to the participants of the 11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference | 8 |
| About the International Likhachov Scientific Conference (Information) | 12 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Plenary Session: DIALOGUE OF CULTURES UNDER GLOBALIZATION | 16 |
|--|----|

PARTICIPANTS OF THE DISCUSSION:

| | |
|---|----|
| A. ZAPESOTSKY , <i>academician and member of the Presidium of the Russian Academy of Education, President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, Head of Philosophy and Cultural Studies Chair, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor; Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Congress of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia, Deputy Chairman of the Board of Rectors of St. Petersburg universities, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation and Artist Emeritus of the Russian Federation</i> | 17 |
| D. GRANIN , <i>writer, Hero of the Socialist Labour, co-founder of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, Honorary freeman of St. Petersburg, Doctor honoris causa of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences</i> | 18 |
| A. CHUBARIAN , <i>academician and Presidium member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute for World History (the Russian Academy of Sciences), President of the State Academic University for the Humanities (Moscow), Dr. Sc. (History), Professor, Doctor honoris causa of SPbUHSS</i> | 18 |
| M. PIOTROWSKY , <i>corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Arts, Director of the State Hermitage, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor; Chairman of the St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, Chairman of the Russian Museums Union</i> | 19 |
| Ye. MAKAROV , <i>assistant of the Accredited Representative of the President of the Russian Federation in the North-Western Federal District</i> | 20 |
| Jorge SAMPAIO , <i>High Representative of Secretary General of the UN at the Alliance of Civilizations, President of Portugal (1996–2006)</i> | 20 |
| G. GATILOV , <i>Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary</i> | 22 |
| Felix UNGER , <i>President of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts (Salzburg, Austria), Professor, Dr.</i> | 23 |
| Husam NASSAR , <i>First Deputy Minister of Culture, the Arab Republic of Egypt</i> | 23 |
| A. MANILOVA , <i>Vice-Governor of St. Petersburg</i> | 24 |
| N. NIKANDROV , <i>President of the Russian Academy of Education, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Education), Professor</i> | 24 |
| L. SANKIN , <i>Professor Emeritus of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences</i> | 25 |
| A. GUSEYNOV , <i>academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute for Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Head of the Chair of Ethics of Lomonosov Moscow State University, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Doctor honoris causa of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences</i> | 25 |
| N. SHMELYOV , <i>academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute for Europe of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow), Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor</i> | 26 |
| V. CHUROV , <i>Chairman of the Central Election Commission of the Russian Federation, Professor of SPbUHSS</i> | 27 |
| V. VASILIEV , <i>corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Education, Chairman of St. Petersburg Council of Rectors, Rector of St. Petersburg Institute of Information Technologies, Mechanics and Optics (ITMO — National Research University), D. E., Professor, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation</i> | 27 |
| Xing GUANGCHENG , <i>Deputy Director of the Centre for History and Geography of Border Regions of China (the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences), LL. D., Professor</i> | 28 |
| M. TITARENKO , <i>academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute for the Far East Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow), Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation</i> | 28 |
| A. SAFONOV , <i>Deputy Minister of Healthcare and Social Development of the Russian Federation, Professor of SPbUHSS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Class 3 Active State Advisor of the Russian Federation</i> | 29 |
| Mustapha TLILI , <i>Founder and Director of the New York University Centre for Dialogues, Diplomat</i> | 29 |
| Reza SAJJADI , <i>Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the Russian Federation</i> | 30 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Hikmat KARZAI , Director of the Centre for Conflict and Peace Studies (Islamic Republic of Afghanistan) | 30 |
| V. TRETYAKOV , Head of High School (Faculty) of Television at Lomonosov Moscow State University, Editor-in-Chief and General Director of Politicheskyy Class journal | 31 |
| O. BOGOMOLOV , academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Advisor to the Russian Academy of Sciences, Honorary Director of the Institute for International Economic and Political Research (the Russian Academy of Sciences), Head of the Department of World Economy at the State University of Management, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor | 32 |
| V. MAKAROV , academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor | 33 |
| Yu. SHEMSHUCHENKO , foreign member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Ukrainian National Academy of Sciences, Director of V. M. Koretsky Institute for State and Law of the Ukrainian National Academy of Sciences, LL. D., Professor | 33 |
| V. LEKTORSKY , academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Chairman of the International Editorial Board of the 'Issues of Philosophy' journal (Voprosy filosofiji), Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor | 34 |
| Heinrich BONNENBERG , Dr. Sc. (Engineering), member of the German Society for Foreign Policy, member of the German-Russian Forum | 35 |
| V. YERSHOV , President of the Russian Academy of Justice (Moscow), LL. D., Professor, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation, Honoured Lawyer of the Russian Federation, Honorary worker of judiciary system of the Russian Federation | 35 |
| H. REZNIK , President of the Bar of Moscow, Head of the Chair of the Legal Profession at the Academy University for Law under the Institute for State and Law of the Russian Academy of Sciences, LL. M., Lawyer Emeritus of the Russian Federation | 36 |
| A. GROMYKO , corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, leading researcher at the Institute for International Security Issues of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor | 37 |
| V. MIRONOV , corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Head of the Philosophy Department at Lomonosov Moscow State University, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Honorary worker of higher professional education of the Russian Federation | 38 |
| V. MAMONTOV , President of the Editorial Board 'Izvestia' public corporation | 38 |
| G. KLEINER , corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Deputy Director of the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor | 39 |
| M. ILOLOV , President of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tajikistan, academician of the ASRT, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor | 40 |
| N. KHRENOV , Deputy Director for Research, Head of the Theory of Art Section at the State Institute for Art History and Criticism (Moscow), Professor of the Chair of the Humanities at Russian State University of Cinematography, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy) | 40 |
| A. NEKIPELOV , Vice-President of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of Moscow School of Economics at Lomonosov Moscow State University, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor, Doctor honoris causa of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences | 41 |

Round Table:

| | |
|---|----|
| INTERNATIONAL DIALOGUE OF CULTURES AND NATION-STATES | 43 |
|---|----|

PARTICIPANTS:

| | |
|--|----|
| G. GATILOV , Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary | 44 |
| Ye. ASTAKHOV , Professor of the Chair of Diplomacy of Moscow University of International Relations under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary | 44 |
| Heinrich BONNENBERG , Dr. Sc. (Engineering), member of the German Society for Foreign Policy, member of German-Russian Forum | 45 |
| T. ZHDANOK , member of the European Parliament (Latvia), President of the EU Russian-Speakers Alliance, Dr. Sc. (Mathematics) | 45 |
| V. ZAPEVALOV , Representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation in St. Petersburg, chair of the Editorial Board of 'Consul' ('Konsul') journal | 46 |
| Husam NASSAR , First Deputy Minister of Culture, the Arab Republic of Egypt | 46 |
| Armand CLESSE , Director of the Luxemburg Institute of European and International Research, Ph. D. | 47 |
| V. KUALDIN , Head of the Chair of Social and Humanitarian Disciplines of the Moscow School of Economics of the M. V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor | 47 |
| A. MOISEYEV , Head of the Chair of Private International Law of the Diplomatic Academy at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation (Moscow), Head of the International Law and International Security Centre at the Institute for Contemporary International Studies of the Diplomatic Academy at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, LL. D., Professor | 48 |
| Eberhard SCHNEIDER , Professor of Political Science at the University of Siegen (Germany), Ph. D. | 48 |
| V. SOGRIN , Head of Centre for North American Studies at the Institute for World History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Professor at Moscow University of International Relations under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia, editor-in-chief of 'Social Sciences and Modernity' ('Obshchestvennyye nauki i sovremennost') journal, Dr. Sc. (History), Honorary worker of higher education of the Russian Federation | 48 |
| Mehdi SANAI , member of Parliament of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Director of the Research Centre for Russia and Eastern Europe at the University of Tehran (Iran), Professor of the Law Institute at Tehran University, Dr. Sc. (Political Studies) | 49 |
| Xing CHANG , Director of the Department of the Institute of Community Development at the Party School of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, editor of 'Scientific Socialism' journal (China) | 50 |

| | |
|---|----|
| K. SHUVALOV , <i>Ambassador-at-large of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Special Representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation on cooperation with the Alliance of Civilizations, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary</i> | 50 |
| Souheil FARAKH , <i>foreign member of the Russian Academy of Education, Professor of Chair of Philosophy of the Department for Humanities at the Lebanese State University, Ph. D.</i> | 51 |
| Vasil PRODANOV , <i>corresponding member of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor</i> | 52 |
| A. SHAHINIAN , <i>Chief Academician Secretary of the Armenian National Academy of Sciences, Presidium member of the Armenian National Academy of Sciences, member of the American Chemical Society and the American Society for Photobiology</i> | 52 |
| Felix UNGER , <i>President of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts (Salzburg, Austria), Professor, Dr.</i> | 53 |
| M. ILOLOV , <i>President of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tajikistan, academician of the ASRT, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor</i> | 53 |
| Mustapha TLILI , <i>Founder and Director of the New York University Centre for Dialogues, Diplomat</i> | 53 |
| M. TITARENKO , <i>academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute for the Far East Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow), Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation</i> | 54 |
| A. GROMYKO , <i>corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, leading researcher at the Institute for International Security Issues of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow), Dr. Sc. (History), Professor</i> | 54 |
| M. SHLAPAK , <i>Vice-President of the Academy of Sciences of Moldova, Dr. Sc. (Art Criticism)</i> | 55 |

Plenary Session

DIALOGUE OF CULTURES UNDER GLOBALIZATION

*Andrey Petrov University Concert Hall
(St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences)
May 12, 2011*

Co-Chairs:

- G. GATILOV** Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
- D. GRANIN** writer, co-founder of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, Honorary freeman of St. Petersburg, Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences
- A. NEKIPELOV** Vice-President of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of Moscow School of Economics at Lomonosov Moscow State University, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor, Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences
- M. PIOTROWSKY** corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Arts, Director of the State Hermitage, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor, Chairman of the Congress of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia, Chairman of the Russian Museums Union
- A. ZAPESOTSKY** academician and member of the Presidium of the Russian Academy of Education, President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, Head of Philosophy and Cultural Studies Chair, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Congress of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia, Deputy Chairman of the Board of Rectors of St. Petersburg universities, *Scientist Emeritus* of the Russian Federation and *Artist Emeritus* of the Russian Federation

Speakers:

- O. BOGOMOLOV** academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Advisor to the Russian Academy of Sciences, Honorary Director of the Institute for International Economic and Political Research (the Russian Academy of Sciences), Head of the Department of World Economy at the State University of Management, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor
- H. BONNENBERG** Dr. Sc. (Engineering), member of the German Society for Foreign Policy, member of the German-Russian Forum
- A. CHUBARIAN** academician and Presidium member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute for World History (the Russian Academy of Sciences), President of the State Academic University for the Humanities (Moscow), Dr. Sc. (History), Professor, Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences
- V. CHUROV** Chairman of the Central Election Commission of the Russian Federation, Professor of SPbUHSS
- A. GROMYKO** corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, leading researcher at the Institute for International Security Issues of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor
- X. GUANGCHENG** Deputy Director of the Centre for History and Geography of Border Regions of China (the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences), LL. D., Professor
- A. GUSEYNOV** academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute for Philosophy (the Russian Academy of Sciences), Head of the Chair of Ethics of Lomonosov Moscow State University, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, Doctor *honoris causa* of SPbUHSS
- M. ILOLOV** President of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tajikistan, academician of the ASRT, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy)
- H. KARZAI** Director of the Centre for Conflict and Peace Studies (Islamic Republic of Afghanistan)
- N. KHRENOV** Deputy Director for Research, Head of the Theory of Art Section at the State Institute for Art History and Criticism (Moscow), Professor of the Chair of the Humanities at the Russian State University of Cinematography, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy)
- G. KLEINER** corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Deputy Director of the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor
- V. LEKTORSKY** academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Chairman of the International Editorial Board of the 'Issues of Philosophy' journal (Voprosy filosofiji), Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor
- V. MAKAROV** academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute (the Russian Academy of Sciences), Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor
- Ye. MAKAROV** assistant of the Accredited Representative of the President of the Russian Federation in the North-Western Federal District
- V. MAMONTOV** President of the Editorial Board 'Izvestiya' public corporation
- A. MANILOVA** Vice-Governor of St. Petersburg
- V. MIRONOV** corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Head of the Philosophy Department at Lomonosov Moscow State University, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor
- H. NASSAR** First Deputy Minister of Culture, the Arab Republic of Egypt

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| N. NIKANDROV | President of the Russian Academy of Education, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Education), Professor |
| H. REZNIK | President of the Bar of Moscow, Head of the Chair of the Legal Profession at the Academy University for Law under the Institute for State and Law of the Russian Academy of Sciences, LL. M., <i>Lawyer Emeritus</i> of the Russian Federation |
| J. SAMPAIO | High Representative of Secretary General of the UN at the Alliance of Civilizations, President of Portugal (1996–2006) |
| A. SAFONOV | Deputy Minister of Healthcare and Social Development of the Russian Federation, Professor of SPbUHSS, Dr. Sc. (Economics), class 3 full State Advisor of the Russian Federation |
| S. M. R. SAJJADI | Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the Russian Federation |
| L. SANKIN | <i>Professor Emeritus</i> of SPbUHSS |
| Yu. SHEMSHUCHENKO | foreign member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Ukrainian National Academy of Sciences, Director of V. M. Koretsky Institute for State and Law (the Ukrainian National Academy of Sciences), LL. D., Professor |
| N. SHMELYOV | academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute for Europe (the Russian Academy of Sciences), Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor |
| M. TITARENKO | academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute for the Far East Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow), Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, <i>Scientist Emeritus</i> of the Russian Federation |
| M. TLILI | Founder and Director of the New York University Centre for Dialogues, Diplomat |
| V. TRETYAKOV | Head of High School (Faculty) of Television at Lomonosov Moscow State University, Editor-in-Chief and General Director of Politichesky Class journal |
| F. UNGER | President of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts (Salzburg, Austria), Professor, Dr. |
| V. VASILIEV | corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Education, Chairman of St. Petersburg Council of Rectors, Rector of St. Petersburg Institute of Information Technologies, Mechanics and Optics (ITMO) — National Research University, D. E., Professor, <i>Scientist Emeritus</i> of the Russian Federation |
| V. YERSHOV | President of the Russian Academy of Justice (Moscow), LL. D., Professor, <i>Scientist Emeritus</i> of the Russian Federation, Honoured lawyer of the Russian Federation |

A. ZAPESOTSKY¹: — Ladies and Gentlemen, attention, please. We are starting our plenary session of the 11th International Likhachov Conference. I invite to come to the podium the Chairman of the Congress of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia, the Honorary Citizen of our city and Honorary Doctor of Science of our University, outstanding Russian writer, Mr. Daniil Granin. Daniil Alexandrovich, you are welcome. I invite to come to the podium Deputy Minister of the Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation Gennady Mikhailovich Gatilov. The next person to be invited is the Chairman of the Congress of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia, Director of the State Hermitage Museum Mikhail Borisovich Piotrowsky.

Esteemed colleagues, today we have got together here for the 19th time. The initiator of our studies was Dmitry Likhachov from the very beginning of this programme. I'd

¹ Academician and member of the Presidium of the Russian Academy of Education, President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, Head of Philosophy and Cultural Studies Chair, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor. Mr Zapesotsky is Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Congress of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia. He is Deputy Chairman of the Board of Rectors of St. Petersburg universities.

Author of more than 1550 scholarly papers and essays on the problems of culture, education, mass media, trade-union movement, social and youth policy, international relations. He is a script-writer and film-director for more than 30 popular-science films and for more than 300 shows on Russian television. Member of the board of Russian Children's Foundation, member of editorial boards of the journals: 'Pedagogika' (Pedagogy), 'Voprosy Kulturologiji' (Issues of Culture Studies), 'Literaturnaja Uchoba' (Literary Education), 'Filosofiya i Kul'tura' (Philosophy and Culture).

Awarded the Russian Federal Government Prize in Education, Laureate of the Gorky Literary Prize. Decorated with the Order of Friendship. Prof. Zapesotsky is holder of the Ushinsky Medal, the Gold Medal of the Russian Academy of Education. He is decorated with Leo Tolstoy Big Gold Medal of the International Association of Writers and Essayists (Paris). He is Doctor *honoris causa* of universities of the USA, Ireland and the Ukraine. Member of Paris Academy of Sciences and Arts, of European Academy of Sciences and Arts (Salzburg).

Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation and *Artist Emeritus* of the Russian Federation.

like to remind you once again that in the year 2001 President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin issued a Decree to commemorate the memory of Dmitry Likhachov. According to this Decree, the 'Days of Science', which were held here at this University, initiated by Dmitry Likhachov in 1993, acquired the state status of the International Likhachov Scientific Conference. I'd like to say that each year during the last 5 years we have gathered here approximately 1500 people. Tomorrow we will convene 7 sessions, and we will invite young scientists to this hall, and school pupils from all over the country, and also from foreign countries, students of high schools which have clearly presented their compositions, coverings and topics developed by Dmitry Likhachov. They have come to St. Petersburg, and the winners will make their presentations. I'd like to confirm that the cause of Dmitry Likhachov has a future and is viable. Also I'd like to thank all of you for participating in this scientific conference. And it is a pity that we cannot give the floor to every one of you. All participants have submitted their papers, we have published them on the Internet, and also in the corresponding Proceedings of the Conference the texts have been published. We have made an agreement here that we are not going to read out the texts of our publications. The most important thing is to speak out here personally. This is a tradition. The speech should last 5 minutes, so please try to organize a discussion, and please do not read out the text of your publication. Once again, today we have a plenary session. The time limit is 5–7 minutes at maximum. Please be very correct, and don't get offended, because if you exceed the time limit of 7 minutes then I will have the authority to stop you. We have 233 papers, and we have here 38 members of the state academies of science, 24 research institutes, 73 universities are present this year. We

have a group of 24 top journalists, including 10 leaders of our main scientific magazines. We also have here foreign guests from 26 countries. We have outstanding writers, and representatives of art, literature, science and of the state bodies. Again, do not be offended. Tomorrow we will take part in the workshops with representatives of the scientific community. The session will last for approximately 4 hours. So tomorrow we will have another session to speak in detail covering the topic of each session. In the programme we have listed all the sessions, the definitions, the premises. So I think everything has been done in order to provide the conditions for all the participants. Now I'd like to add that everything which will be spoken here and tomorrow at other sessions will be recorded. The transcript will be published and presented to speakers. We also welcome written papers. The maximum volume of publications will be up to 10,000 characters. So, please, after the sessions, during a month you can submit additional texts in written form, which will be published in the second volume of the Proceedings. The Organizing Committee asks you to stick to the topics outlined by the Organizing Committee. I'd like to wish you successful work.

M. PIOTROWSKY: — *The floor is given to a writer, Mr Daniil Granin.*

D. GRANIN¹: — This is the 11th Likhachov Scientific Conference. During these years it has become a tradition of this university. We take it as a need of our social life. The Likhachov Scientific Conference invites more and more representatives of different groups of intellectuals from different areas of life. These conferences become more and more interesting as I see them. The time we live in evokes general concern, but this concern will somehow exhaust itself. We have to think about the tasks, not only about our concerns, but about the methods with which we would be able to solve the tasks facing us. We need to get new ideas for our intellectual part - scientists. We expect that they will suggest new ideas and partly put them to practice. I'd like to say that I'm aware of the difficult work which is needed to serve our scientific goal. This work has been fulfilled by the Organizing Committee headed by Alexander Sergeevich Zapesotsky. On behalf of the participants of the Conference I'd like to thank the University, the Organizing Committee and personally Alexander Sergeevich. Also I'd like to say that the part of our society present here is, in my opinion,

¹ Writer, Hero of the Socialist Labour, co-founder of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, Honorary freeman of St. Petersburg. Mr Granin is the author of books: *Iskateli* [Those Who Seek], *Idu na Grozu* [Going Inside a Storm], *Eta strannaya zhizn'* [This Strange Life], *Klavdiya Vilor* [Claudia Vilor], *Bloknadnaya kniga* [The Blockade Book] (in co-authorship with A. Adamovich), *Kartina* [The Picture], *Zubr* [Bison], *Begstvo v Rossiyu* [Escape to Russia], *Vechera c Petrom Velikim* [Evenings with Peter the Great], *Intelegendy* [Intelegends], *D. A. Granin – Universitetskkiye vstrechi. 33 teksta* [D. A. Granin – University Meetings. 33 Texts], *Prichudy moyey pamyati* [Quirks of My Memory], *Kak rabotat 'geniyem* [How to Work as a Genius] [collection], *Mesto dlya pamyatnika* [A Place for a Monument], *Skrityy smysl* [A Hidden Meaning], *Vse bylo ne sovsem tak* [Everything Was a Little Different] and others. Member of the Public Chamber of the Russian Federation.

Laureate of State Prizes of the USSR and Russia, the Russian Federation President's award in the field of literature and art, St. Petersburg Government Prize in literature, art and architecture, Heine Award, Daniil Granin is decorated with the Order of Lenin, Order of the Red Banner, Order of the Red Banner of Labour, the Order of the Patriotic War of the 1st Class, the Order of Friendship of Peoples, the Order for Services to the Fatherland (3rd degree), Service Cross (1st degree) — Officer's Cross (FRG), the Honorary Badge of the Order of St. Andrew and others. Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences.

one of the most serious assemblage of representatives of what we call intelligentsia. Intelligentsia has been blamed a lot. There are various disputes around it. But probably in this very difficult period of time we have to play a more important role, because much depends on us. As the poet said: 'We live without feeling the ground beneath our feet.' And Mandelstam is right. In many cases we fail to feel the calamities which can be dangerous, which make the Earth tremble. We walk this Earth but we don't feel it. We have to feel this danger and this concern. Moreover, we have to do something, to do what is necessary to do. Because only talks, only criticism and only our words will not resolve any problem. I wish our Conference every success.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Daniil Alexandrovich. I invite Mr Alexander Chubarian, academician and member of the Presidium of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute for General History, President of the State Academic University, Doctor of History, professor and honorary doctor of our university.*

A. CHUBARIAN²: — Esteemed colleagues, for me, as well as for everyone sitting here, it's a great joy and happiness to be here. We have become accustomed to the fact that in May every year we take part in this Likhachov Scientific Conference. We have to plan our daily work in such a way so that we could take part in this Conference. Alexander Sergeevich said that we are not here to speak about culture in general terms and about the heritage of Dmitry Likhachov, but we have to examine the events which happened during last year. I think this year gave another confirmation of a vision expressed by Dmitry Likhachov that the phenomenon called culture will keep getting stronger. This is evident in our country, and this is also felt in the whole world. Last year there was great concern that in our country there was a decay of morality. Everywhere we hear discussions around moral values. There are polemics around a national or a European identity, and culture is seen as one of the most important things. Finally, at the end of the previous year we heard statements by the leaders of the countries of the European Union about the old world where everything seemed to be very stable, sustainable, with these long-standing European traditions. All of a sudden they met with problems of multiculturalism. I think because of that we are obliged, not

² Academician and Presidium member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute for World History (the Russian Academy of Sciences), President of the State Academic University for the Humanities (Moscow), Dr. Sc. (History), Professor. He is the author of more than 300 scientific publications including 11 monographs: *Mirnoye sosushchestvovaniye. Teoriya i praktika* [Peaceful Coexistence: Theory and Practice], *Brestskiy mir 1918 g.* [The Brest Peace of 1918], *Yevropeyskaya ideya v istoriyi. Vzglyad iz Moskvy* [The European Idea in History, 19th-20th centuries. A View from Moscow], *Istoriya XX veka. (Novye metody issledovaniya)* [History of the 20th Century: New Methods of Study], *Istoki tsivilizatsiyi* [Sources of Civilization], *Zapadnaya Yevropa i SShA* [Western Europe and the USA] and others. A. O. Chubarian is managing editor of periodicals *Yevropeyskiy al'manah* [The European Anthology], *Rossiya i Baltiya* [Russia and the Baltic States], *Tsivilizatsiyi* [Civilizations], *International Social Sciences* journal, *Cold War History* international journal. He is Editor-in-Chief of the journal of the International Association of Institutes of the CIS countries *Istoricheskoye prostranstvo. Problemy istoriyi stran SNG* [Historical Space. Issues of the History of the CIS Countries], Member of editorial board of *Novaya i noveyshaya istoriya* journal [Modern and Contemporary History]. He is President of the Russian Society of Archive Historians. Chairman of the National Committee of Russian Historians. President of the International Association of Institutes for History of the CIS Countries. Foreign member of Royal Norwegian Academy. Member of the Presidential Council of the Russian Federation for Science, Technology and Education. Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences.

only to continue our usual work, but to stage new questions in the realm of culture. This session has been set up in order to study world history. And the modern economic school convened a very productive congress, where they spoke about globalism, putting new meaning into globalism. They defined universalism, and what the global meaning of history is. I'd like to say that one of the few failing ideas which was emphasized by many people that said that we now have a number of things which are demonstrative of the tendencies which are present in our social life. And culture is one of the most valuable phenomena. Culture is understood in a very broad sense, not culture in the narrow sense just comprising art, literature and various poetry. Now we have to include the culture of behaviour, the culture of everyday life. And now we also have a problem of culture in our national relations, international relations between nations. Not long ago a manifest has been signed by a number of prominent people, including the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Germany. They also generated a special appeal calling to find specific means, not only for dialogue, but for adaptation of what we call a multicultural society. This will create better conditions for greater tolerance, so people will be able not only to live as neighbours, but also to intervene, to make an alloy of different cultures. Also we have to say that national cultures will survive. Nobody is going to sacrifice them. The national culture is facing obvious advantages over general education or scientific space. Here we can see a very important task to find this emphasis between the national culture and the culture of a state, culture of a region, and going up to global culture. This is the task for us to solve. Also I'd like to say that there is a problem of a contact zone of cultures. This problem is tackled by a number of organizations. We have identified these contact zones, where multicultural dialogue was held during the whole history of humankind. These zones are around the Black Sea, around the Mediterranean, around the Baltic Sea. Now science faces a new task of generalization of the role of culture in the modern world and the factor of stability. This factor will preclude the possibility of conflict, promoting further prosperity of humankind. Thank you.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Alexander Oganovich. Now I'm giving the floor to the Head of the Congress of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia, Director of the State Hermitage Museum, corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Mr Mikhail Piotrowsky.*

M. PIOTROWSKY¹: — Dear colleagues, it's a great pleasure for me to speak at this famous Conference. I've submitted an article entitled 'Two Squares, Two Museums', where I'm talking about Bagdad and Cairo, referring to the political events there. We are going back to old dialogues, old problems that used to exist 30–40 years ago. The demolition of Saddam Hussein statue is a symbolic

¹ Corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Arts, Director of the State Hermitage, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor. Author of over 200 research works; these are On the Muslim Arts, Historical legends in the Koran, Koranic legends, Supermuseum in the time of the ruin of the Empire (museum as a evolutionary factor), Muslim Arts: between China and Europe, Legend of the As'ade al Kamil, the King of the Himjara Kingdom, South Arabia in the Early Middle Ages. Establishment of the medieval society, etc.

Deputy Chairman of the Arts and Humanities Council under the President of the Russian Federation, Chairman of the St. Petersburg Intelligentsia Congress, Chairman of the Russian Museums Union, Editor-in-Chief of the Christian East Journal, Chairman of the Guardian Council of the European University in St. Petersburg.

performance. In relation to that I'd like to say that we set up the Congress of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia and we thought that nothing more had to be spoken about. We're facing different problems now. But quite recently assembling at this Conference I found out that we do have intellectuals and they only increased fleet in intellectual dialogues, in intellectual attempts to tackle different issues. And also the question is if Russia has a chance of the revival of intellectuals.

The rebirth of intelligentsia is not only contrary, but due to the challenges. Who are the most corrupted people in our country in an average man's opinion? Authors, musicians, singers, museum workers, teachers, lecturers. We are talking about these attacks on intellectuals, it's the society that is to blame. Again, in the heritage of D. S. Likhachov, the heritage of our culture, the heritage of our intellectual driving force of this culture we have to contemplate on these challenges. I'd like to speak about Japan. Japan is now in a very difficult situation in the aftermath of this disaster, but they are trying hard to restore their culture, to restore their country. When there is a great disaster people are hesitant whether to send people to the area or not. The Japanese are confident that they should send, and Japan will revive. And we have to follow this example, knowing how determined the Japanese are.

We have such problems, and we have to concentrate on them quite extensively. I would say that the first problem is totem and taboo (which has nothing to do with Freud's famous work). We have a number of totems disappeared, and now we are trying to find new ones. On the other hand, we don't have any taboos and we have to find them. We have a notion of crowd in the totemic system. Crowd is present in our society. Provocative thinking in a creative pursuit, aggression, threat, devastation (like in the case of 'WAR' art-group). We have a number of well-worked taboos. It's respect to the criteria that came about from a group of intellectuals. We understand that there are criteria that do exist among them. It's professional thinking, professionalism, and mercy. On the one hand, people don't usually give money to beggars. Maybe because beggars do not exist any longer: they are crooks in disguise. Mercy is a means that may be used to overcome different problems that do exist in the society. It's typical for Muslim countries to think that everything in the world is predetermined. It's one of the examples. Mercy and compassion – these two things are very effective and really strong in society. This is why we have to turn back to our history and look at it, see what kind of things happened in Russia.

We are going to have an Islamic conference, where we will consider how Russian culture and Islam are interrelated. We will look back to the tsarist Russia and the presence of Islam in tsarist Russia, and the role of intellectuals and science at different phases of their development. One more example of a dialogue between different cultures. In the Hermitage we commemorated the victory in the World War II and opened up an exhibition of Henry Moore's works. We brought in different sketches that were made by this artist during the World War II, the drawings of the London underground. We added to these drawing some sketches by Nikolsky that were made in the bomb-shelter. It's a kind of a world tragedy behind which the tragedy of London became invisible. Two different worlds were presented in these drawings. We try to preserve this fragility of our heritage,

museum heritage. And they are used now as reminders of our tragic events not only in our history, but in the history of the world.

Now we are announcing a Saudi Arabian exhibition. Going back ten years, starting from the trading routes and finalizing in sacred places. These historic references help us understand our interrelation and our countries. And one more theme I'd like to raise. It would be very useful for us to revive the dialogue between St. Petersburg and Moscow. We are trying to restore two faces of Russia. These two cities are very important, that is why to revive the dialogue between St. Petersburg and Moscow is very important. We are selecting what to do in the Hermitage in relation to modern art, we try to select different artists. One of them is Mr. Prigov, he was a postmodernist, lived in Moscow, but his archives are given to St. Petersburg. In St. Petersburg we will start studying his heritage. In Moscow, the author lived in the Beliaev region. Around this region architects and sociologists carried out an extensive research. It's one of the directions we are talking about, and our specific proposals for future dialogues. Sometimes people do not understand why they need to meet up, what to talk about. Sometimes this criticism should be rigorous. Thank you very much.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Dear colleagues, on behalf of the President of the Russian Federation, we have Mr Evgeny Makarov, well-known in our University and in St. Petersburg not only as a statesman, but as a public figure as well.*

Ye. MAKAROV¹: — Good afternoon, dear participants of the Likhachov Conference. In 2001 I was involved in the preparation of a decree, on the basis of which this Conference is organized. Now with great pleasure I'd like to read out the welcoming words of Mr. Medvedev, President of the Russian Federation, addressing to you:

'Dear friends, I congratulate you on the opening of the Likhachov Conference in which very highly authorized experts, scientists from more than 20 countries participate. You are to discuss the key humanitarian problems of the present day. One of them is the development of cultural dialogues. The specific feature of this Conference is the exhibition of the works of Dmitry Likhachov that will be of interest not only for the Conference participants, but for the general public as well. Your meetings will certainly contribute to popularizing of humanitarian ideas. And initiatives will become a great impact on strengthening international, inter-confessional relations. I wish you a very productive and fruitful work. Dmitry Medvedev.'

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Evgeny Ivanovich. Dear colleagues, we have a number of welcoming words addressed to our Conference. Unfortunately, I cannot read out all of them, but I'll mention them. It's the welcoming words from the President of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Mr Osipov that has repeatedly submitted his reports to the Conference. It's from the Chairman of the State Duma, Mr Gryzlov. It's from the Minister of Culture of the RF, Mr Alexander Avdeyev. It's from the Minister of Education and Science of the RF, Mr Andrey Fursenko. I'd*

¹ Assistant of the Accredited Representative of the President of the Russian Federation in the North-Western Federal District.

Chairman of the Federation of Trade Unions of St. Petersburg and Leningrad Region (1991–2000). Author of a number of publications (trade unions issues). *Professor Emeritus* of SPbUHSS.

like to say that Mr Shmakov, the Head of the Russian Trade Unions, was planning to participate, but unfortunately he had to change his itinerary, but he sent his welcoming speech as well. It's from the General Director of UNESCO, Mrs Bokova. It's from the Head of the Alliance of Civilizations under the patronage of the UN, Mr Jorge Sampaio. And a number of other greetings and welcoming words. But I'd still like to read out one message:

'I welcome all the participants of this 11th Likhachov Conference. It's a tradition to gather in St. Petersburg and invite distinguished people. It's an outstanding event in the local and international level that addresses the most burning social and humanitarian issues. The first and foremost is the development of dialogue between countries, strengthening the psychoethical foundations of society, and preserving Dmitry Likhachov's heritage that is still outstanding and important. I wish you constructive and fruitful discussions, very interesting meetings. Vladimir Putin.'

Dear colleagues, here is a video file addressed to the participants of the Conference, from Jorge Sampaio².

J. SAMPAIO³: — Excellencies, ladies and gentlemen, distinguished guests,

First of all, let me greet all the participants and express my heartfelt thanks to the organizers for the opportunity they gave me to address this conference on the topical issue of the dialogue of cultures in our globalizing times. Let me tell you how thrilled I am to share with you a number of reflections on the central issue at a time when we are witnessing important changes in some countries of the Arab world, a key region of our global village. A few days ago, in Cairo, the Alliance of Civilizations together with the League of the Arab States organized a symposium on the role of media in social transformation. This is very much about what is at stake in your countries, so allow me to recall here what I said there. Ladies and gentlemen, as a former student who led youth protests, a lawyer who defended political prisoners during dictatorship, and as an old retired politician of a country, Portugal, that also made a revolution, which we called the Carnation Revolution, to bring freedom, human rights, dignity, development, and democracy to its people I must say that I have been following the ongoing changes in the so-called MENA [Middle East and North Africa] region with great excitement and hope, but also a certain anxiety. Excitement and hope because I sense that Arab societies are at a turning point that may present a quantum leap for their development at large. But equally I feel some anxiety, because the prospect of some missed opportunities in the region is also looming large. This might put people's lives and aspirations on hold for a while. At a time when we see such great discredit of our politics emerging in much older democracies, namely in Europe, while other societies are now claiming for freedom and democracy as a way to achieve dignity and adjust to life, let me recall very briefly the Indian groundbreaking scholar Amartya Sen's vision of democracy and development, as they are quite inspiring when we think about the ongoing changes in this region.

² Transcript of a video file addressed to the participants of the Conference.

³ High Representative of Secretary General of the UN at the Alliance of Civilizations, President of Portugal (1996–2006). His area of professional interests is human rights issues and health care issues. The author of books: *"A festa de um sonho"* (1991), *"Um olhar sobre Portugal"* (1995), *"Portugueses"* (1997), as well as multiple publications on politics and culture.

In this regard, what I like most in Professor Amartya Sen's approach is his concern in rooting the discussion of democracy in the vast world, and looking beyond it, 'outside the framework of the European and American evolution', to avoid seeing it as a kind of 'a specialized cultural product of the West'. For him, democracy is, first and foremost, political participation, dialogue, and public interaction, which are fundamental for preventing sectarian violence and making the appropriate social choices to ensure development in a broad sense. For my work as High Representative for the Alliance of Civilizations, this prospect is very enriching. Against this backdrop, let me stress the need to consolidate national ownership of politics and democracy and to keep public debates focused on the demands of people for freedom, development, and justice. This is my first point.

My second point aims at underlining the fact that although each people and each country has its own particularities that make social choices and the search for justice and democracy a non-transferable work on non-exportable goods, however, we live in an interconnected world. We are all connected societies, and, furthermore, we share a common humanity. Therefore, there is also room enough for dialogue and cooperation, for exchanges and partnerships. This is particularly important at times of transition, when all stakes are open, and when sharing views and experiences can help make the right choices. So, communication is a key issue. Ladies and gentlemen, communication is the fundamental basis of human existence, be it as groups of loose individuals, or strong societies. But communication can either be a tool for building bridges between communities and societies, or a channel to fuel hate and mistrust, and ignite violence. I grew up at a time shared by newspapers, radio, and later television, and now I live during — and try to keep up with — a time dominated by the so-called social media, marked by the internet and the likes of Facebook and Twitter. But I also grew up at a time, and in a country, when and where the mass media were not free, and where we had to make a revolution to be able to have access to free speech in the media and in our lives. A lot, as you can see, has changed since the '70s, but communication, and the ability to express who we are and what we want, or simply what we don't want, is still very much on the people's agenda. And this, for one sole reason: people wish to have better lives than their fathers and mothers, and communication is a fundamental tool in that process of social change. I am recalling the basic role of communication in our lives because I believe that, in addition to accepting the role of communication in social change, we must also discuss what are the strengths and weaknesses of the kind of communication we are currently experiencing, and I mean by this networked communication, and no longer just what we learned to call mass communication. I fully believe that if we don't discuss the pros and cons of what communication is today, we will not be able to grasp fully the conditions under which it will fulfil the mission of creating ties between people and of achieving a better society, or on the contrary, when communication is contributing to fuel distrust and break up societies. Over the last years, we have witnessed social change in many areas of the world, but nowhere else has it had such an impact on our perceptions of the world and 'the other' as in the case of the so-called 'Arab Spring'. Through

the eyes of the international media, namely television, and also through social media, be it Facebook or Twitter, or the more local versions of social media, we've witnessed a vast mobilization of people towards social change. Some have called this mobilization Twitter or Facebook revolutions, but in doing so, they have in many ways forgotten that besides social media, there is social trust. I mean trust between people that technology just helps to consolidate. Furthermore, the awareness of the importance of communication with 'the other' comes before trust. I remember pretty well a conversation I had a few years ago with the late Roger Silverstone, Professor of Media at the London School of Economics, who used to insist a lot on the role of the media in shaping our perceptions of 'the other', and the need to have more different views of the world available for us in order to build a better understanding among people. In many ways, such a role has been played by satellite broadcast for the last twenty years. First, with English-speaking global channels and later with Arab, Russian, Chinese, and other languages shared by the population scattered in many different countries. Whether or not we agree with the values shared by individual broadcasters, we have to acknowledge that their existence has led all of us to perceive diversity as a common feature of human societies. This global broadcast communication changed the way we looked upon 'the other', because we were finally able, on a global scale, to see ourselves through the eyes of 'the other'. With satellite television, we all became someone else's 'other', and in doing so, I believe, we have grown as individuals and as societies because we have reached a point where 'the other' is no longer just a product of our imagination, but in fact a real image that can no longer be ignored in our thoughts. It's true that we can always choose to hate 'the other', but it's increasingly difficult to do so when 'the other' enters our living room through our television screens — and I would add particularly, if the broadcasts reach us through the values of free speech. As I have argued, trust is the fundamental dimension that enhances the possibility of fruitful communication towards the building of better societies. But, ladies and gentlemen, trust is also the foundation for meaningful institutions within our society. I mean institutions that are able to become the trustees of individual aspirations. As you have by now realized, I am talking of political institutions, be it governments, parties, associations, or informal networks with common cultural, economic, or political objectives. Dear participants, it is crystal clear that social media adds new social functions to the role of the media in our societies, and we need to explore further these new opportunities. I don't need to recall before this audience that the mass media have always been part of the public space acting as a pool of ideas and values that help people shape their identities. However, social media has given us much more than that. Social media has created a community of belonging and opened up the possibility of building one's autonomy. By this, I mean that social media allowed large groups of people to organize themselves around a common objective to be achieved. Social media allowed people to share aims and act together to achieve this goal. As my good friend Professor Manuel Castels says, we live in a network society, a society where organizations tend to develop according to network models and to be more flexible, but where they still play a fundamental role in our lives. When

looking at social media, one wonders whether the very same people who have stood and are able to stand against what they don't agree with, will also be able to join efforts in building new political institutions, institutions that probably will be more flexible than the previous ones. But these institutions have also to be the main pillars of trust and to become trustees of the political aspirations of societies towards a better future. Will this happen or not? It is still, of course, an open question. But we need to address this topical issue if we want to make full use of the opportunities provided by the networked communication focused on building trust in 'the other' and, consequently, on building trust in our societies. Without trust and the ability to communicate trust through free mediation, the future of society will always be one of deprivation, shaped by fears, and consequently lacking the ability to achieve real social transformations and bridge gaps in mutual perceptions. So I very much hope that your conference will be helpful in this regard. Before winding it up, ladies and gentlemen, let me just invite you all to join our 'Do One Thing for Diversity' campaign, to celebrate the World Day for Cultural Diversity, Dialogue and Development, on May 21. The idea is really to use this opportunity to create a grassroots, worldwide movement of people who care for diversity and are willing to take action. Our aim is to engage one million people around the world to take one action in support of diversity, dialogue, and development. Everybody is invited: individuals, institutions, clubs, education bodies, NGOs. Any 'D' action — I mean an action in favour of one of the 'three D's': dialogue, diversity, development — is most welcome. Take a look at our site (www.unroc.org) to get some inspiration. But first and foremost, be creative, and think of your own special way in which you can celebrate the World Day for Cultural Diversity on May 21, and I wish you a very good one. Thank you very much.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Dear colleagues, our Conferences during many years are traditionally held with the support of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the RF. I'm giving a word to the Deputy Foreign Minister of the RF, Mr Gennady Gatilov.*

G. GATILOV¹: — Thank you. Dear colleagues, allow me to add to this list of welcoming words to the Conference from the very high level a welcoming message from the RF Minister of Foreign Affairs, Mr Lavrov. This forum is a very respectful one for the exchange of opinions on problems that are still vital for humankind, the part of collaboration efforts of our vision of the epoch. It's very important to support the balance between cultural identity and civilization for the interchange of their cultural heritage. It is important to have a renewed model for foreign relations developed taking into account fundamental changes not only in politics, economics and financial area, but in social and cultural spheres as well. I wish a fruitful work and all the best to the participants of the Likhachov Conference. Dear colleagues, allow me from myself to add some ideas to this message from the Minister. They concern the fact how we think of

the promotion of the international interests of the Russian Federation, how we see the task for the development of cultural dialogues with civilizations. We think that the main thing now on the agenda, and you are well informed about that, is to work out a comprehensive agenda that would overcome collaboratively new challenges, new tasks that appear in international relations. And these aspects of the cultural dialogue and the dialogue of civilizations play a valuable role. We have to harmonize our relationships, because we are all in one boat. And we have to solve our common problems. Primarily, the problems of development, but the ongoing development cannot be ensured without the dialogue of culture and harmonizing civilizations, of interests of different people. And now we should not impose our own principles, but ensure competitiveness of our values. As recent events have shown, any attempts of imposing own principles will not bring positive results. On the contrary, it leads to a gap between people, to conflicts and to new problems that would have to be tackled at a different level.

The main task is to take account of the cultural traditions, moral traditions of any society. Without that the positive movement forward will not be ensured. The second problem is globalization. While bringing in positive results in one sphere, globalization, paradoxically, entails other problems and tasks in the sphere of culture and cultural civilization programs. How these positive features of globalization can be balanced with the negative impact on cultural diversity? New challenges come to the international site, Internet society, religion structures — all have their own niche in this new idea, new view. And we are trying to take it and make use of it quite actively. Cultural diplomacy has increased its importance, and from my point of view, diplomacy is a very useful tool to put forward the foreign affairs cause of our country. We will be supporting cultural diplomacy and we will back up those who are contributing to the promotion of the interests of Russia at the international level. In this respect, as far as the development of culture of different countries is concerned, the development of understanding and narrowing the gap between civilizations, a very important role is played by cross-cultural international years with Italy, Spain and China, with other countries. This work is very important to narrow the gap between the peoples who understand the cultural values that each country possesses with unique opportunities available for each nation, for each country that can be presented to the international community.

We cannot but mention such international structures as UNESCO that plays a very important role in this activity. And, as you know, the year 2010 was announced the Year of Cultures. In this respect the role of this organization is very important. Everything is happening with the active participation of the UN. In the past the activity of this organization was aimed mostly at strengthening peace and security, and it is going to do this now, but currently the focus is shifted to the area of the humanities, to the area of culture. That is why under the aegis of this organization such forums were created as the Alliance of Civilizations, as the previous speaker mentioned. And welcoming words were sent from this organization. I'm talking about that because I want to emphasize the idea that in reality the international community has increased understanding of the fact that without the dialogue of cultures, civilizations,

¹ Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. Author of a number of publications, including: *Peacekeeping UN 'Blue Berets'* ('Golubye kaski' OON na sluzhbe mira), *Results of 'The Great Gathering' at the UN General Assembly* (Itogi 'bol'shogo sljota' na Genassambleje OON), *Results of the UN Doha Forum* (Itogi foruma OON v Dohe) and some others. G. M. Gatilov is decorated with the Order of Friendship.

we cannot ensure the movement forward in all areas – in the area of development, the area of searching for the adequate ways to fight the challenges we have recently been facing, including anthropogenic and humanitarian catastrophes. All these problems will be discussed in details during the sessions that will be held within the framework of the Conference. During the discussions, many interesting ideas and words will be said. And we, as practitioners working in the international affairs area, will apply them later in our day-to-day use, first of all, to support the interests of our motherland.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Gennady Mikhailovich. Dear colleagues, I got information from the Organizing Committee that we have representatives from 11 foreign academies of science — Ukraine, Moldova, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Azerbaijan, Armenia and a number of other countries. Unfortunately during the plenary session we are not able to give floor to the representatives of all the academies, but they will talk at the workshops. So I'd like to invite Mr. Felix Unger, who is the President of the European Academy of Arts and Science (which is a partner of the Russian Academy of Sciences in the EU), a surgeon in the field of cardiovascular diseases, who was the first on the European continent to transplant a human heart.*

F. UNGER¹: — Dear Rector Zapesotsky, thank you very much for your warm words. Ladies and gentlemen, I think we all owe a big thank-you to the Rector, to Professor Piotrowsky as members of the European Academy of Arts and Science for organizing this conference. We are very pleased that we were invited and it gives me a great pleasure to say some words of greetings and share with you some ideas of what we are doing.

Ladies and gentlemen, the Academy of Science and Arts has 400 members and we are very pleased having your Rector and Professor Piotrowsky among us. But what is the main essence of our academy: ladies and gentlemen, we try to think interdisciplinary — this is a very important approach of our society and believe me, when we are electing members it's not so easy to find individuals who are capable to think interdisciplinary. Secondly, we are acting transnationally. We have a lot of nations in Europe but we are reaching out — we have members from China, Japan, Argentina, from the United States. Everywhere where we think that they can come to Europe they are going to be invited. And thirdly, we are building bridges. What is the bridge: the bridge is a way to go from one position to the other position. The deputy minister was just saying that it's a source and a form of a dialogue.

Ladies and gentlemen, we as academicians have an important draw in our society to contribute to culture. We are all a part of the whole culture and now we are starting to find new terminology in the global culture. When I was small we learnt the European culture, first the Austrian culture, European culture, now — the global culture. And it's constantly turning much more to other position therefore we need also to know what is science and what science can do.

¹ President of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts (Salzburg, Austria), Professor. A Head of University Hospital for Cardiac Surgery at the private Paracelsus Medical University. Dr. Unger was the first European surgeon to make a heart transplantation. He is honorary member of the Russian Academy of Arts. Author of works: *Cardiac Reconstructions, Coronary Artery Surgery, Coronary Artery Surgery in the Nineties, Wucht des Ganzen: Pulsstheorie statt Chaos?*

We believe that science is nurtured by three big areas — a harmonic triangle: one angle is your relation to nature, there you find natural sciences, technical sciences, environmental sciences. Another is the interpersonal relations — history, law, medicine of course, economy, trade and psychology. And then we have the third angle — that is our area where we are dealing with spiritual things: that's philosophy, Arts, and ladies and gentlemen, don't forget the world religions. Also you have to keep in mind that we should always try to keep the balance within this triangle. Why? Because the singular coming to the answer what is science in essence — science is nothing else helping you understanding your existence, managing your existence.

Ladies and gentlemen, this Likhachov Conference is now dealing with global culture and global culture is not quite easy to understand if we do not understand sometimes our own culture with own heritages. Culture, ladies and gentlemen, is not the sum of people who live in the area. So, culture is much more, is that you demonstrate which spirit you live in a certain area of this wonderful world. We know all that it's sometimes difficult, we know that we are used to having our family situation, we have our local environment, we have our state environment, we have continental in our global environment. And all this new information technology, with media we can overcome also distances, at the same time and we can share different opinions immediately. But ladies and gentlemen, Mr Piotrowsky has spoken of the European culture. What is European culture in essence — it is nothing else but our source of human rights and human rights are based on Christian values. And what are these values: nothing else but freedom, truth and love. And ladies and gentlemen, I was just saying that we as academicians can contribute a lot. Indeed, we are doing it. When we are looking for example at the marvellous results that we've achieved, when we are looking into the orbit with billions of stars, when we are looking at our own genes...

Ladies and gentlemen, what we detected is breathtaking. Why? We are all built of four simple amino-acids and all other things — how we are sitting, that we have grey hair, that we have different skin — this is only a small variation in the complete set of our genes. And so, really, I see here a basis for a global culture and I also see it nourished by Schiller who wrote that all people are akin. Ladies and gentlemen, in the beginning we spoke of a bridge. A bridge can be used for a dialogue, it's for overcoming different positions, it's geographical, it can be used for transportation. In to the hall I can see so many young faces of our future and we as fathers and grandfathers can say: Please, my dear youth, don't stop on the bridge, go across because the future is waiting for you.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Let me now give the floor to Mr Husam Nassar, first Deputy Minister of Culture of the Arabic Republic of Egypt.*

H. NASSAR²: — Thank you very much, Mr Chairman. I'm sorry I don't speak Russian, so I have to address you in English. Coming from Egypt it's a great honour to be here for the first time in Russia and attending the 11th Likhachov Conference on multicultural and intercultural dialogue. I think we are having the main

² First Deputy Minister of Culture, Arab Republic of Egypt, poet.

problem in understanding what is multicultural and what is intercultural. We've been talking about the subject for the past 20 years having so many conferences and achieving no results on the grounds. From our understanding multicultural and intercultural is trying to bridge 2 regions together. When we intersect 2 regions we are having or we are talking about dissimilarities. If we go farther from the intersection we go into similarities and then peculiarities and then differences. I think we all are falling into the trap of starting the dialogue from the farthest point of sequence instead of focusing on dissimilarities and similarities. I was listening to the honoured president of the university: he talked about regions and stepping from the regions into the globe. Regionalization has suffered a lot from Mr. Huntington. And instead of seeing the glass half-full we see it half-empty. Instead of talking about ancient civilizations he talked about divisional civilizations. We've never been like that all through history, and globalization is not a new trend, we're just speeding up the rhythm of the dialogue. We are coming up as Egypt with a new vision in order to come up with a mechanism of evoking multicultural and intercultural dialogue. It's a very simple concept by understanding our content and the content of the world and trying to segment the content and make it intercultural. If I talk about country like Egypt from a heritage point of view and from a contemporary point of view and then we are having for any subject or cultural subject matter — we are having the artistic component and the intellectual component. Working on these 4 subjects we can analyze our content and make it available for the others. In understanding the content we understand how we influence other civilizations and how we got influenced by other civilizations. If I'm talking of revolution, for example like the one we had recently in Egypt, I can relate poetry and I'm a poet as well, I can relate poetry or revolutionary or rebellious poetry with Pushkin or Nâzım Hikmet. If I want to talk of negroid movement related to Egypt or any other subject I can talk to people in their native language for their better understanding. So this is the concept with understanding our civilization how we influence others and how we get influenced by others. I'll be presenting the topic with a bit more details tomorrow and I want to use this opportunity to thank you very much.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Dear colleagues, it's a tradition that the governor, Mrs Valentina Matviyenko, participates in our Conference. Unfortunately, today at 10 o'clock a very important meeting started under the country's leadership, and she participates in this meeting. I am giving the floor to vice-governor of our city Alla Manilova.*

A. MANILOVA¹: — Dear friends, dear guests, I am welcoming you here, in St. Petersburg, in the city of unique cultural traditions. The very notion of the dialogue of cultures for the city is not just a figure of speech and abstraction, it is the way of life. In April, quite recently we held here in St. Petersburg a theatrical award. Several years ago we could not imagine that theatrical Oscar winners of the continent would come to Russia. This year it was made not only in relation to the fact that our theatres are

¹ Vice-Governor of St. Petersburg, Vice-President of the Russian Book Union, Chairperson of St. Petersburg Editorial Board, Chairperson of St. Petersburg Commission on Toponymy; conferred the Order of Honour and the Order of Merit, 4th class.

well-experienced and professional, but as a contribution of St. Petersburg, not only in initiating of the dialogue of cultures, but because St. Petersburg is the leading city in the cultural diplomacy we are talking about. Quite recently we have held the festival of the theatres of the CIS and the Baltic countries for the 13th time. We had a very important dialogue. Now countries are separated by borders, but still they preserve their love for the Russian theatrical culture. We are the only city in Europe that realises the project "St. Petersburg theatrical seasons", and the Israeli press has called it the main cultural event of 2010. This seasons would be held in the twin city of St. Petersburg — Milan. These events are large-scale, they are truly St. Petersburg events.

St. Petersburg is a very good place for a cultural dialogue. It is the intellectual level that contribute to these steps. I want to express my gratitude to Mr. Piotrowsky, and to Dmitry Likhachov for reviving the role of intellectuals that can be combined with the ideas of tolerance. St. Petersburg was created by Peter I as a multinational and multi-confessional capital, historically St. Petersburg, on the one hand, promotes the European ideas of culture and, on the other hand, multicultural ideas. These qualities were given to the city from the birth. Several years ago we had the governmental program of harmonizing international, intercultural tolerance. St. Petersburg was awarded a golden medal by UNESCO, and Valentina Matviyenko received it in Paris, for the promotion of tolerance ideas. We understand our responsibility for the fact that during globalization taking into account international problems related to multicultural factors, in St. Petersburg such notions will be preserved as St. Petersburg cultured speech, St. Petersburg style. Dmitry Likhachov wrote that hundreds of people, not being local St. Petersburg natives, adopt manners of behaviour native of St. Petersburg residents. It's impossible without the cultural level that contributes to the adoption of this style. St. Petersburg resident is not only a stamp in the passport, you have to incorporate in the cultural traditions, you have to become a part of this cultural layer, to become a St. Petersburg citizen. I wish great success to this conference and to every individual present here personally.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Alla Yuriyevna. The floor is given to Nikolai Dmitriyevich Nikandrov, President of the Russian Academy of Education.*

N. NIKANDROV²: — Thank you, Alexander Sergeevich. Good afternoon to everybody present here, according to the procedure we have I am not going to give a long presentation. Briefly I'll mention three points. First

² President of the Russian Academy of Education, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Dr. Sc. (Education), Professor. Author of more than 300 scientific papers including the following books: *Russia: Socialization and Education at the turn of the millennia* (Rossiya: sotsializatsiya i vospitaniye na rubezhe tysyacheletiy); *Development of Values: Russia's Version* (Vospitaniye tsennostey: rossiyskiy variant); *Prospects of Education Development in Russia* (Perspektivy razvitiya obrazovaniya v Rossii); *Education and Socialization in Modern Russia: Risks and Opportunities* (Vospitaniye i sotsializatsiya v sovremennoy Rossii: riski i vozmozhnosti); as well as the following course books: *General Foundations of Pedagogy* (Obschie osnovy pedagogiki, with co-authors); *History of Pedagogy* (Istoriya pedagogiki, ed.); *Didactics of Higher Education* (Pedagogika vysshey shkoly); *Organization of Teaching and Education Process at a Pedagogical Institute* (Organizatsiya uchebno-vospitatel'nogo protsessa v pedagogicheskom institute); *Introduction into the Speciality* (Vvedeniye v spetsial'nost'). Member of the Committee of the Russian Federation on UNESCO. Laureate of the Award of President and Government of the Russian Federation in the field of education.

of all I would like to express my gratitude to the university and to the head of the university. And, number two, I have to say a few words from the Collegium of the Ministry of Education and Science and from the Presidium of the Russian Academy of Education.

First of all, I participated in many Likhachov Conferences and met up with many of you. It is a pleasure and an honour to be present here. In fact, because of my duty, I have a great opportunity of communication in different scenarios, but I value the fact that here I got acquainted with many famous people whom I knew vicariously. Thanks to you, Alexander Sergeyevich, thanks to the university, for giving this opportunity to exchange opinions within the framework of this Likhachov conference. As for my presentation, I would like to speak about ideas and myths as a means of upbringing.

Talking with Mr. Alexander Chubarian, we mentioned the fact that during recent months in different European countries they have been talking about the collapse of multicultural ideas. One may just rub hands and say how they got in. It would be indecent, though. Or one may say *c'est la vie*, it's life. Everything is bad, you can't but accept this. It's the second approach. I don't like this approach either. I think Dmitry Likhachov would have approved the third approach. When we speak about the importance of the dialogue of cultures, we have to work hard to promote it by all means, and this is what makes this Conference feasible.

But the ideas of the ideological struggle have not disappeared. We are talking about the fact that ideological education exists as ever. In April last year the President said the following during the state meeting related to the support of the youth movement: "We have to support ideological education that has been abandoned since the collapse of the Soviet Union for 20 years." What does it mean? First of all, it's not just that we have to fight. But there is the need to promote the interests of Russia not only in the international area, but in educating our citizens in a proper way, in understanding specific features of our culture. In my presentation I will talk about that. I will be more specific during tomorrow's workshop.

Different myths exist about Russian alcoholism, Russian inability to incorporate democratic ideas. I would like to mention some books on Russian alcoholism, Russian cruelty, cells, prison, Russian laziness and Russian inappropriateness. These myths are blown up and incorporated as a means of education. This is the role of myth: it is far in the past. But the educational nature of myth is still retained.

What else I wanted to do while speaking on behalf of the Board of the Russian Academy of Education is that I would like to give the Ushinsky Medal to one of the honourable persons here, I mean Lev Abramovich Sankin. I got acquainted with him long ago and I think that he is one of the most remarkable persons I have ever met. I would like to note his ability to help everyone, ability to sympathize. Sometimes Mr. Sankin may be very serious and very tough, but in fact he is a really cordial person, and a very good organizer. He was indispensable in organizing this conference as well. The Ushinsky Medal is given to Mr Sankin for distinguished deeds in education.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Lev Abramovich worked for 43 years at our university and during the last 10 year he*

was the first vice-rector and participated very actively in preparing the International Likhachov conference.

L. SANKIN¹: — This is a great honour for me to receive this award from the hands of the President of the Russian Academy of Education. This should not only be attributed to me, but to the scientific achievements of our remarkable university. I am grateful to Rector Zapesotsky for creating the scholarly atmosphere that I worked in. Thank you.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Lev Abramovich. My congratulations. This is one of the most distinguished awards of our Russian Academy of Education. Now I will give a word to one of the distinguished philosophers, Director of the Institute for Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician A. A. Guseynov, doctor honoris causa of our university.*

A. GUSEYNOV²: — Dear colleagues, it's not the first time I have been given the floor here. Last year I talked here under the same rostrum. The topics of Likhachov conference is an interrelation of culture at the angle of a future dialogue of cultures. It's a very responsible theme, and it relates to the fact that together with our consideration that the very process of interrelation of culture is developing. These two aspects overlap and influence each other. In this way our consideration of interrelation of culture has existential sense, largest non-interesting consideration, but consideration that can be compared to a person what he has done during the day, what can be connected for tomorrow. After last year, since the previous conference, different events happened in the world that are very important for understanding our topic, the one that have been mentioned — an official rejection of the policy of multiculturalism that was announced by the president of France and the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany, one more event that is running parallel is another uprising in Africa and the Middle East. These events are interrelated and they give fruit to reflection. What Angela Merkel said is that I try to quote. At the beginning of the 1960s our country invited foreign workers, and now they are living here. During certain time we said that they would leave the country but this didn't happen. Our approach was related to multiculturalism that we would be living together and value our cultures, but this was not successful. We didn't want people who could not speak German, because they can't be full-fledged participants of the labour market. These are the most important ideas that Angela Merkel voiced.

I express my gratitude to her openness, to her naivety that marked very important ideas. She said that they had invited foreign workers to do the work that the Germans couldn't do and didn't want to do, because it is manual

¹ Professor Emeritus of SPbUHSS.

² Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute for Philosophy of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Head of the Chair of Ethics of Lomonosov Moscow State University, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor. Author of more than 400 publications including: *Sotsialnaya priroda нравственности* [Social Nature of Morality], *Zolotoye pravilo нравственности* [The golden Rule of Ethics], *Velikiye moralisty* [The Great Moralists], *Yazyk i sovest'* [Language and Conscience], *Filosofiya, moral', politika* [Philosophy, Ethics, Politics], *Antichnaya etika* [The Ethics of Antiquity]. Managing editor of the yearly *Eticheskaya mysl'* [Ethical Thought], editor of a series 'Biblioteka eticheskoy mysli' [The Library of Ethical Thought], editor of *Social Sciences* journal (the English edition), member of the editorial board of journals: *Filosofskie nauki* [Philosophical Sciences], *Voprosy filosofiyi* [Issues of Philosophy], Vice-President of the Russian Philosophical Society. Laureate of Russia's State Award in the field of science and technology. Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences.

work. They invited them, knowing that they would be there in a second role. They didn't think of the fact what their fate would be, they might have left, or they had to live together shoulder to shoulder, then she said that while announcing the policy of multiculturalism they demonstrated their human respect, human support via the mass media to their identity, but in fact they hoped that they would get assimilated and become a part of their society, but when they saw that it would not happen, that they did value their identity, their differences, they didn't recognize this. She said one more important thing: they could not tolerate that because the labour market, the market economy would not recognize this. For market economy we need only a single language, this is not only linguistic way. There should be people that obey managerial commands.

These are very important things she voiced. I understood that what we call the collapse of the multicultural policy is the collapse of the narrow-minded approach to the very idea of multiculturalism. In fact it's a kind of parody, if the very culture is understood as an economic reflex, something secondary to economy. The approach that in fact has been trying to be applied to foreign workers, this happened historically — this influx of emigrants — they came not because of cultural processes, not because of the cultural interaction, but because of a different logics, because of a social or economic logics. It is a different logic and the way of solution should be different as well, social and economic — that is why within the framework of cultural approach you can't solve all these problems facing the fact that it's not successful. That is why this thesis was brought up — that the multicultural policy was not successful.

I would like to bring the second factor. What's happening in North Africa and in the Middle East. Now let's look at the events which take place in Africa. Apart from new means of manipulation of people's opinion via the Internet, the uprising of common people is based on the protest, here we see those protests against social injustice, poverty. We see social motives which are the reasons for streams of immigrants from Africa to Europe. In Europe we see emigrants for economic reasons, but we see many people in Africa which are not satisfied with the dictatorship in their countries, and they have their ideas of democracy. They are trying to improve their material situation, to get a better social position that isn't available in their own African countries, but they are not happy now, because this was not the only goal, they wanted to put into practice their belief in Western values, democratic values, and they are now surprised that Western people become irritated by mosques, and the Europeans don't want to recognize that emigrants are equal to them as citizens, in their dignity and their right to live here and to worship their own beliefs and religions, the right to follow the traditions of their ancestors. Here we see a very serious collision.

All these events provoke a new approach in our cultural dialogue we have to think of the limit of the culturologist approach, we have to be more specific and more strict in description and definition of cultures and intercultural activity, so that cultural problems should not be misused as a cover for social demagogical reasons. Thank you for your attention.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *We are grateful to you, Abduislam Abdulkarimovich, and now I invite Nicolai Petrovich Shmelyov, an outstanding Russian scientist, Director of the Institute of Europe, also belonging to the State Academy of Sciences, Professor, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences.*

N. SHMELYOV¹: — This is the first time I have taken part in this conference, although I used to watch the activities of the conference with great attention. I am grateful to the organizing committee for the invitation. I have to be very short in my presentation. In certain cases we can speak about the presence or absence of intelligentsia, but this is a topic for a separate discussion.

Now let's speak about actual spiritual state of our society. We are at the stage when we face a question of "What should we do?", and gradually it becomes more and more obvious, and we know what should be done, but how should we do that? We don't have answers to this question. We spoke about upgrading, modernization, and this bloodless revolution. Yes, we have to improve our productivity and efficiency by 3 times, but how can we improve operation of the social mechanism and make it move fast? These are central problems of modern Russia. But unfortunately we think that this is not a serious problem.

There is a problem of extreme monopolism. It doesn't exist anywhere in the world. If we look at businessmen, every one of them has to have 100 or 500 per cent of annual profits; only under such conditions they would start working. Elsewhere in the world a businessman would be happy with 10 per cent of annual profit, and this 10 per cent of overall rent in Saudi Arabia or 20 per cent of oil rent in Norway is enough. We have 50 per cent of this oil rent, belonging to our top oil and gas companies. Of course, they are reluctant to be active. They invented this Skolkovo project, and think that will do.

In the '90s a disaster happened. Look at our economy. In the '90s we lost one half of our industry, we have only a half of the previous industrial potential. But we are not sure that this half will survive with a continuous operation for 5–10 years at maximum. We have to have a second industrialization; modernization is, of course, a term which is not well-defined. We have to do something new, and we are very sorry, of course, that the spiritual foundation was undermined, and mental potential now is weakening. This is our reality.

¹ Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute for Europe (the Russian Academy of Sciences), Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor. Author of over 70 scholarly publications, including books: *Prepayments and Debts. Yesterday and Today of Russia's Economic Reforms* (Avansy i dolgi. Vchera i zavtra rossijskikh ekonomicheskikh reform), *Europe Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow* (Evropa vchera, segodnja, zavtra), *Europe and Russia: An Attempt of Economic Transformations* (Evropa i Rossija. Opyt ekonomicheskikh preobrazovanij), *Europe and Russia: Problems of the Southern Region. The Mediterranean, the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea* (Evropa i Rossija: problemy juzhnogo napravlenija. Sredizemnomorje–Chernomorje–Kaspij), *International Relations* (Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya), *Threats and Predictions: On Their Adequacy* (Ugrozy i prognozy (k voprosu ob ikh adekvatnosti), *Russia in the Diversity of Civilizations* (Rossija v mnogoobrazijii tsivilizatsij) and others. Mr Shmelyov is the author of novels: *Silvestre* (Silvestr), *On My Way I Felt Unwell* (V puti ja zanemog), collections of short stories and tales: *The Upper Floor* (Poslednij etazh), *Performance in the Honour of Mr Prime Minister* (Spektakl' v chest' gospodina pervogo ministra), *Pushkin Square* (Pushkinskaja ploshchad'), *Night Voices* (Nochnyje golosa) and some others. Many of his works have been translated into foreign languages. He is member of the Economic Council under the Government of the Russian Federation. Member of the Human Rights Commission under President of the Russian Federation. Member of Moscow Writers' Union and the Union of Journalists of Russia.

How can we improve the situation? In my sphere we have to accept one fact that investments in science are now 10 times less than those in the Soviet Union. We have only 20 percent of investment into our education as compared to the case of the Soviet Union. It is no use to cry. During the last decade we lost one third of thinking people. Let's look at the reality. While professors are in poverty, the young scholars will emigrate. The situation would deteriorate even further. The average age of the personnel in my Institute is about 80 years. Yes, of course, we have young and promising scientists but we can't bring them to upper positions, middle-aged people are very rare, and new generations, of course, should get a good education first to come and enter serious science. I will finalize my presentation with the idea that we have to find the answer to the question how to do the necessary things. Knowing how is the major problem.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *The floor is given to an economist who is well-known as a specialist in international relations, and who is the Chairman of the Central Electoral Commission, Mr Vladimir Churov.*

V. CHUROV¹: — Esteemed colleagues, dear Alexander Sergeevich, thank you for the opportunity to come again and address the audience from this podium. Several years ago I was here and spoke about the broken hopes, which we cherished in the sphere of culture. There were unrealised hopes connected with our naive understanding of the globalisation process. Today we face a new broken illusion of multiculturalism. At least in its Western European understanding. Of course, a multicultural factor depends on the country, where a multicultural policy is being pursued. In some countries they have different sources of multiculturalism. If we compare England, Germany, Russia, Turkey, the US – we don't have a universal process of interaction and coexistence of different cultures or subcultures. During the last several months, the most worrying factor which I recall every day were the dances as demonstrations staged by young people in the streets of different European cities as a protest against the Holy Week. This is a sign of barbarism.

When we listen to the words spoken by the by leaders of Germany and France they are horrified by degradation of society in the sphere of culture and subculture including the culture of people's behaviour. I see that the only system, which by definition stays truly multicultural, is the electoral system in any country all over the world, because the general democratic principle of the electoral system recognized in the world is a universal and an equal right. No nation can follow these principles exactly, mainly due to their originality. Every state has to strive to reach this character of universal and equal elections. Unfortunately, these principles were not observed properly, mainly due to historic foundation. First of all, because of the fact that the principle of elections to the bodies of power is one of the instruments to preserve the integrity of state and to promote the existence of state and coexistence with neighbours. This system operates in different countries, in Belgium, for example, the system is not able to preserve the integrity of

the state. In the similar way the electoral system couldn't actually keep the integrity of the Sudan state. There was a referendum recognized by the international community and Southern Sudan became an independent state, and we can mention a number of states where the electoral system is multicultural. This system is in great trouble and faces great problems and turmoil. I would like to remind you that in Turkey and in Egypt before the latest events the elections have been regularly held as fairly democratic and actually the objections were less as compared to other countries that are now stable. Also I have to mention other countries. I refer to the full text of my presentation published on the Internet. Electoral systems account for the national peculiarities. In one Republic of the RF 75 deputies were considered an insufficient number, but 95 were elected, so that all the main international groups could be represented in a local legislative assembly. This is a good example of improvement of our legislation. To finalize my presentation, I would like to dispel the illusions of the intelligentsia: we do not make deputies; a multicultural electoral system gives birth to deputies and electoral commissions. Thank you very much.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *The floor is given to the deputy chairman of the Russian Council of University Rectors of St. Petersburg, Mr Vladimir Vasiliyev.*

V. VASILIEV²: — Esteemed Presidium and dear colleagues, I'm happy to welcome you on behalf of the Council of Rectors of the Universities of St. Petersburg at this wonderful Likhachov Conference. We have already heard about some problems that have been voiced here and some interesting ideas have been voiced here. We will continue our work in sessions tomorrow, and the conference is very important for our students, because the Council of Rectors unites 108 universities of St. Petersburg. We embrace large portions of our citizens, over 500,000, we have to deal with technologies, I mean, IT, biotechnologies, cognitive technologies. When we speak about innovations they mean technological innovations, we have to deal with problems and we have to understand, to somehow look at the content of technologies beginning with IT. The second thing is that now in Russia and in other countries, including the US, they are speaking about re-industrialization. Several economic reasons in connection with economics have been squeezed from these countries to the developing countries and now they understand that economy should survive in every country, otherwise the countries will be undermined. I think attention should be paid to these problems, as technological innovations only will not guarantee serious progress of society. If we take the commercial success as the main criterion for the success in different areas including art and science it should proceed as the main criterion for the development of such intellectual spheres. We have to understand that new technologies are insufficient for international progress. We have to pay

¹ Chairman of the Central Election Commission of the Russian Federation, Professor of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences. Author of over 30 scientific works including the books: 'Mystery of Four Generals,' 'The Whole Russia Is Voting: on Legal and Organizational Peculiarities of the Coming Elections' and others.

² Corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Education, Rector of St. Petersburg Institute of Information Technologies, Mechanics and Optics (ITMO) — National Research University. Published a number of research works on computer technology, including the book *Internet Technologies for Education* (Internet-tehnologiji – obrazovaniju), and articles in collections of scientific papers and journals. Vice-President of the Russian Rectors' Union, Chairman of St. Petersburg Council of Rectors, President of D. S. Rozhdstvensky Optical Society. Laureate of the Presidential Award and of the Russian Government Awards in the field of education.

attention to culture, arts. Only in this case will we be able to somehow raise emotional uplifting of our society including technological development. Some of my ideas are quite disputable, but I would like to emphasize that we have to understand information technologies as the only factor. Our conference today and tomorrow will deal with these issues as a wonderful platform for communication and discussion of humanitarian issues. Thank you.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Distinguished colleagues, a group of scientists from China are present here. I give the floor to the representative of China's Academy of Social Sciences, Professor Guangcheng Xing.*

X. GUANGCHENG¹: — I would like to emphasize that the dialogue of cultures during globalization is very important. International conference on the dialogue of cultures, on the conditions of globalization is very important, from my point of view. Me as a scientist on Russian problems, I read a monograph by Likhachov, it said quite clearly: Russian culture had a European character, Russia is a European country, I agree with this point of view. All the same, taking into account the geography, the geopolitics and the economy of Russia, it is a typical superpower linking Europe and Asia. Russia is located in Europe, but a part of the country extends to Asia and many processes take place in Europe. It is a difficult situation — asymmetry of Russia. It influences the relations between Russia and China. The two great countries with extensive borders. It is very important to strengthen the development and cooperation of borderline regions. From our point of view, current Russian situation, Russia is between two parts: developed Europe and developing Asia. There may be different orientations. As for the integration factors that allow to combine efforts of Europe and Asia to promote the development and flourishing Russia should play a universal strategic role stepping from the history, the current state of Russia is located in Europe, but most part of it is located in Asia, Siberia and the Far East are the strategic areas for strategic development of Russia. Improvement depends not only on modernization and territory development, but on the development of the remote regions, like Siberia and the Far East. Russia plays an important diplomatic and economic role. Russia is developing rapidly, and mechanisms of cooperation such as associations in the South-Eastern Asia, with Korea and Shanghai and Beijing are very important. Russia is flourishing now, and Russia is facing very important challenges. What is the place of Russia in the economy of the Atlantic-Pacific region? In geopolitics? It has a great potential for full-fledged participation in the Atlantic region. We express great interest in the strengthening of the Russian position in the Pacific region, for the development of these regions.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Mr. Xing. I should say that the Russian scientific community has been studying*

¹ Deputy Director of the Centre for History and Geography of Border Regions of China (the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences), LL. D., Professor. Author of a number of scholarly publications, including books: *Relations of China with New Independent States of Central Asia, Process of Making Decisions by Soviet Authorities over 70 years, On Russia's Parliaments, Putin and Medvedev: Tandem of Supreme Power; articles: Shanghai Cooperation Organization: Priority Directions* and others. Vice-President of the Association for Promotion of Sustainable Development in China's Western Regions. Vice-Director of the Research Centre of Shanghai Cooperation Organization at the Academy for Social Sciences of the People's Republic of China.

these boundary regions as well. Now I am giving the floor to an outstanding Russian scientist, academician Mikhail Titarenko.

M. TITARENKO²: — Dear friends, I thanked in Chinese my old friend and colleague, the former director of the Russian Institute in China, now the Deputy Director of the Centre for History and Geography of Border Regions of China (the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences) for his friendly attitude to Russia. When we faced the tragedy of collapse of this great country, the only few in the West did not take advantage to blame Russia for all sins. Russia is the only state that officially first recognized China. Each time talking with Yeltsin, with other ministers, they started with the words: we came to your great country to know your great culture and great people. It was the result of deep generalization and learning lessons from our tragedy.

Recently Beijing held a large scientific conference involving more than 23 scientific organizations, the Academy of Social Sciences being the organizer of this conference, and the main idea of the conference was to learn lessons from the collapse of the Soviet Union. All that professor Xing said reflects the attitude of the main part of the Chinese society that understands that both of us, Russia and China, are in a situation in globalization when we have to stay shoulder-to-shoulder. Only together, only in cooperation, only combining our efforts, respecting each other, taking into account each other's interests, would we preserve our integrity as states, otherwise we would not be able to stop this process. Otherwise, all the maps that are published by Ms Albright and Mr Brzezinski with 6 or 65 states on the territory of Russia would become not just a dream of our so called friends but a reality.

That's why I think that Likhachov Conference is an intellectual attack of all the remaining part of the Russian intellectuals, patriotically thinking intellectuals who want to preserve the great Russian culture. And the question is how, as academician Shmelyov raised. And our Chinese friend has shown us. In the 5th century BC the great Confucius answered: in harmony, but not in uniformity. This is the example of building such multiculturalism that is in crisis in the West. But it's inevitable, we should not be happy about that, because it's built on inequality, on the concept that there is European and American culture that is the superior culture, synonymous of the world culture, and there are some minority cultures. It is the top-down view, that is the view that differs from the one held by many distinguished people: Pushkin, Dostoevsky, Trubetskoy, and our great citizen Lev Gumilyov.

² Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute for the Far East Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow), Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, *Scientist Emeritus* of the Russian Federation. Author of more than 300 scholarly publications, including 11 monographs: *Russia and East Asia* (Rossija i Vostochnaja Azija), *Russia Facing Asia* (Rossija litsom k Aziji), *China: Civilization and Reforms* (Kitaj: tsivilizatsija i reformy), *Russia: Security through Cooperation: East-Asian Vector* (Rossija: bezopasnost' cherez sotrudnichestvo: Vostochno-aziatskij vector), *Geopolitical Importance of the Far East: Russia, China and other countries of Asia* (Geopoliticheskoje znachenije Dal'nego Vostoka. Rossija, Kitaj i drugije strany Aziji) and some others. Many of Mr Titarenko's works have been translated into foreign languages and published in China, Japan, the USA, the Republic of Korea, Germany, Vietnam, India and other countries. Honorary professor of a number of universities and Academies of Sciences of China, the USA, Cuba, the Republic of Korea, Vietnam and Turkey. Mr Titarenko is decorated with the Order of Badge of Honour, the Order of Honour, the Order for Services to the Fatherland of the 4th degree. He is recipient of E. V. Tarle Prize of the Russian Academy of Sciences.

Not long before his death Gumilyov answered this “how”. I will quote: “If Russia is to be saved, then only as a Eurasian state, only through Euro-Asian approach.” And that’s what our Chinese friend said. Russia is European to the Urals, and then it is Asia.

We have power lines, religious lines coming through Russia: Christianity, Islam, Buddhism, Judaism. It’s a multi-confessional country. European criteria can’t fit adequately. And from the European viewpoint, Siberia and the Far East are only a resource part of Russia.

Peter the Great opened the window to Europe, but other windows are closed. Several windows in the East and some in the North. If we stick to the policy that Russia is only Europe we will have only the windows to Europe and a few ones to the North and other windows to other directions will be closed. Why? Because we have to implement a comprehensive space-related approach. It’s not Belgium, it’s not Holland. It takes 7 days to get from one part of the country to the other part of the country.

The idea that Gumilyov expressed: Why the Euro-Asian approach? Because it’s an alternative approach to the notion of multiculturalism. The Euro-Asian approach really works, but it has not become the part of a comprehensive policy, it’s built up on the principles of cultural equality and interchange. We have to build our principles this way, otherwise non-European cultures and non-European peoples, and there are hundreds of them, will die out. We are giving an example of creating a Euro-Asian approach, equal approach, synchronizing approach. And the example is our relationship with China. We hold different events — conferences related to Chinese culture, education, friendship. We ought to cultivate this approach. Thanks very much for that to Dmitry Likhachov and to the Likhachov Conference.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *The floor is given to Alexander Lvovich Safonov.*

A. SAFONOV¹: — Good afternoon, dear colleagues, in the course of today’s consultation, we had an idea that culture is not an appendix attached to economics or social policy. I would also like to join this idea, which is a very deep one. When we speak about culture, we have to understand that culture is not formed from the top, not from the above. It is formed from everyday life and understanding of people, and cultural approaches are based on this elementary level of a family and neighbourhood of every person. From this environment every person gets the primary understanding and ideas for behaviour.

If we examine the latest history of our country, we have serious economic and social changes which transform one economic system into another one, and many groups of population were touched by these changes and because of that we now see a gap between the components of this social tissue. Every human combines economic, social and cultural elements. We see that we experience a multicultural

approach in our social policy, and let us speak about the way how we should cope with the problems. We have to rely on specialists, of course, for the selection of the direction of our policy, but when we speak about the way how we can improve the situation, we have to understand that only by means of a dialogue, in which many layers of society will be involved, will we be able to elaborate a real understanding of the means for the resolution of our problems.

Russia should recreate such ideology of a social dialogue. In such a case we will not face the problem of total monopoly, not only economic, but also political monopoly, when people who concentrate in their hands a great volume of material resources, are reluctant to get engaged into a dialogue. They don’t want to understand the way of life of different layers of our population, exactly those people who create material wealth.

Speaking about the 19th and the 20th century, we have to understand that we had great revolutions, but now we have to give ear to all parts of social society beginning with a family, we have to learn how to organize a dialogue, but for me, as a representative of the Ministry for Healthcare and Social Progress, it is very important not only from a philosophical point of view, but also out of practical needs: if you understand the needs of your subject, you will be able to find the answer to the question of “how” to do things.

In the life of our society communication between different groups of population is very important. This way we will be able to put everything right. Such programs will be developed on the basis of real interest, they will incorporate all the challenges existing in the society. We will make basis for tolerant behaviour of those who are involved in these processes. These are not mere words, I describe the main means to support our society and promote the idea of survival of our country. Of course, we understand that recently we experienced great division in our society and now we have new sectors, and in this sense we have a feeling that we hear quite different voices in society, because of that we have a new idea of perception in our people, I mean from the viewpoint of the quality of life rather than from the cultural point of view.

I would like to emphasize once again that this problem is urgent and we have to deal with this problem, not in theory only, but in practice. We understand that our motherland starts with a family, so we have to start with a concrete human being and so must our state programs do. In this sense we will be able to form quite a normal dynamically developing society, which will be ready to perceive the best of any culture. This approach has a great potential for further development.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Alexander Lvovich. The floor is given to Mustafa Tlili.*

M. TLILI²: — Thank you, Mr Chairman. Thank you for inviting me for the 3rd time. I consider myself now as the honoured Russian. Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to say a few things about the events that are happening in some parts of the world that have been tormented for quite some time. It has been 50 years since most of them gained their independence in the early 60s. That part of the world is Northern Africa and the Middle East. The very important

¹ Deputy Minister of Healthcare and Social Development of the Russian Federation, Professor of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Economics), class 3 Active State Advisor of the Russian Federation.

Author of a number of textbooks, instruction materials and reference books: *‘Management of Social Expenditures: Actual Problems and Modern Tendencies’*; *‘Modern State of Social Labour Relations in Russia and Prospects of Their Development’*. Head of collectives of authors of encyclopaedias and proceedings on job safety and work conditions, social insurance, managing social expenditures.

² Founder and Director of the New York University Centre for Dialogues, diplomat. Author of books: *Le Bruit Dort, For Nelson Mandela, La Montagne du Lion: Roman, La Rage aux Tripes: Roman, Un Apres-midi dans le Desert: Roman*, and others.

part of the world, both for the international community, for Europe, for Russia and of course first and foremost for the people of these countries.

If you look at most of what is happening there — it is happening on the two shores of the Mediterranean. The North shore, which is the European shore, and the South shore of the Mediterranean. The North as it was said previously has a collapse of multiculturalism. In emigration community there are about 20 million Muslims in Western Europe. They were brought there to reconstruct Europe at the time the Europeans were coming out of the World War II. They could not do the job by themselves and had to resort to labour commission. In fact, they were brought on the basis of contracts with the states to reconstruct Europe: North Africans to France, Turks to Germany and people mostly from Pakistan to England. Over the decades those workers were supposed to come back home, but their stay in fact became more than temporary because they brought their families with them, and from generation to generation (now we have the 3rd generation) they began to consider themselves Europeans. They are Muslim Europeans, and they have nowhere else to go. This is their land. However, because of the failure of the policy they followed these years, the policy promoted by the states, these people have not integrated properly to feel at home, to feel fully belonging to the countries they live.

Now, on the other side at the Mediterranean there is another story: the story of authoritarian regimes that have not responded to the needs of their people. It's started in Tunisia, Egypt follows. We now know that it's happening in Syria and Libya. The success of the Tunisian revolution and of the Egyptian revolution is of course heartening but there are tragedies going on in Syria and Libya, as we know.

If you look at the slogans of the youth who started these revolutions, the reference is not to the religion, to Islam, to Arabism but the only reference you will find is to democracy, to freedom, freedom of expression, to human rights, to the need for the transparency and for democratic mechanisms. Another reference is to universal values. These values are shared by the two shores of the Mediterranean.

Through these two revolutions you can say that finally the Arab people have entered history. And the essence of history is a universal achievement of all the humankind. Russia has entered that phase and its latest revolution of the early '90s lead to its adjoining to the idea of liberal democracy. Now the Arab world has followed this way and entered the revolution which is a democratic liberal revolution based on the universal values of democratic life. This is something very important that needs to be reflected on and there is hope that we shall reflect on it in more detail tomorrow. Thank you very much.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Esteemed colleagues, we have among the participants the Ambassador of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the RF, Mr Reza Sajjadi. You are welcome to make your speech.*

R. SAJJADI¹: — After the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the USA had to do two steps in order to conquer the

whole world. Only two steps. The first step was to create an image of a supposed enemy, because we saw it during the Cold War when they presented the Soviet Union as the greatest enemy. Later on, the USA wanted to continue the division of the Soviet Union, because they considered the Soviet Union too wealthy, too rich. We know that bin Laden was created by the Americans in order to make him start the war against the Soviet troops. And because of that it is quite reasonable that he was a good person to personify a new enemy. In other words, Islamic extremism was considered to be a new world enemy. Starting from the point that among certain Muslim nations situated in the northern Caucasus, they cherished certain ideas, because that extremism appeared in the Caucasus, proliferated there.

At the same time it was quite natural that Western financial institutions used to help them, because they also wanted to expand extremism in the Caucasus. We consider that the only proper way that is optimum for the RF is to preserve its integrity and unity. The only instrument that can destabilize and undermine Russia is a war, an internal conflict. Because of that we see that this sort of war was started due to the appearance of a rival in the form of extremist elements from Central Asia and from other parts of Russia. And because of that we consider that the dialogue between the Russian Orthodox Church and Islam is the only way how we can preserve coexistence of the two religions. There is the urgent need to preserve integrity of the Russian Federation, Islamic world and the world at large to give security to all of us.

After the disintegration of the Ottoman Empire in the Islamic World we have a single independent Islamic state which appeared 30 years ago after the victory of the Islamic revolution in Iran. Because of that it is quite natural that in certain cases things are distorted when we speak about extremists. We see that extremism is a threat to the Islamic world itself. And we see that the Westerners and Americans captured Iraq and Afghanistan, they do atrocities, they do wrong under the coverage of trying to preserve the lives of the local people, for example in Libya. Islam is a religion that pays tribute and respect to all other religions. Because of that we understand the importance of the dialogue between Islam and the Russian Orthodox Church. And also it is quite natural that on behalf of the Islamic umma we reach out to greet Russian Orthodox friends. Thank you.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Among our foreign colleagues we have our guest from Afghanistan representing a family well-known outside Afghanistan. The floor is given to Mr Hikmat Karzai.*

H. KARZAI²: — I want to thank the Chairman and the organizers for inviting me and particularly for the event which brings together scholars, writers and scientists from different parts of the world. I'm particularly honoured to be here. Let me also say that it's my first visit to St. Petersburg, the city that I consider a cultural capital. It is only appropriate that the event on Likhachov is held here.

logies, promotion of cooperation between universities and branches of industry.

¹ Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the Russian Federation. B. Sc. (Electronics) and M. Sc. (Management). Mr Sajjadi occupied executive positions in the office of the President of Iran. Author of a number of scholarly works devoted to issues of politics, scientific and technological development, shipbuilding, engineering in oil, gas and other strategic industries, nano- and biotechno-

² Director of the Centre for Conflict and Peace Studies (CAPS), one of the leading research centers in Kabul, Afghanistan, Bachelor of Arts in Political Science (University of Maryland, USA), Masters of Science in Information (American I. University, USA), Masters of Science in Strategic Studies (Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore).

With that I have plenty of remarks for tomorrow but I'll try to sum up my conclusions in a few remarks. And what I want to do is to start with a question whether at a crucial time like today and with the environment where we are living in the multicultural dialogue is necessary and important, is it needed? What I want to do is to share with you a few small stories about my own life and what I believe is necessary to move forward, as for the society and, particularly since the colleagues from Europe talked about the youth and what is it, what kind of world we should leave to the next generation.

In early 1990 I was a student, I became a refugee from Afghanistan and while I was a refugee a very useful and important book was given to me by a friend of mine and I started to read that book. The deputy minister from Egypt referred to the book. The book is called *The Clash of Civilizations* written by a Harvard University professor, his name was Samuel Huntington. His argument was that from now on conflicts in the world are not going to be based on ideology or economics. The primary source of conflict will be cultural. Now, in the Muslim world there was a fan of Samuel Huntington. That fan was no other than Osama bin Laden. Osama bin Laden not only referred to Samuel Huntington but he took his argument further. His argument is that there is not only the cultural clash but there also is a direct confrontation between Islam and the West. That's why it is the responsibility of each Muslim to conduct jihad against the West. Now, there are people who are susceptible, particularly among the youth, living in certain countries of Europe where concepts like multiculturalism in certain ways are leading towards failure. This brings me to my second question: Are we actually facing the clash of civilizations or is Islam facing the clash within itself? People of Afghanistan will tell you that we are not facing the clash of civilizations. The reason for that is that in Afghanistan we have over 46 counties trying to rebuild the Afghanistan after the three decades of conflicts of violence that keep going. We have two different generations which have become victims, they have been sacrificed. Now, if you take a look at Afghanistan of some years ago, you will understand that there was a culture of tolerance, a culture of hospitality, there was a culture which was able to co-exist. Islam grew. And Islam grew because of its logic and not because the power of the sword.

Islam spread all the way from North Africa to the strait of Gibraltar. In Afghanistan we believe that cooperation of civilizations rather than a clash is happening. Most importantly, it's the education that desperately needed in countries like Afghanistan, because without education once again we will be creating youth which will become any fool's army and it is the same youth that is now in certain ways brainwashed and they're becoming suicide-bombers at so many different levels.

My final argument is that we do need to understand one another, we do need to live with one another and it is only possible to work with one another and most importantly to be able to relate to one another. So, I leave my remarks here and I hope tomorrow we will have an extensive discussion. Thank you once again.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you. The floor is given to Mr Vitaly Tretyakov.*

V. TRETYAKOV¹: — I am happy to be again in this wonderful city of St. Petersburg and this wonderful university. I would like to pose a number of questions, we are coming closer to lunch time and I won't spoil your appetite. I would like to emphasize that when I am worried when the Europeans start speaking in the absence of representatives of other continents about the possibility to improve the European civilization so that it could get out of the current crisis and develop even more. No doubt that European technology achieved great success over the latest decades, but I would also like to remind that European civilization actually started all world wars. No other civilization started wars, European civilization extinguished millions and millions of people in their own countries and people from different countries, from other civilizations. Being a part of representative element of the European civilization, I continue thinking deeper and deeper whether force will be used to bury the existing European civilization and other civilizations. We are coming closer to this possibility.

And secondly, not long ago the question of the European civilization was scrutinized, and our scientists claimed that in 2045 we'll be able to create artificial human beings. The problem is to create mind and intelligence. We don't know how to cope with existing human beings. And we are trying to create artificial human beings. I am grateful to the Islamic civilization that it doesn't set such an awful task to solve in future. Also speaking on behalf of the Europeans, I'd say that we are concentrated on cultural values that are being destroyed by barbaric peoples. For many people this is an obvious fact. We look deeper at the problems of television. We have to pay attention to the fact that the European culture is creating within itself such institutions that destroy the existing European culture more efficiently than the ancient barbaric tribes. Of course, cinema and TV are the highest technological achievement engaged in destruction of the world culture. Undoubtedly the main destruction is being made to the European culture. We all know how to struggle against barbarism, but how can we counteract these institutions? We are afraid to counteract them, they are part of our culture, they are led by educated people, those people who graduated from universities, highly educated people from intelligentsia are heads of these institutions of culture. I see that absolute freedom to intelligentsia is as dangerous as to barbaric tribes. Even then there is a question: which danger is greater?

Mr Mikhail Piotrowsky rightly said that we have to find new taboos, new absolute prohibitions, some old prohibitions have to be removed. We are afraid to criticize ourselves. Nevertheless, in the rhetoric, inside European discussions we have this criticism, but this is a very superficial criticism. We mentioned nationalism and culture as separate phenomena, but these two are interconnected very closely. Let's speak about the past. Who was responsible for stirring up the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict in the last years of

¹ Head of High School (Faculty) of Television at Lomonosov Moscow State University. Author and anchorperson of the TV program "What is there to be done? (Philosophical talks)."

Author of books: *"Russian Politics and Politicians in Normal and Pathological Conditions. A Glimpse of Russian Politics in 1990–2000"*, *"How to Become a Famous Journalist. A Course of Lectures on Theory and Practice of Contemporary Russian Journalism"*, *"The Science of Being Russia. Our National Interests and Ways to Promote Them"* as well as over two thousand articles in Russian and foreign press.

Recipient of awards in literature and journalism, including "The Golden Pen" from the Union of Journalists of Russia, the TEFI award and others.

the Soviet epoch: Armenian peasants or intelligentsia in Armenia and Azerbaijan? All writers, all intellectuals were involved in these horrible deeds. All the people who were destined to think about the future made horrible things.

We have a number of questions and I know for sure that European civilization is a cradle of all of us, of course, it is a sort of our education, I'm a child of this culture, but this European culture is lost now, it doesn't have answers to some questions. They conceal some things and are reluctant to see the truth. My last point is that we have to forget about this obsolete idea of progress in order to get answers to urgent questions. We can say for sure that all greatest achievements of European culture are in the past, they are stored at the Hermitage, but its current state is far from progress.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Vitaly Toviyeovich. Esteemed colleagues, now I would like to invite the youngest participant of the plenary session, Mr Kirill Kolyshnitsyn. He is the author of the best composition about academician Likhachov. The jury headed by D. A. Granin selected this author to be the best out of 500 authors of such papers. The honorary diploma is to be given to the winner of the contest.*

K. KOLYSHNITSYN: — I'd like to thank the 11th Likhachov Scientific Conference and I'd like to thank the board of jury for the award and high estimate of my achievements. I'd like to congratulate everyone on the Victory Day, because it is a very important event for every Russian family, and it is connected with the topic of my essay. My work with documents which were given to me by the family of Mikhail Belousov was the main source of information in my paper. This is my conclusion that history is not made by historians. It is not described in the text books only, but it is real people who are heroes. I would like to thank Irina Zhitnikova for the materials given to me. I am very grateful to the teacher of the Russian language who helped a lot. I'd like to end with the quotation from D. S. Likhachov that "memory opposes the destruction caused by time", and we have to remember the Second World War to avoid the similar destruction in the future.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you. Let's wish luck to our young successors. The floor is given to academician O. T. Bogomolov.*

O. BOGOMOLOV¹: — Dear participants of the 11th International Likhachov Conference. I'd like to start with quite a customary phrase that says that we are living in a changing world. It's truly so. And in fact the global crisis,

¹ Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Advisor to the Russian Academy of Sciences, Honorary Director of the Institute for International Economic and Political Research (the Russian Academy of Sciences), Head of Department of World Economy at the State University of Management, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor. He was elected Deputy of the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR in 1989 and the State Duma of the Federal Assembly of Russia in 1993. Author of over 600 publications including the books: *Reforms from American and Russian Scholars' Viewpoints* (Reformy glazami amerikanskikh i rossiyskikh uchonykh); *Reforms in the Mirror of International Comparisons* (Reformy v zerkale mezhdunarodnykh sravnenij); *My Chronicle of the Transition Period* (Moya letopis' perekhodnogo vremeni); *Thoughts Over the Erstwhile and Essential* (Razdum'ya o bylom i nasushnom); *World Economy in the Globalization Period* (Mirovaya ekonomika v vek globalizatsiji); *Non-Economic Facets of Economics: Unknown Mutual Influence* (Nejekonomicheskiye grani ekonomiki: nepoznannoje vzaimovlijanije) and others. O. T. Bogomolov is decorated with the Order of October Revolution, the Order of the Red Banner (twice), the Order of Badge of Honour, the Order for Services to the Fatherland of the 4th and the 3rd degree.

its consequences, is an evidence of cardinal changes in the development of the human civilization. We have to take it into account when we talk about our Russian problems and problems of the other civilizations. The current Western society, capitalism, shows its flaws not only in the financial and currency spheres that is visible, but in the development of democracy, the state order. Many Western analysts say that we have opportunities, but in fact these opportunities are predetermined. The revolutions in Egypt, Tunis and other countries of the Arab world are an evidence of the changes taking place in the world.

In the mid of the previous century an outstanding sociologist Pitirim Sorokin in his epoch-making work *Cultural Sociodynamics* wrote that the crisis of the human civilization was obvious. And in the light of the global crisis we find proof of that suggestion. Quite important changes have happened in the society under the influence of technological progress and other factors. And it entitled different changes. According to different authors, we are talking about quite crucial macro-shift important for the civilization. It has both positive and negative consequences. The humankind is facing the opportunity to go up one more level. And the destructive consequences as well that lead to the split in the society between different generations, different strata.

As an economist, I have always been searching for ways in the area of economy to develop and overcome barriers. I'm convinced that the economy has its humanitarian dimension, that sometimes the most important is not the decisions taken in this area, but the situation in the ideology, in the state order, in culture and in other areas of public life. These spheres influence economy greatly. One cannot but see that the ideological concepts, state of mind do influence the economy of the society.

We should say that active-thinking people in the world have already started to re-evaluate ideological postulates and values. They are looking for the alternative development models of the system that proves to be incapable in many areas. And it's still the subject of heated debate. I'd like to refer to different ideas. Say, Joseph Stieglitz, Nobel Award laureate, writes that the economic theory proves to be incapable as well as the American model of capitalism. If we take our Russian situation, we have been building the market economy for 20 years after the American pattern, under the influence of the Washington consensus or more liberal mainstream in the economic theory. But it, in the worst, has become the subject of the very serious rethinking and evaluation of ours. We stick to the course of shock therapy, of widespread privatization and other steps that were worked out in the beginning of the '90s and prompted by this Washington consensus. The Economist says that the world today is facing the new economic hybrid that might be called state capitalism. And the striking example, according the journal, is the Chinese model. There are such books in America as *Beijing Consensus*, or *How the Chinese Authoritarian Model Can Become Dominant in the 21st Century*. Although the Chinese leaders themselves don't call this model state capitalism. Their quest is for a social humanitarian and harmonious society. I'm saying this because ideological issues, from my point of view, have remained unsolved.

I can argue with academician Shmelyov who said that it is clear what should be done. Unfortunately, it's not clear

now what kind of society we will get as the result of our changes. The Constitution says that our state is a social one, but its definition is not developed. And the attempts of the scientists to interpret this are part of the goal we have to achieve. What should it be, capitalism in a primitive way, or a society oriented to meeting social needs, development of culture, education and science, increasing the level of national health and so on? All these issues are the subject for a discussion and the subject for very serious criticism in the West. In our country this topic is ignored.

What should be done to make our society healthier, to improve healthcare, education, to overcome the detrimental gap between the rich and the poor that exceeds all worldwide standards and examples? This issue should be solved. Unfortunately, we are short of time. The main problem that we are facing now and that is a subject for a discussion is what role our state should play or the state in general in the current world to overcome the challenges the changing world poses, and this macro-shift in the civilization development poses. Should the state increase its influence on the economic and social processes? Or, as minor liberals and reformers think, should it leave the economic life and just restrict itself with regulations? It's just a political issue: through which strategy of development, what direction to move forward.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Oleg Timofeyevich. The floor is given to Valery Leonidovich Makarov.*

V. MAKAROV¹: — The main problem that we are discussing now is how to combine different cultures, how should they interact. The key issue is how. Nicolai Petrovich Shmelyov put forward this issue, but where is the answer? As we are living in the phase of the humankind's development that can be called individualization, the usual answer is: We have to find a very super-wise person, or we have to set up a genius team and confine them in a confined place, and they will come to a decision. Only collective utility can bring up the result. Not just a limited team, but a mass of people. And, as I see, now the humankind has reached this phase. If we look at the whole development of civilization, it was people who were its driving force. Who invented the wheel, the gallows and alike? But then the individualizing approach appeared. Those geniuses came about – Aristotle, Newton, Galileo, we know them.

¹ Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor. President of the Russian School of Economics, Head of the Economics Department of the State Academic University for the Humanities of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director-Organizer of the Higher School for the State Administration at Lomonosov Moscow State University. Author of more than 300 scientific works, among which are the following: *Mathematic Theory of Economic Dynamics and Balance* (Matematicheskaya teoriya ekonomicheskoi dinamiki i ravnovesiya, with co-authors), *Intangible Assets and the Intellectual Property Value Assessment* (Otsenka stoimosti nematerial'nykh aktivov i intellektualnoy sobstvennosti, with co-authors), *Russian Science and High Tech at the Turn of the Third Millennium* (Nauka i vysokie tekhnologii Rossii na rubezhe tretyego tysyachel'etia, with co-authors), *Russia in the Globalizing World. Modernization of the Russian Economy* (Rossiya v globalizuyushchemsya mire. Modernizatsiya Rossiyskoy ekonomiki, with co-authors). Professor *honoris causa* of Lomonosov Moscow State University. Editor-in-chief of 'Economics and Mathematical Methods' journal (Economika i matematicheskiye metody), member of the editorial boards and panels of the journals: Economics of Planning, Social Sciences, 'Cybernetics and the System Analysis' (Kibernetika i sistemnyi analiz), 'Economy of Modern Russia' (Economika sovremennoy Rossii), 'Science of Science' (Naukovedeniye), 'Optimization' (Optimizatsiya) and others. Laureate of the USSR Council of Ministers Award, Laureate of the L. V. Kantorovich Award and of the Demidov Award.

They are creators of new knowledge. But now the process is moving to the phase of mass creativity. People's creativity is more decisive than individual, because our society has become an informative one. It's the mass creativity that can create a product that is impossible to do single-handed. Take Wikipedia, it's a very interesting product that a single person or even the authors of the Encyclopaedia Britannica cannot create. We are not talking just about the collective creativity of a limited team, of 1000, 2000 or 6000, but of mass creativity.

The day before yesterday I read on the Internet very interesting information that an automated computerized machine asked a social network a question, and very many responses were received as a result. This machine analyzed the responses and a very interesting result appeared which was unexpected for a person. Now we are at the threshold when we have to find new technologies how to collectively tackle the problem. In any areas we find these examples when copies of well-known masterpieces are made. Take *The Three Musketeers*. There are hundreds of versions of the book. It's a kind of creativity, but an interesting one. Or in programming everyone knows the open code technique. With this open code technique it is possible to produce an operational system in a better way, on a finer level than a single company can do. It's just the beginning of the way how to create this technology in a correct way. In the past, talking about Russia, a wooden Matryoshka doll was created, and this is a classic example of a fractal. This fractional, portal principle should be applied, when you come inside, deeper and deeper, and you have a chef d'oeuvre. When you are constantly improving, and an offspring of Leonardo da Vinci makes some sketches, and then masses of people add something as well, a new masterpiece can appear. It's our problem: interrelation with culture. And we can find the answer how this people's creativity can bring about new technology. And I'm sure we will be living happier than we are living now.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you. The floor is given to academician Yuri Sergeevich Shemshuchenko.*

Yu. SHEMSHUCHENKO²: — Esteemed colleagues, dear Alexander Sergeevich. I was happy to accept your kind invitation. I'd like to convey special welcome from our President of the National Academy of Science, world-known scientist Boris Yevgenievich Paton. I talked to him

² Foreign member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Ukrainian National Academy of Sciences, Director of V. M. Koretsky Institute for State and Law of the Ukrainian National Academy of Sciences, LL. D., Professor, honoured worker of science and technology of Ukraine. He is the author of over 800 scholarly publications, including books: *Local Soviets and Maintaining Law* (Mestnyje Sovety i obespechenije zakonnosti), *Man, Nature, Law* (Chelovek, priroda, zakon), *Scientific Legal Thought* (Akademicheskaja juridicheskaja mysl'), *State and Public Monitoring of Environment* (Gosudarstvennyj i obshchestvennyj kontrol' v oblasti okhrany okruzhajushchej sredy), *Legal Issues of Ecology* (Pravovyye problemy ekologiji), *Nature and Law* (Priroda i zakon), *Legal Status of the Academy of Sciences of Ukraine* (Pravovoj status Akademiji nauk Ukraini); scientific articles: *The Earth's Ecologic Constitution: Concept Approaches* (Ekologicheskaja konstitutsija zemli: kontseptual'nyje podkhody), *The Modern System of Energy Legislation in the Ukraine and Main Trends of Its Improving* (Sovremennaja sistema energeticheskogo zakonodatel'stva Ukrainy i osnovnyje napravlenija jejo sovershenstvovaniya), *Problems of the Agrarian Law Development* (Problemy razvitiya agrarnogo prava v Ukraine) and others. Yu. S. Shemshuchenko is academician-secretary of the Department of ecological and agrarian law of the National Academy of Legal Sciences of the Ukraine. He is Editor-in-Chief of the *Legal State* (Pravovoe gosudarstvo) scientific yearly. Mr Shemshuchenko is Laureate of M. P. Vasilenko Award of the Ukrainian National Academy of Sciences, the Ukraine State Award for science and technology.

before coming here and this is his personal request. Thank you very much.

I'm pleased to participate in this very important event and I'm here not for the first time, but each time I'm ready to come to St. Petersburg because I have relatives living here, including one Russian poet who has multiple publications, and he is the editor of the magazine on Russian unity. And speaking on the topic of our Conference, much has been said about the global purposes which should be considered. Being a lawyer, a specialist in law-making policies, I'd like to also emphasize that law was included into the main agenda of this Conference, because it's an element of culture, not only an element of the social structure, but an element of culture. And again here we can define a number of different problems.

I'd like to say that one of American lawyers published the book *Meta-Law: The Law of Extraterrestrial Civilizations*. Of course, it's a very complicated issue, because the law means that there should be two sides present, at least, two sides in this extraterrestrial society. We have only one – this earthly civilization. There is no space civilization, but they promised that very soon there will be a civilization from space that will come to Earth.

Nevertheless, the question is of interest because the author is trying to develop the main principles of this extraterrestrial law. And the foundation for it is the principle of "Don't do harm to anybody or anything". Of course, this is a good idea. Today it is obvious that it is important for our present situation and probably for the future situations. Now we have to deal with international organizations based here on our wonderful and beautiful globe. Of course, ecology is a very important problem, I mean, it transgresses any state borders. And here we have to improve the ecological order.

I have said that my idea is that people have to deal with the problem of creation of, so to say, ecological code of the Earth, which would actually control and regulate the diversity of interests and needs of all nations, all states of the world, and the interests of internal affairs. This law should not be based on force; it should be based on humanistic principles. And in such a case this law will serve all of us. For this purpose we have to create adequate mechanisms which have been mentioned today concerning how we can resolve this question and, of course, the problem is very pressing.

Another important thing is comparative law studies. We have to examine and compare law in America, in Europe, in China. We should examine long-term traditions, and Slavic law should also be analyzed, beginning with Yaroslav the Wise. He was an ancient Russian ruler. This is a subject for further discussions, including our forum. It actually fits nicely in the context of our discussions. I wish success to all of you. Thank you very much.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you. The floor is given to academician Vladislav Alexandrovich Lektorsky.*

V. LEKTORSKY¹: — Dear friends, I have only a short period of time, and will try to identify a number of problems

¹ Academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Education, Chairman of the International Editorial Board of the 'Issues of Philosophy' journal (*Voprosy filosofii*) Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor. Author of more than 300 scholarly publications, including monographs: *Subject, Object, Understanding* (Subjekt, objekt, poznanije); *Classical and Non-Classical Epistemology* (Epistemologiya klassicheskaja i neklassicheskaja); *Transformations of Rationality in Modern Culture* (Transformatsiji ratsional'nosti v sovremennoj kulture); *Philosophy in the Context of Culture* (Filosofija v kontekste kulture). Editor-in-Chief and one of the authors of a series of

that should be tackled, which are of great interest. I'm not going to tell you the contents of my publication for this Conference. I'd like to set a number of other questions that I formed when reading papers by the participants of the Conference. So I will share my ideas which describe my attitude to the subject.

If we are talking about economic problems faced by our country, these are very difficult problems and they will stay with us in the future, so we are worried as these problems are connected with our life, with our possible survival and with what should be done. Of course, we have to raise these questions, but I'd like to find out something else. Though we have a number of complex problems and we even have the answers how to solve them, there still remain more distant areas in the direction of which we should move.

The Western civilization is a civilization of means, and not of goals. The contemporary civilization taken as a whole or within its individual structures places the problem of the meaning, of values. Why should we do that? What is the purpose? For whose sake should we do certain actions? And what is acceptable life? How can we define acceptable life or an acceptable way of life? We have to understand the meaning of human life. Here we have multiple problems. We see here a very tight interaction of different cultures, it is due to the fact that in the core of each civilization we see such changes that question certain values and which seem to be very deeply rooted.

We listened to academician Valery Makarov, and he told us that technologies are being developed, finding a broad way for collective reason, collective creativity. I also deal with these issues, of course. And we use Wikipedia. And we understand that persons who are individually not very bright get together and produce sometimes very nice things. But, of course, we have to be very careful, because in Wikipedia we also have a lot of rubbish. In the past we used to have great figures in literature, and now everyone can also write a piece, publish it on the Internet and claim it to be high literature. Like a joke from the Soviet times: a person, who pretended to be a writer, proclaimed that he hadn't read Pushkin or Dostoevsky, he hadn't read anything. His answer was that he was not going to read, as he was going to write. So this is the true picture of the contemporary age.

The Internet managed to summon great masses of people to the central square of the capital for demonstrations and protests. We can go into the streets and we can topple a leader. We also have to understand that along with the ideas of democracy we also have experts. They serve certain communities, and they also have their own ideas.

As a whole, Western civilization, human rights, all these notions have to be reconsidered because we have new social technologies. The Western world has to preserve its identity. Within the Western world they hesitate, they have conflicts, they face problems. Not long ago this multicultural policy seemed to be a success, and now it's a failure. There are some other examples that didn't lead to a success. The multicultural approach means that we have to recognize the presence of different cultures, they do have differences, and we have to take lessons from each other. We have to

books *Philosophy of Russia of the Second Half of the 20th Century* (Filosofija Rossiji vtoroj poloviny 20 veka) (M., 2008–10). Many of his works have been translated and published in the USA, the UK, the FRG, France, Finland, South Korea, Turkey, China and other countries. V. A. Lektorsky is decorated with the Order of Badge of Honour and the Order of M. V. Lomonosov.

develop a special mechanism for implementation, because in the past other manners of multiculturalism created a sort of ghettos, isolated communities. This should be somehow reconsidered. Multicultural dialogue should be preserved. The dialogue should be redefined, tolerance should be redefined. In all cases we have to renew definitions of certain core notions. Thank you.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Dear colleagues, we have an interesting situation here, as for a number of participants of this Conference the idea of culture is the subject of scientific research, but for the other part it is just their interest in their professional spheres. But there are people for whom the dialogue of cultures has become the thing of life. And the whole life is seen as a dialogue of cultures. We have said recently about the failures of the dialogue of cultures in Germany, in France, between the West and the Muslim world. It's very important to remember that in our history we had very successful examples of the dialogue of cultures. Anybody who knows history of Europe wonders how Germany and France were able to create an integrated state. Now the young generation does not think about the way Russia and Germany had to traverse after the atrocities of World War II.*

Now we have a person here with a very interesting biography. A person who comes from an aristocratic family, one of whose relatives served in the German Army, came to Russia and was held in captivity, whose relatives were military officers of high position. The person in question has done much for the peace in Europe; he loves Europe and Russia very much. He even married a Russian woman and spent decades on promoting closer relations between our countries. He has contributed much to narrowing the gap between our two countries. He participated in building the Bridge across the Atlantic, too. He's truly a great German. I'd like to give the floor to Mr Bonnenberg.

H. BONNENBERG¹: — Thank you, Alexander Sergeevich, for the opportunity to speak here. It's for the 3rd time that I'm speaking in this wonderful hall. The first time I spoke about the coming together of the two German peoples, of the two German states. And, after the unification of Germany, the main point was to find out that self-identification of each people and respect between them, which is one of the main sources of coming smoothly, peacefully and together. The next speech I gave covered the topic that Europe is more than the EU. It was a discussion about how a western state, which can be part of the EU, and an eastern state (like eastern CIS states) could come together for a new powerful Europe, for the future which could be a strong competitor against China, India and America. We need real self-understanding, self-identification of both

¹ Statesman and public figure, eminent organizer of industrial production in the FRG, Dr. Sc. (Engineering). Chairman of the Supervisory Board and the Board of directors of Lausitz and Central German Mining Administration Company 'Northern Power Plants'. Since the 1990s Mr Bonnenberg has been Head and Executive Authorized Representative of the German State Property Fund. Since 1995 he has been Chairman of the Supervisory Board and the Board of Directors of 'Northern Power Plants' company. Mr Bonnenberg took part in preparing the agreement on the Baltic gas pipeline (Russia–Germany). Member of German Society for Foreign Policy, German-Russian Forum, German-Ukrainian Forum, Association of German Engineers, German-Arab Friendship Society. Mr Bonnenberg is on the board of trustees of a number of universities in Western Europe and the USA. Author of a number of publications, including: *German Transformation in the East. Germany: Achievements and Problems*. Mr Bonnenberg is decorated with the highest Order of the Federal Republic of Germany – the Order for Services to the Fatherland.

parts and we need respect, the acceptance... peaceful acceptance.

Now I am standing here to speak about globalization. For me globalization is the age of the present world order. The age in which we are living and which is mainly influenced by chip technology. Chips give information for each time and each place, about people at each place and each moment of time. So, all walls are breaking down.

It started with the fall of the Berlin wall in 1990 in Germany. Further walls are breaking down, information walls are breaking down. Finally we are coming to a completely new world and I'm very happy that so many young people are here now because they are joining the discussion now. You, young people, have to find something like the world system of values system. Let's call it world consciousness. And when I look at the world now I understand that we have two systems of values which are in competition, hopefully in peaceful competition. The first I want to mention is the world of citizenship - the system of values which has been developing for last 500 years, it is based on humanism, enlightenment, Marxism and pluralism... all such things. We had very dirty experiments in history which are influencing this system of values. And I would say this system of values is all over the world: it's in Switzerland, in China; it's the system where freedom creates the truth. Of course there are versions of the system. Here in Europe we have roots in Greek and Roman civilization, Christianity and the Celtic civilization, the Germanic and even some Arabic influences — these are the roots of our system of values. The Chinese have Confucius but last, not least we have a system of values which I want to call the system of values of a citizen.

The competition in systems of values we have here is because of the system of values of Islam. Islam is not only a religion; Islam is also a model of society. And I think it's very important that we live in the system of values of a citizen and we produce a very good self-identification what we are. Otherwise we would have real problems. We need to provide peaceful discussion to a very powerful partner, which is Islam. Our system of 500 years is thought to be made by men, but the Islamic system is supposed to be given by God, so it can't be changed by men, it can only be interpreted.

What we need is peaceful discussion of the future of these value systems: world of citizenship and Islam. Both systems have marvellous historical roots. Of course we know that there are a lot of activities in the UN — we have agreements on human rights, we have agreements upon basic laws of living — all this is our world of a citizen and very important parts of the UN agreements are not signed in many Islamic countries. And this is very important to know and to see that compromise be found with those countries. By the way, these agreements still haven't been signed by Vatican as well. I hope tomorrow we will have interesting discussions about the competition between these two systems of values. Thank you.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you. I invite to the podium professor Valentin Yershov.*

V. YERSHOV²: — Good afternoon, dear colleagues. We were asked to respond to the previous speeches, so I

² President of the Russian Academy of Justice (Moscow), LL. D., Professor, *Scientist Emeritus* of the Russian Federation, Honoured Lawyer

would like to express my views concerning the expression “creativity of masses”. Dostoevsky gave us a good example of such a case. The topic is the Dialogue of Culture. Also it makes me think about individual law and global law. It was also stated that words are not deeds and we have to be practical – we have to identify tasks and start solving them. I would also like to quote the previous speaker that our major problem is that of monopolism, positivism in legal science.

We know that there is a great sign of monopoly in Russian law and we have to somehow incorporate international law into our domestic law. There are a number of examples — the case of Konstantin Markin vs the Russian Federation is one of them. He was a citizen of St. Petersburg, and he had three children. This person applied for a special allowance to be able to take care of the children, but he failed, he did not succeed in getting such an allowance. This person, Markov, addressed the European court in Strasburg, because Russia has ratified the convention about the equality of rights between men and women. And men have the same rights to take care of children. In our Constitution there is a special clause stating equality of rights between men and women. So this was the case.

We see that the Russian court also had to start new hearing after the resolution taken by the Strasburg court. But they examined the Russian law, and the Russian court actually could not take a proper decision, because they were not able to contradict the resolution of the international law. But nevertheless we see that the Russian law was also obligatory for them. There was a controversy, contradiction. The Higher Court ruled out that the European Convention is not a law obligatory for the judges in the Russian Federation. Because of that we can immediately see that legism cannot resolve all our problems and cannot guarantee human rights in all cases, and cannot guarantee justice for our court resolutions.

In the whole world, including the Russian Federation, we see that international law is not an independent system. That is obvious, and many discussions are evoked by these circumstances. It's important to provide true observance of human rights. We also have some other dilemmas and other examples; we have doctoral theses by scientists who actually are binding Constitutional Court to examine the international law to decide whether this international law is adequate from the point of view of the Russian law. Of course, we see now that we cannot have an absolute sovereignty of states. The ideal sovereignty was set forward in the 16th century, and now we have to introduce another concept — the concept of moderate independence. We have to advocate prevalence of international law over the

of the Russian Federation, honorary worker of judiciary system of the Russian Federation. Member of Scientific-Advisory Board of the Supreme Court of the Russian Federation. Chairman of the Judicial Qualifying Examination Panel at the Supreme Qualification Board of Judges of the Russian Federation. Author of over 100 scholarly publications, including monographs: *General-Theoretical and Civil Guidelines of Law* (Osnovopolagajushchije obshcheteoreticheskije i grazhdansko-pravovye printsiipy prava), *Status of Court in Rule-of-Law State* (Status suda v pravovom gosudarstve), *Theoretical and Practical Problems of Applying Labour Law* (Teoreticheskije i prakticheskije problemy primenenija trudovogo prava), *Judicial Enforcement* (Sudebnoje pravoprimeneniye), *Labour Contract* (Trudovoj dogovor) and some others. Member of editorial boards of journals: *Russian Justice* (Rossijskoe pravosudije), *Russian Judge* (Rossijskij sud'ja), *Russian Justice System* (Rossijskaja justitsija), *Human Rights* (Prava cheloveka), *Foreign Legislation and Comparative Jurisprudence* (Zarubezhnoje zakonodatel'stvo i sravnitel'noe pravovedeniye). V. V. Yershov is decorated with Anatoly Koni Medal, First Degree Medal for Services on Protecting Rights and Freedoms of People, First Degree Badge of Honour of the Judicial Department of the Russian Federation and some others.

national law. This is an integrated understanding of law based on the fact that we have developed concepts of law and they should not restrict each other or ignore each other. They have to be perceived and we should use the best of all existing systems.

In my point of view, we have to decide what should be done, and we have to start developing in detail the concept of integrated understanding of international and national law, comparing the law in the Russian Federation and other countries as well. We have to harmonize international and national law. And we have to set proper priorities between these two law systems, so that in the case of a collision between the two systems we would be able to somehow respect the traditions.

Also we have to develop domestic law. And what is most important for the Russian law is one norm which should also be mentioned in our Constitution and federal law. And we will be obliged to set a proper ratio, a balance between the principles of our law and of the laws of other countries. I think that with acceptance of some other principles and concepts, our system will operate in a stable way, and we will have stable decisions taken by court. Otherwise, we will have collisions, like I said now, in our codes. All codes — criminal, civil and others.

It is universally recognized that law can only be focused on the future, not on the past. But in the cases stipulated in this particular law, this law can have a retroactive effect as well. We have to prohibit such an effect that law will be applicable to such cases in the past. In answer to the question what to do and how to do it in the realm of our law I would say that we should make a proper combination of international and national law fixing proper priorities.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you. The floor is given to a remarkable Russian lawyer Henry Markovich Reznik.*

H. REZNIK¹: — Good afternoon, as a lawyer I'm going to talk about the social state. First, I have to touch upon a general issue. I have to say that we live not only in a changing world, but also in a controversial world and a world of paradox. Many events, most of them, have multiple effects both positive and negative. We cannot say that there was something good in the age of the Soviet Union and there was a higher level culture in those days. It is unproductive and hardly wise. This is not normal when literature, including thick magazines, is published in millions of copies, and people are trying to subscribe, but subscription is limited. So the situation in the Soviet Union was such that now we live in a different country. The territory is the same but the country is entirely different. Unfortunately, the changes were very dramatic, and it was a kind of a revolution. This is a kind of sublimation. Sublimation is a transition of a substance from one physical state to another state, for example, from solid state into liquid state. This was such a transition.

We now have great changes in economics, culture, relations between people, because when we had one empire, the state during the Soviet era, there was no other President, like in the Egypt of Pharaoh, holding the state property, no private property. Then there was a turning point. It was

¹ President of the Bar of Moscow, Head of the Chair of the Legal Profession at the Academy University for Law under the Institute for State and Law of the Russian Academy of Sciences, LL. M., *Lawyer Emeritus* of the Russian Federation.

declared that our private property is sacred, untouchable, and everybody is free to become a businessman. We get the results of such reforms, of course. We undertook a number of reforms. I'm not going into details. In the Civil War we managed to employ the Yugoslavian version. Unfortunately, Gaydar was not given a chance to finalize his positive reforms in the year 1996–97. Default came in 1998. The price for a barrel of oil was \$8, and we had to pray that the price would go up to \$12.

And now we have the price that is greater than \$100. At the beginning of this century this easy money came to Russia due to high oil price. Because of it the state was about to solve certain social problems. At first it was difficult to define the social state, because it is very difficult to speak about social, economic rights, healthcare. It is difficult to include these rights into a definition which can be defended in court. We are speaking about justice, and we've said that justice is a mechanism, that law is a mechanism for making provisions for justice. If we speak about social states, we all come to the equalization, redistribution of the national gain, national production in favour of the weak.

Similar things can be applied to culture. The question is how and where can we get money to support culture? In boxes? Who will put money to these boxes? Business class has put money into the boxes. But in the beginning of the century the role of the state increased dramatically, state corporations interfered with business, they entered the sphere of business. And, naturally, we came to unprecedented, horrible corruption, which became a style of life now, in such a situation. You watched the President initiate a number of changes, but still 15% of the subjects of our economic activity have been taken responsible for criminal offences, 15% were taken to court. We have a number of cases, which are sometimes greater than those cases that are actually taken to court. 45 of those who were suspected to be criminals managed to pay money and escape court hearings. This is monopolism combined with corruption.

And now if we examine the wishes of our young people, we can see that at the beginning of this era the most popular professions were those of a lawyer and economist, and now everybody is thinking of becoming an official, a state officer. They understand that the state machine is so powerful that you can make a brilliant career there. Many speakers who spoke here before me stated this: we have to determine, formulate the goal, we have to set goals. It was said that we cannot follow the Western way, and we cannot follow the Eastern way. We have a very special Russian way, the original way, the Eurasian way. I respect those speakers, but how can we actually see the difference between the European values and the general human values? These values have been pressed into the legislation. And now we actually see that our state can blow up from the inside.

In the times of the Internet the most dangerous thing for Russia, which can kill our country, is, you know, the formulation of the national idea.

We were forbidden to live our usual lives. First, we were building socialism, we had to build something, we could not live a normal life. And I will quote. "It was a great idea to have brotherhood, and everything was very practical, but people were the obstacles. People always want something and are the source of all the bad things. We understand that it is necessary to work for the future, but they have to go

to the hairdresser's, or they want to drink beer. Instead of struggling for the bright future, they struggle against it. So how is it possible to build a powerful state?" This is from a poem by a poet who is a favourite pupil of Berthold Brecht's — Hans Magnus Enzensberger. People should get a possibility to grow, to improve themselves. There is no other way and there are no means for democracy other than the creation of middle class.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you, Henry Markovich. The floor is given to professor Anatoly Gromyko.*

A. GROMYKO¹: — The previous speaker showed that one of the barriers to solve our internal problems is that we confuse the truth with the right decision. I agree with the opinion of academician Nikolai Petrovich Shmelyov that we should think of how to solve the problem. We cannot solve the problem with a fire of truth, regardless of how intensively it will be defended by both sides. We are a bit subjective here. The right decision can only be made by a consensus, in Russian, agreement, between these two. An agreement, or consensus, like Nikolai Shmelyov said, we yet have to find. Otherwise we will perish. It's quite obvious. We should not either defend someone or offend someone.

I'm an international scientist; I'd like to say about the world culture. Briefly. World culture is the basis for the safety of both the people and the state. I'm a bit concerned that the world culture now is blurred. And it's very good that this issue had been brought up at this Conference. The role of culture in international relations is laid in the international law, in the Charter of the UN. We have the legacy of a great victory: when our troops were in Europe on the Elba, in San Francisco there was a Conference on the establishment of the UN. When some say that Yalta has perished, it's stupidity. One of the decisions held in Yalta were the decisions on the establishment of the UN.

The world culture shall be defended worldwide by all the state holders. You can just refer to yourself; everybody should contribute to the defence of the principles on which the international community is based. And these principles are laid in the Preamble of the Charter of the UN, in different articles of the UN. They were formulated in 1970 during the UN Conference. They were approved. The principles of non-intervention into state affairs, exceptions were made only for the case of genocide.

There were terrible events in Rwanda, when during several months as a result of the conflict between two very large tribes that lived in the region — Hutu and Tutsi, during several months one million people died, were killed, mostly Hutu killed Tutsi, as they were in the majority, the UN had to interfere, but it didn't happen. It is one of the shameful pages in the history of the UN. And the Helsinki agreement,

¹ Corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, leading researcher at Institute for International Security Issues of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor. Author of over 30 monographs: *Africa in World Politics* (Afrika v mirovoj politike), *Masks and Sculpture of Tropical Africa* (Maski i skulptura Tropicheskoy Afriki), *The Kennedy Brothers* (Brat'ja Kennedi), *New Thinking in the Nuclear Age* (Novoje myshlenije v jadernyj vek), *Andrei Gromyko: The Flight of His Arrow* (Andrej Gromyko. Poljot jego strely) and some others. Mr Gromyko is also the author of more than 300 articles in journals. Member of the Russian Academy of Sciences Scientific Council for the African Issues. President of the movement 'For the Consolidation of the Democratic World Order and the UN Support'. Honorary member of the Royal Academy of Sciences of Morocco, of Malagasy Academy of Sciences, Doctor *honoris causa* of University of Leipzig. Mr Gromyko is decorated with the Order of October Revolution, the Order of Friendship of Peoples. He is recipient of the USSR State Prize and V. V. Vorovsky Prize.

signed by the President of the USA, was mute. But when the Soviet Union disintegrated, and this was facilitated from the top, they came up with different explanations why it happened. The stability in Europe has been shattered. And war broke out because of a decrease in moral values. Even in Middle Ages people declared war. Now they do not declare war; they attack at night and throw bombs and missiles, knowing that there would be no response.

We have to work to strengthen the culture of peace, and to strengthen international law, which is important. I'm winding up. There are two tendencies in international affairs. Law fights with strength. I don't know which tendency wins. I'm an optimist and think that law will defeat strength. History is made by people. One cannot just sit and watch how other statesmen destroy one's opportunities, strengthening their influence in the native geopolitical region where Russia used to be present. Take the Balkans. Russia used to have great influence in the area, but now this presence has been greatly diminished. Those who wonder why the USA supported Kosovo and were against Serbia, may know that it's because they wanted to be rehabilitated in the Islamic world for the policy they lead. And to create in Kosovo the largest military base.

In Libya the USA acts in such a way, because the former is rich in oil and gas reserves. I participated in a meeting at the Academy of Science in Morocco. And king Hassan II said that he had ordered to find water in Morocco, but never to discover oil. Otherwise, a country where oil was discovered might be under the pressure of a country interested in these national reserves. Thank you.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you. The Dean of the Philosophy Department of Lomonosov Moscow State University professor Vladimir Mironov is given the floor.*

V. MIRONOV¹: — Good afternoon, dear colleagues. What we have been discussing is related to the threats globalization poses today. Even from the day-to-day basis. We are accustomed that it's a process related to progress, and people say that globalization is progress. We don't see what this process can entail. It is clear that the globalisation process brings much comfort. And it is typical for a human being to accept this comfort ranging from a TV, a mobile phone and so on. As Berdyaev says: "I'm going to Paris tomorrow. And I choose to go by train, and not on horseback."

Likhachov said that the dialogue of cultures is related to the fact what your contribution to knowing your culture is. To know your culture better you have to submerge yourself into a different culture. Some scientists speak about the intersection of cultures. The most interesting is what is not

what intersects in cultures. This thesis about human culture is a bit conditioned. There were different cultures living under different conditions, but they had to intersect. So this thesis of cultures, the dialogues of cultures, is very deep and integrated. To evaluate our own culture and to say that the Russian language is really great and powerful, we have to know at least one more language for comparison.

The following problem, as Vitaly Tretyakov raised it, and Confucius was mentioned aptly, is a fact that in a great number of the intersecting cultures uniformity cannot be achieved. There should not be this dead uniformity. I dealt once with the educational reform. If the reform lasts for more than 10 years, it should be considered as a counter-reform. What is the goal of the reform? To generalize. High quality integrated education can't be achieved. Our leaders call for these reforms. While implementing this general unified examination system, they refer to Europe. Dear colleagues, give me an example, where you can find these similarities.

I once asked my friends from the French delegation: "Would you like to have instead of the French wine only the European wine available?" And they disagreed. There are different educational systems – German educational system, British educational system and others. Germans are unwilling to implement foreign or Bologna educational system. It's one of the problems that we have to understand because education is a component of any culture. Starting from education we get what we have.

And the last thesis. We have been mentioning the Internet and Wikipedia. I have a number of articles where I try to find analogues of what's happened. Bakhtin analyzed medieval cultures trying to find different layers of these cultures. The Internet has a great deal of positive things, but sometimes turns the system into a foolish thing, like a carnival – everyone is trying to put on masks and disguise themselves. It's a widespread carnival. This carnival becomes a day-to-day life thing, like a show, and this show invades politics. This show can interfere with science. You can see how culture can interrelate with all the things that are happening in our life. I'd like to thank the organizers for the invitation. Other colleagues have gathered in this room and this communication can bring about a great deal of positive things, a lot of opportunities. And this is how the dialogue of cultures is being realised.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you. The floor is given to Mr Vladimir Mamontov, President of "Izvestiya" newspaper office.*

V. MAMONTOV²: — First of all, esteemed colleagues, I'd like to thank the organizers for this invitation. I regard this forum as a feast, a festival of intellect and usually borrow ideas from here and grow up here. I wish that we continue this very useful exchange of opinions. Concerning the topic which has already been mentioned here, these multiple cultures and ideas of tolerance in Europe. But until now nobody has examined what caused such a situation. I'm a journalist, so let the scientists correct me. I'm not aware of certain things, but in my experience, in my opinion, there was one single reason why this approach of tolerance did not succeed. It is due to hypocrisy.

¹ Corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Head of the Philosophy Department at Lomonosov Moscow State University, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, honorary worker of higher professional education of the Russian Federation. Author of a number of scholarly publications and manuals, including: *Patterns of Science in Modern Culture and Philosophy* (Obraztsy nauki v sovremennoj kul'ture i filosofiji), *Philosophy and Metamorphoses of Culture* (Filosofija i metamorfozy kul'tury), *University Lectures on Metaphysics* (Universitetskije leksiji po metafizike), *Ontology and Theory of Knowledge* (Ontologija i teorija poznanija), *Philosophy* (Filosofija) and some others. Editor-in-Chief of journal Moscow University Bulletin. Series 7. Philosophy (Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta. Ser. 7. Filosofija), member of editorial boards of journals *Issues of Philosophy* (Voprosy filosofii), *Bulletin of Russian Philosophical Society* (Vestnik Rossijskogo filosofskogo obwestva), *Philosophic Sciences* (Filosofskie nauki). Prof. Mironov is Vice-President of the Russian Philosophical Society. He is decorated with Medal of the Order for Services to the Fatherland of the 2nd degree. Prof. Mironov is recipient of Lomonosov Prize.

² President of Izvestiya Newspaper Office, OJSC. Author of the books: *Seven Dreams in September: Social and Fantastic Alloy* (co-authored), *How to Make a Newspaper Be Read* and others. Member of the Public Chamber of the Russian Federation.

I will start with an example which I saw in Vladivostok, my native city. They have very quickly constructed a federal university on a remote island, Russky, they are going to build a huge bridge. And we can foresee a great and bright future for the university. Buildings are constructed by those illiterate Turkmen workers from Turkmen villages. And also by our friends from China, also from rural areas of China, by our friends and colleagues from Tajikistan, Uzbekistan. Special charter flights have been organized. They live there in reasonable conditions. The builders do not realize that they take part in a noble action, that they are building a temple of science — a university. So the question is: don't we have our own human resources? Who will work there? Who will study there? We expect the people to come from Malaysia, from other Asian countries. I'm happy that this university is being built, but I see huge contradictions which will be serious and in future we will have to overcome these contradictions.

And there is another story from Vladivostok too. If you take 10 citizens, 9 out of 10 will say: "We don't need these roads, this bridge, this university. We don't need the reconstructions made for somebody else. Probably these are interesting thoughts. They are trying to build a bright future. But we will not be there due to multiple reasons." So here we cannot foresee and organize a dialogue between cultures. No dialogue at all or a very strange dialogue. Nobody raised this issue. I'm a journalist, and maybe scientists have to start studying this event. I published two articles on the problem, because I understand that we are trying to build something, but at the same time we destroy what we used to have.

My third example. Not long ago when I was in Bishkek I saw an advert — they required to employ a sewing machine operator, the payment is \$500, but the job offered is in St. Petersburg, in a suburban area. And this lady from Bishkek, from Central Asia, is invited to come to St. Petersburg region to work there as an operator of a sewing machine making covers for canvas for Hyundai cars. We can also say that somehow our old Soviet way of life still exists, we somehow follow traditions. But this is self-deception. We deceive ourselves.

When I tell such stories I do not claim that I am going to arrive at valid conclusions. These are the ideas of a journalist, but I think when we talk about a dialogue between civilizations, between cultures and subcultures, we have to keep in mind that in reality there are principles and forms which allow to make people happier, even if these people are multicultural. Because we in this way are trying to invite people — please come and work for us — after that we will try to squeeze them out. But if we actually want them to come and in future become equal to us, then we have to bear this idea in mind from the very beginning, and then the policy should be different. My idea is that we have to start thinking of the future of our huge projects. Thank you.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you. The floor is given to a corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences professor Georgy Borisovich Kleiner.*

G. KLEINER¹: — Thank you very much, Alexander Sergeyevich. First of all, I'd like to express my feelings

¹ Corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Deputy Director of the Central Economic and Mathematical Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor. Director of the Institute for New Economic Information of the New Russian University, Head of Chair of Economics of the State Academic University for the

of gratitude to the organizers of this wonderful event. This is my second Conference. And what is most important for me is the opportunity to look once more at the portrait of Dmitry Likhachov. When I looked at this face which is so enlightened with spirit, I was thinking about the text of my presentation, and I actually recalled the atmosphere that was here last year. And exactly this is the definition — the inspiration, and also a highly spiritual wave. We are trying to examine our lives in depth and for this I am very grateful to the organizers. I am not going to tell you the contents of the published paper. I actually wanted to analyze the whole list of points of exchange between different countries. And also I was thinking about intercultural communication. And I wanted see the difference between the exchange of ideas and exchange of goals, for example.

Thinking back to Daniil Granin's idea, I would like to express my concern. What is the matter of our concern today? We have heard a number of speakers representing different specialities discuss economic problems. They understand that private property should be effective. We also know that the state should be present in the economy. This is true for certain situations, but we have the theory of economics and the science of economics, which obliges us to determine when private property is not equitable, is not usable. All these conclusions should be supported by certain principles and facts. Otherwise we can speak endlessly. I'd like to say that the modern state of the theory of economics is miserable because the orthodox theory which was considered to be all-embracing and self-sufficient in the whole civilized world suffered defeat. Here we can mention the international crisis, and also internal failures.

Two years ago a colleague of mine, academician Polterovich, published a paper "Crisis of Theory of Economics". He spoke about internal and external problems. I would say that the problem is as follows: we have to determine whether we have to have a single economic theory for all countries, all states; and if there should be one theory, we have to elaborate, develop such a theory; if multiple, then we have to create all of them. And my idea is that such a theory should be oriented at civilizations. Examine the operation of enterprises. An American enterprise is a toy in the hands of shareholders and its aim is to bring profit to these shareholders.

In Europe the idea is somehow deeper, because every enterprise has to satisfy the needs of all the participants of the production process, including the owners and different

Humanities, Head of Chair of Institutional Economics of the State University for Management, Head of Chair of System Analysis in Economy of the Financial Academy under the Government of the Russian Federation, professor of the Department of Economics of Lomonosov Moscow State University, of Moscow School of Economics under Lomonosov Moscow State University, member of other universities.

Author of more than 500 scientific publications, among which are: *Strategy of a Company* (Strategiya predpriyatiya); *Microeconomics of Knowledge* (Mikroekonomika znaniy); *The Theory of a Firm and the Practice of Russian Enterprises: Status, Problems, Prospects* (Teoriya firmy i praktika rossiyskikh predpriyatii: sostoyaniye; problemy; perspektivy); *Evolution of the Institutional Systems* (Evolutsiya institutsional'nukh sistem); *Production Functions: Theory, Methods, Planning* (Proizvodstvennyye funktsii: teoriya, metody, planirovaniye); *Forward Production Planning in Company: An Attempt of Modelling* (Perspektivnoye planirovanie proizvodstva v ob'edineniy (opyt modelirovaniya)), and others.

Editor-in-Chief of 'The Economic Science in Modern Russia' journal (Ekonomichekaya nauka v sovremennoy Rossii), Deputy editor-in-chief of the 'Russian Journal of Management'. Member of the Academic Expert Council on Anti-Crisis Policy of the Analytical Administration of the Executive Office of the State Duma. Laureate of the V. S. Nemchinov Award of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 2002. Decorated with the Medal of the Order for Services to the Fatherland of the 2nd degree.

kinds of local communities. In the Soviet Union every enterprise served the satisfaction of needs of the national economy. In Yugoslavia self-governing enterprises were very popular. So the question is: what sort of enterprises do you want to have?

Next question: What sort of people do we have in our country? Whether our society consists of the people who are obedient to social ideas, or they are obedient to big families or clans, which, as we say, are autonomous. These issues should be tackled. We have to create a systemic theory, but not a theory which would depend on the system, which is being studied by such a theory. And the creation of such a theory is one of the pressing tasks faced by our science of economy.

I agree with V. L. Makarov that people's creativity is in a position to resolve such problems, but we have to somehow think of a happy medium, because masses can be very productive. I think here in our hall we have a great number of intellectuals and talented people, both theoreticians and practitioners. Here we can find a platform on which the dialogue of cultures will be possible, and it will be possible to find solutions and we may come closer to the solution to the problems. Thank you very much.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you. The floor is given to Mamadsho Ilolovich Ilolov.*

M. ILOLOV¹: — Dear colleagues, dear Alexander Sergeevich, thank you very much for the opportunity to have my ideas shared. All the participants of this International Conference feel very well in a creative sense, of course. We have a different atmosphere. People who come here are specialists in different fields. We have to exchange our opinions; we have to speak about the intercultural dialogue under the globalization conditions. I'm not going to read out the presentation I prepared, I will say just a few words about what is happening now in the CIS countries.

For 20 years we have been trying to preserve the Academy of Sciences of Tajikistan, a very difficult task indeed. Thanks for my colleagues from the Russian Academy of Sciences who have supported me, particularly President Osipov and the First Vice-President academician Nekipelov who is present here. They supported us. We, physicists, have our priorities. We started to restore scientific test sites in Pamir. But mostly it is very difficult to do.

Much has been said about the international culture, political culture, the culture of conflicts, I'd like to say about the culture of science. We have some flaws. I'm talking about my colleagues. It's difficult now because the data we use are just imitations, no clear reliable data that can be used for scientific conclusions. There is no industry that used to be in the Soviet times. We did have some flaws and drawbacks; I'm not going to praise those times. But they were reasonably good. Now it's difficult, much more difficult. I'd like to refer to my colleagues, we should not forget each other, let's support each other, during difficult times we have to support each other, not allow science to disappear.

¹ President of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tajikistan, academician of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tajikistan, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics). Author of more than 100 research and popular-science works including the treatise 'The Cauchy Problem for Certain Classes of Abstract Evolution Equations' (Zadacha Koshi dlya nekotorykh klassov abstraktnykh evolyutsionnykh uravnenij) and the popular-science book *Science and Time*. Conferred the Order of Glory (First class) of the Republic of Tajikistan.

There are a number of problems. My country is a Muslim one. And it's good. I've never seen anything negative written about Islam. It goes back to 1400 years back. It's not just a religion, it's society. It has much to be learned from. Dear colleagues, we have to undertake a serious approach, mainly in these problems. We have to reveal the truth about Islam to Western scientists, but we should not follow them in their faults. Huntington is right saying that if there is a clash of civilizations it will be in the area of cultures. This is why we have a great deal to do to find a way out of this difficult situation that we are facing at the very beginning of the 21st century. I wish great success to everybody moving in that direction, great success to this Conference. And I wish to see the 99th anniversary of the Conference. Thank you very much for the invitation. Huge success to everybody.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Thank you. The floor is given to Nikolai Andreyevich Khrenov.*

N. KHRENOV²: — Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Dialogue is a very difficult universal subject. There are different aspects — legal, political, technological. Everything is discussed. I'd like to speak about one aspect only — the mental aspect of this problem. Many scientists have worked on that. We have different opinions on this issue, which is a grey area, despite the fact that quite serious, namely French, historians dealt with this problem. While examining the history of art, I came to the conclusion that at some point in history there emerged two mental paradigms that confront each other. If we don't take them into account, we cannot evaluate specific events accurately. One paradigm appeared in the Enlightenment period, it is called Modern by Habermas, the second paradigm is Romanticism. They were redefined during the New Time, though their appearance can be traced back to the Renaissance time. But they still define the world perception of the people up to the current day. They are historical constants. We don't think enough about them.

The emergence of Postmodern triggers a downturn of Modern, decline of Modern. But, in fact, it's the thing that lay in the basis of Romanticism. It is the chronological issues of these paradigms. Let's talk about their essence. It's a reconstruction of all the social structures and institutions, including the education and the upbringing of a new person. It's a futuristic world perception. It's the basis for the revolutionary world perception that is in the basis of all the revolutions of the new time, including the Russian one. It's undervaluation of traditions, undervaluation of history, religion, national peculiarities, and culture as a whole. Culture is related with the national peculiarities of

² Deputy Director for Research, Head of the Theory of Art Section at the State Institute for Art History and Criticism (Moscow), Professor of the Chair of the Humanities at the Russian State University of Cinematography, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy). Author of over 400 scholarly publications, including books: *'The Acting Man' in Russian Culture* ('Chelovek igrayushchij' v russkoj kul'ture); *Cinema: Rehabilitation of Archetypal Reality* (Kino: reabilitatsiya arhetipicheskoy real'nosti); *Performances in the Age of the Revolt of the Masses* (Zrelishcha v epokhu vosstanija mass); *Will for the Sacred* (Volja k sakral'nomu); *Culture in the Age of Social Chaos* (Kul'tura v epokhu social'nogo khaosa); *Russian Proteus* (Russkij Protej); *Images of the Great Gap. Cinema in the Context of Cultural Cycles Succession* (Obrazy velikogo razryva. Kino v kontekste smeny kul'turnykh tsiklov); *Socio-Psychological Aspects of Interaction between Art and Audience* (Sotsial'no-psikhologicheskie aspekty vzaimodejstviya iskusstva i publiki); *Audience in the History of Culture. The Phenomenon of Audience in the Context of Mass Psychology* (Publika v istoriji kul'tury. Fenomen publiki v raketse psihologiji mass); *Social Psychology of Art: The Age of Transition* (Sotsial'naya psikhologija iskusstva: perekhodnaya epokha) and some others. Member of Russian Filmmakers' Union, member of the Union of Theatrical Figures of Russia.

the nation. It's aggressive in relation to the previous epochs. Thanks to this, unprecedentedly dynamic world appeared. It's a monologue; it is not a dialogue by nature. It's not a problem of equality and politics; it's a problem of mentality. It's an unconscious thing.

The second paradigm is triggered by the rational consciousness of Modern. It's a confrontation with Modern. It's the cultivation of history and national specific features, religious revitalization, rehabilitation of culture as an element. And the previous epochs. Say, Middle Ages. It's not the Dark Ages. The futurism of Modern can be compared with Romanticism. It's a different interpretation of history. Not a history of absolute spirit, but including persons, individuals. It's the history of the nations and peoples that create their own culture, self-sufficient culture. When we think about the existence of independent culture in history we confront the problem of dialogue, but the dialogue is rejected. Romanticism rehabilitated, reopened the dialogue and its opportunities. There are great world cultures that are independent and self-sufficient. The problem of self-sufficiency and independence is the other side of ideology. Goethe in a kind of a manifest in his *West-Östliches Divan* put a question whether we were going to stop considering cultures as exotic. Let's compare this with mental paradigms and compare them with different cultures.

Some cultures fit with Modern, some cultures fit with Romanticism, some of them are futuristic, some are pessimistic. I refer to the article by Sergey Bulgakov, where Russian intellectuals are criticized for a very simplistic way of studying the Enlightenment period. They played a great role in our history. While I'm developing this logic, I'm interested to know in what situation now Russia is. And is it really ready for the dialogue? It's not that nations are programmed in such a way. In one country, you can find either atheism or futurism. Kurt Hübner, a current German philosopher, shrewdly traced these paradigms in the Stalin period and the German Reich. If Romanticism is in the image of fascism, then Enlightenment is under the influence of Leninism and Stalinism. We can trace the development of all these dominant concepts of Romanticism and Enlightenment and their dramatic confrontation, their destructive nature. But we could see the traces back to the roots.

Modernism is still alive, I think it has not outlived itself. And I think that the USA as the leader of globalization shows how this world perception is realized by this civilization. When I put forward this question, I decided to find a philosopher who would prove my guess. And I was successful – Baudrillard has a very interesting saying, suggestion about the fact that Europe is disenchanted with these modern settings, but the USA preserved them in an intact way. These Enlightenment settings with their monologist subtext have many progressive things, but negative ones as well. And it triggers narcissism of the great American civilization, which does not understand other cultures. When I heard the speakers from the Middle East countries, I became convinced that this is a case of misunderstanding the East. I take the Iraq situation as a personal drama and tragedy.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — Thank you. The floor is given to Vice-President of the Russian Academy of Sciences academician Alexander Dmitriyevich Nekipelov for the closing word.

A. NEKIPELOV¹: — Thank you very much. I'm grateful to the Chairman and my esteemed colleagues. As all the previous speakers, I'm not going to refer to my published texts. The problem we have to actually tackle here is still seen as very important. I'm going to use this opportunity in order to tell you very briefly about the situation in the leadership of the Russian Academy of Sciences. Because the Academy is not a homogeneous organization, it's heterogeneous. How we are looking at the situation with science, with education, and what sort of future is awaiting us. It could be of interest because we witness a very lively discussion in our society concerning the fate of our science. Our position is as follows: the Academy of Sciences is an organization which, first of all, is called to deal with fundamental research studies, although everybody understands that there is no firewall between fundamental and applied science. The first question which we have to consider, and our society has to find an answer to this issue, we have to determine exactly what sort of fundamental science we need. This is the question, because fundamental science is not a cheap toy, it's a very expensive toy. Because of that there are no countries in the world which have all-embracing fundamental science, but the existence of such science brings about very obvious and great advantages. The fundamental science was inherited by the Russian Federation from the Soviet Union, of course. During the '90s the scientific potential was undermined, but still it is preserved at a fairly high level.

And we now find ourselves in a point of bifurcation, the point when we have to determine the line for further development. We have to understand that our science has to cover the main areas of studies, so that at least we should be able to understand the progress, which takes place in the world. If no, then we will actually fail in the future. And we are convinced that this problem has to be resolved by society as a whole, not by the Academy of Sciences alone. It is very sad that a solution to this problem has not been found yet, and the degradation of our science continues.

The situation is such that during the latest years we have actually seen the number of young people — those who are under 35 — growing. And we have an older generation — 60 years of age and more. This is because of the fact that pensions are very low, and because of that we have a problem of positions. Everyone understands that the system cannot operate having only the input. It has to provide for proper procreation of scientific personnel. Today it is not working.

In many discussions we speak about our Russian fundamental science seeing it a legacy of Stalin's years. Because of it we actually think that we have to say goodbye to this system and transfer fundamental studies to universities, or we have to change this system

¹ Vice-President of the Russian Academy of Sciences, academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of Moscow School of Economics at Lomonosov Moscow State University, Dr. Sc. (Economics), Professor. Author of more than 200 scholarly publications, including books: *Essays on Post-Communist Economy* (Ocherki po ekonomike postkommunizma); *Formation and Functioning of Economic Institutions: from 'Adventures of a Castaway' to Market Economy Based on Individual Production* (Stanovlenije i funkcionirovanije ekonomicheskikh institutov: ot 'robinzodstve' do rynočnoj ekonomiki, osnovannoj na individual'nom proizvodstve); *Central and East Europe in the Second Half of the 20th Century* (Central'naja i Vostochnaja Evropa vo vtoroj polovine XX veka) and some others. A. D. Nekipelov is a member of the Academic Board at the Security Council of the Russian Federation. He is decorated with the Order of Honour, the Order for Services to the Fatherland of the 4th degree. Doctor *honoris causa* of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences.

of investments and funding. The history of the Russian Academy of Sciences goes beyond this Stalin's period. And at every stage, including the Stalin stage, we managed to preserve very efficient mechanisms of guidance and control of our scientific community. And here I speak about the distribution of resources, both in funds and land and so on. The state used to give land and other objects of real estate to our Academy of Sciences. The state also took part in the selection of the most important areas for studies. The whole activity of the Academy of Sciences was based on the principle of self-government. The principle of funding was used in such a way that the state had to determine the general outline of science and allocate money. The state did not interfere with the details of expenses.

Was this mechanism working ideally? No, it was not. Several aspects of self-government became, so to say, rusty. They are outdated, obsolete. And our scientific community has to deal with them. We became old-fashioned because of the fact that science had to overcome difficulties typical of the '90s. And we have to recall the reforms, the changes which took place in the '90s. Many people left the country. Nevertheless, our science is still with us. And even now it is in a fairly good shape. Under conditions when people did not have the money, they at least got freedom and earned money when and where it was possible. I'm not going to accuse anybody. When salaries increased, we found out that it became very difficult to change this tendency.

And now our greatest concern is that we now face a very serious lack of interest. Our people are not very much interested in the affairs of the Academy. They have an unresolved interest in other organizations, other places. For example, I can examine the character of work and needs of our sections and departments. They are speaking about eventual possibility to generate money. Science resembles a social care organization. Such science will not be efficient. And the situation remains the same even now. We are told that the system of distribution is ineffective in principle, but in reality it's a competitive system and there is struggle for resources at all levels.

Sometimes we have to close laboratories, to close institutes. If we are struggling to get resources this does not mean that we are happy with this situation, because here we face formalism and some negative effects. But the problem is whether we are going to use guillotine to cure a headache. We have very ardent arguments concerning the evaluation of the results of scientific activity of scientific groups and individuals, of course. Scientific studies are carried out at different institutes and they are most efficient. We are not able to get similar results in other institutions from the point of view of publications outside Russia and index of citation. And also speaking about the efficiency per unit of expenses, we are quite all right even on the international scale. We realise that it cannot last long since we look efficient because the funding of the Academy is not very high, and not because the results are impressive.

Now a very serious struggle is being waged around the Academy. And quite recently we actually saw that the centre of gravity, the emphasis was transferred to the humanities and social sciences. They say that mathematicians, physicists have a good standing in the world, but the humanities and social sciences are weak in Russia. They comprise the heritage of the old Marxist system. Journals are not up-to-date. Usually they have only a few publications known outside Russia. And

because of that attempts are made to prove that it is necessary to somehow take the humanities and social sciences outside the Academy of Sciences and introduce a division for natural sciences as it is done in some countries. It is very interesting to see that here we have a new situation when graduates of universities who actually went to the West and got education there now play an active role here. It is interesting to say that the question of the return of brains to Russia is actually raised by the people who graduated from our universities, perhaps got a scientific degree here, went to the West and failed there. But ambitions remain.

At the Russian Academy of Sciences such scientists meet with a very tolerable attitude. We understand the causes which made them leave Russia, but they display aggressive manners, even transgressing the border of scientific ethics. They actually say that all scientists who stayed in Russia are good for nothing, are rubbish and are not very valuable from the point of view of modern science. And at the same time those young scientists did not acquire strong positions in the West. Because of that I see here a sort of a conflict.

Before coming here I saw a certain paper published which attracted general attention. I'm speaking about Alexander Muravyov who is working here, at the School of Management of St. Petersburg University. But his main position is in Germany. He wrote a paper describing the state of the science of economics in Russia. This person gathered a great deal of interesting facts, but what attracts attention is that people who have integrated into the scientific environment of the European countries, automatically raise the question whether the situation in Russia corresponds to certain rules and regulations in the West. For example, they will start comparing the average volume of papers and publications here in Russia and outside Russia. And somehow they even neglect the size of journals. They count pages. We have to evaluate the volume objectively, but nevertheless such a person would easily make a conclusion which is far from true.

And there is another tendency which is of great concern for us, and I'm going to speak about it here, at this University which is actively cooperating with academic science. We now witness that somebody is trying to drive a wedge between the Academy of Sciences and scientists working at universities. Some people say that university science is much more promising and it should be funded properly. I feel it would be a disaster if such attempts at dividing the scientific and educational community into two parts belonging to the area of the Academy of Sciences and to universities would succeed. It would be a very bad move, especially in the existing reality. This way we would lose the rest of our science. I'd like to say that such conferences as the Likhachov Conference at your wonderful University are very important events. You usually invite representatives from the Russian Academy of Sciences and we eagerly accept your invitations. These conferences play a very important role in consolidating our scientific community and in ensuring that the scientific and educational community would assume a single attitude because we have common tasks and goals.

A. ZAPESOTSKY: — *Dear colleagues, allow me to thank everybody for a very intensive and solid work. Thank you very much. Our plenary session is over. The Organizing Committee wishes you a fruitful and successful work in your workshops tomorrow.*

Round Table

INTERNATIONAL DIALOGUE OF CULTURES AND NATION-STATES

*Radisson SAS Hotel Conference Hall,
May 13, 2011*

Co-Chairs:

- G. GATILOV** Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
- A. GROMYKO** corresponding member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, leading researcher at the Institute for International Security Issues of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (History), Professor
- M. TITARENKO** academician of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute for the Far East Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Moscow), Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor, *Scientist Emeritus* of the Russian Federation
- F. UNGER** President of the European Academy of Sciences and Arts (Salzburg, Austria), Professor, Dr.

Speakers:

- Ye. ASTAKHOV** Professor of the Chair of Diplomacy of Moscow University of International Relations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
- H. BONNENBERG** Dr. Sc. (Engineering), member of the German Society for Foreign Policy, member of the German-Russian Forum
- X. CHANG** Director of the Department of the Institute of Community Development at the Party School of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, editor of 'Scientific Socialism' journal (China)
- A. CLESSE** Director of the Luxemburg Institute for European and International Studies, Ph. D.
- S. FARAKH** foreign member of the Russian Academy of Education, Professor of Chair of Philosophy of the Department for Humanities at the Lebanese State University, Ph. D.
- M. ILOLOV** President of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tajikistan, academician of the ASRT, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Professor
- V. KUVALDIN** Head of the Chair of Social and Humanitarian Disciplines of the Moscow School of Economics (Lomonosov Moscow State University), Dr. Sc. (History), Professor
- A. MOISEYEV** Head of the Chair of Private International Law of the Diplomatic Academy at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation (Moscow), Head of the International Law and International Security Centre at the Institute for Contemporary International Studies of the Diplomatic Academy at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, LL. D., Professor
- H. NASSAR** First Deputy Minister of Culture, the Arab Republic of Egypt
- V. PRODANOV** corresponding member of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), Professor
- M. SANAI** member of Parliament of the Islamic Republic of Iran, Director of the Research Centre for Russia and Eastern Europe at the University of Tehran (Iran), Professor of the Law Institute at Tehran University, Dr. Sc. (Political Studies)
- E. SCHNEIDER** Professor of Political Science at the University of Siegen (Germany), Ph. D.
- A. SHAHINIAN** Chief Academician Secretary of the Armenian National Academy of Sciences, Presidium member of the Armenian National Academy of Sciences, member of the American Chemical Society and the American Society for Photobiology
- M. SHLAPAK** Vice-President of the Academy of Sciences of Moldova, Dr. Sc. (Art Criticism)
- K. SHUVALOV** Ambassador-at-large of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Special Representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russian Federation on cooperation with the Alliance of Civilizations, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
- V. SOGRIN** Head of Centre for North American Studies at the Institute for World History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Professor at Moscow University of International Relations under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia, editor-in-chief of 'Social Sciences and Modernity' journal, Dr. Sc. (History), Honorary worker of higher education of the Russian Federation
- M. TLILI** Founder and Director of the New York University Centre for Dialogues, Diplomat
- V. ZAPEVALOV** Representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation in St. Petersburg, chair of the Editorial Board of 'Consul' ('Konsul') journal
- T. ZHDANOK** member of the European Parliament (Latvia), President of the EU Russian-Speakers Alliance, Dr. Sc. (Mathematics)

G. GATILOV: — Esteemed colleagues, let's get started. Today we are going to discuss cultural and national issues. Yesterday at the plenary session we had a very productive exchange of opinions on the subject of the dialogue of cultures and civilizations. We discussed suggestions from the participants and what I noticed with pleasure was that people of different occupations, experts in different fields, were united by our common goal how to make the dialogue of cultures, the dialogue of civilizations useful for the development of humankind. How to direct our efforts to unite our inspirations for a safer, more reliable road for all countries, how to make sure that all countries and nations can coexist and develop effectively and the role of states should not be underestimated.

We mentioned at yesterday's meeting that each country can contribute constructively to the development of the international dialogue of cultures. As to Russia, yesterday I tried to bring up some topics, ideas, we do undertake at the state level, our efforts, how we see our position in international coordinates of development of international dialogue of cultures. We are going in that direction.

We spoke yesterday about multiculturalism. It is an important topic for discussion that has appeared quite recently. And rejections of multiculturalism by some states invoked intensive reaction in the world, and the reflection of this problem was our discussion yesterday. As for Russia, we have already made our choice taking into account our historical experience, taking into consideration dozens of ethnic groups, we recognize multiculturalism. It is our historical choice and we are not going to step aside. And it is the voice at the highest political level. Russia supports all initiatives aimed at strengthening intercultural and intercivilizational concord. Among them is doubtless the initiative of the Congress of St. Petersburg Intelligentsia, embodied in the 'image' of Likhachov International Scientific Conference.

The second aspect is, and we mentioned this yesterday during the discussion, the problem of the clash of civilizations. I think that there is no clash of religions and civilizations as a problem, and the attempt to lay responsibility for negative events in the road of terrorist attacks or any activities or put responsibility on some religions and civilizations is a way to nowhere. In our opinion, this should not be the case. Each country, its religion, its civilization contribute constructively to our common development of the new times of the humankind. It is a starting point for our discussion that was raised yesterday.

And today we are going to exchange our opinions in this field, as you see from the agenda. We have several heads of section. I'd like to ask them to help me during our session. As for the format of our meeting, we will be working up to 12 o'clock. We have a number of speakers and by colleagues and I suggest follow the list as it is presented on the agenda. If you have any wish to say something, raise you cards and we will give you the floor as well. The time frame is 5 to 7 minutes if there are no other suggestions. Seven minutes is the time limit.

After this introduction I suggest starting our discussion and according to the agenda, according to the list of the participants I invite professor Yevgeny Astakhov.

Ye. ASTAKHOV¹: — Thank you, Mr Chairman. I am a professional diplomat. I am a former Ambassador Extraordinary and I will try to share with you some of my ideas. Now we have a number of questions. What is global civilization? What is the objective of one of the organizations, Euro-Atlantic?

Now we are facing a systemic crisis: social crisis and economic crisis. And it is more difficult for cultural values. During this international crisis there are no sufficient grounds that western countries are leading. They are now losing in terms of gross domestic product. In Moscow among the élite eurocentrism is very strong. And now we think of the position of some countries, such as Germany, France. Their positions are rather shaky and in 40 years they will be at the second level of powerful states. They will lose economic and political positions. Who will lead? China? The United States? Or India, Brazil, maybe Japan, Indonesia? Then comes Russia if it is economically successful.

Civilizations include not only material factors. Although the West continues its strategy of imposing the directions, which for me as a diplomat was difficult to accept, and of trying to push the states blaming them for something. But the dialogue should be continued at all levels with the European Union, with NATO. We should keep in mind, though, that if we don't look at the East, if we do not strengthen our bonds with China, in BRIC directions, if the West doesn't see our interests are directed to the East, not the West, no productive dialogue is possible.

We can see some traces of westernization. It is visible in Russia as well, precisely in mass media. Soon power will be the most important weapon. The former criteria will be rated second. Different satellites are looming over the country. Globalization is useful in the ideological area, but human civilization without preserving diversity of cultures, diversity of traditions, the way forward wouldn't be possible. I think that our people should take this into account. In principle, God gave life to human beings. People rate through severe conditions, comfort. And these protestant ethics to work to produce goods, to consume goods, these approaches are clear, but it is not an aspiration of development.

Western civilization stepped aside from Christianity. If we say in rough terminology, the old Europe is aging in all respects. Western civilization in principle is developing horizontally. Consuming goods, promoting technological progress, all these things are interrelated. They are developing consumerist society. They look where to buy real estate, where to buy things, they try to be patriotic. They should develop vertically, not only horizontally. Horizontal development is a way to nowhere.

After Libya other things are clear. All countries do not have guaranteed sovereignty. There is no international law. After Libya it is quite clear: if any state would like to gain control over the natural resources located at the territory of this state, the territory of this state can be under the direct military strike. To share these resources with other NATO

¹ Professor of the Chair of Diplomacy of Moscow University of International Relations under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. Author of a number of scholarly publications on diplomacy and politics, including a monograph *Macro- and Microeconomic Diplomacy: Supporting National Business* (Makro- i mikroekonomicheskaja diplomatija: soprovozhdenie natsional'nogo biznesa) and a number of scholarly articles. Many of Mr. Astakhov's scholarly works have been published abroad.

countries and the European Union, to attempt to locate forces in the European space. And in the CIS countries these representatives appeared immediately. There was nothing: hotels, embassies, but they appeared. And I would like to express my tanks to Mr. Gorbachev to the changes he made. The theory, there is market principle of organization of life of society and nothing new we try to thrive to exclude possibility of unpredictable development in the history that can move in an unpredictable direction.

G. GATILOV: — *Thank you. Dear colleagues, don't get offended if I interrupt you. Otherwise, we will not fit into the time frame. Now the next person to speak is Mr. Heinrich Bonnenberg.*

H. BONNENBERG: — All I want so say is there always is the possibility of elections. The situation is the following: we have a lot of emigrant clubs in Germany and also in Berlin and all those groups are very different. And these people work within our society without any problem. And we have Islamic people (the biggest group are the Turkish people) and we also have a lot of Muslim people from Bosnia, Bulgaria and Libya, Palestine and so on. It's a wide range of discussion. The main problem is still education and learning the German language. It's a complicated story how to handle this. We tell them that learning German is the only way for them to stay in the country. There are groups which are making business delivering fruits, goods and so on... the whole community. So, the question of education seems to be the main problem.

We have other things involved with the shariah problem. It's a very important problem because some 'business people' in this ghetto-structure are not really eager to give others freedom of making their own decisions concerning their life; for example, they can't know whom they are going to marry, whether they want to change their religion, so there could be problems. We need one more discussion to make a decision what special parts of shariah could be accepted and could not be accepted. But the main point is that we have a constitution in our country and the constitution is the foundation of our society, so everybody should be asked if he accepts the constitution without trying to organize German society in His image and likeness.

I just want to mention that multi-culti is possible only if one knows its meaning and if somebody accepted the constitution of course he can live in his culture, it's not a problem to do that. The only problem we have is that parts of shariah do not agree with our constitution.

G. GATILOV: — *The next is Ms Tatiana Zhdanok, Deputy of the European Parliament from Latvia.*

T. ZHDANOK¹: — Thank you very much. I would like to say that unfortunately I was not present here during the plenary session. This was the day when we had a session in the European Parliament. I was able to come later at night

and probably this is why it is somehow difficult for me to fit into the discussion which started yesterday. But I would like somehow to respond to the ideas spoken today. Of course, I am not going to keep my speech close to the published text. I'd like to express my scepticism concerning the cultural signal which we could get from Russia when we are outside Russia.

I speak on behalf of the Russian-speaking people living outside Russia in the neighbouring countries. I'd like to say that Mr. Bonnenberg has mentioned the problem of Muslim communities in Germany, but we have millions of Russian-speaking people and they have their own culture and business providing food and products to members of the community and somehow we can see traces of nostalgia, and for the Russian people nostalgia is a very real thing; and also they would like to preserve their culture. The impulses coming from Russia are perceived in the European countries mainly connected with this nostalgia phenomenon. In my paper I indicate that unfortunately no new ideas, new impulses are coming from Russia to the Western countries. This is very sad. There is need for us to get more impulses from Russia.

As a member of the European Parliament, I have been involved in very serious discussions, important issues, including the latest initiative generated by the Council and supported by the European Commission that we partly abandon one of the most important symbols of the united Europe. I mean the Schengen Agreement. A very emotional discussion was held in the European Parliament, the Chairman of the European Commission took part, and the Commissioner responsible for the problems of immigration also took part in the discussion. We considered the issue of migration, the problem connected with immigrants. We saw the division between the left, the centre and the right wings of the Parliament.

All left-wing groups together with the liberals were very critical of these ideas suggested by Italy and France, that European Countries have the right to unilaterally introduce such restrictions, and the reason for that and the wording in the documents of the European Commission concerning large immigration streams is not clear. They speak about large streams. Our group representing the Green Party in the European Parliament asked the question: what is the meaning of 'large streams' of immigrants, how can we measure the volume of such streams and where are the criteria? Now they have, so to say, closed border between Italy and France due to the presence of 16,000 immigrants. But these countries require additional labour in order to support their own pensions, for example.

Chancellor Merkel at the end of the previous year declared that the program of cultural integration failed. Being a mathematician I would say that I don't like the term of integration used in politics. Integration in mathematics means summing up, and this summation is done to get a new quality. And when the word 'to integrate' is used in politics they mean that internal community should integrate into, say, German society. It's not integration, it's assimilation.

And due to lack of time I give only isolated ideas and also I would like to respond to the previous speaker. It was mentioned very clearly that today the European Union looks at Russia as a bride and usually we come across traces of russophobia in the West. But now things are changing and we have been invited the alliance of entrepreneurs in

¹ Member of the European Parliament (Latvia), President of the EU Russian-Speakers Alliance, Dr. Sc. (Mathematics). A co-Chairperson of For Human Rights of United Latvia party. Author of a number of publications, including study-guides: *Zadachi-testy po vysshey matematike: Mnozhestva. Funktsiyi. Predely. Proizvodnyye* [Problem-Tests on Higher Mathematics: Sets. Functions. Limits. Differential Quotient], *Zadachi pismennykh vstupitelnykh ekzamenov po matematike v 1983 i 1984 gg. (s resheniyami)* [Problems of written examinations on Mathematics from 1983 and 1984 (solutions added)], miscellanies «25 Questions to Tatjana Zhdanok», «European Diary» and others. Ms. Zhdanok is one of the founders of the EU Russian-Speakers Alliance. Decorated with the Order of Friendship.

Brussels and they also generate signal that you, politicians, put barriers to our business with Russia. And one of the major chemical companies in Belgium constructs a great enterprise in Novgorod here and the theory is that Russia will actually turn to the East if the West will not use its last chance of getting together with Russia in better terms. So, even within the European Parliament I see traces of phobia against Russia.

G. GATILOV: — *Thank you very much. This is the view from the Baltic States. I am giving word to Mr Vladimir Zapevalov, representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation in St. Petersburg.*

V. ZAPEVALOV¹: — Dear ladies and gentlemen, dear colleagues. As a representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in St. Petersburg I welcome you. Together with such well-known names of St. Petersburg as Northern Capital and Cultural Capital of Russia, one more title was added. It is the Diplomatic Consulate Capital of Russia. And I would like to devote my presentation to role of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in St. Petersburg as one of divisions of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia and the place of this ministry in the dialogue of cultures and how diplomatic part may help to strengthen relationships in the globalized world.

The consulate community of St. Petersburg accounts to 35 general consulates, the Department of the Belarus Embassy and 3 representatives of international organisations. And the geography is very wide. Countries are from North America to Australia and from Northern Europe to Latin America. We should note that diplomatic consulates have to deal not with political, but economic consulate-related issues and cultural issues as well. Consulate representatives of foreign countries accredited in our city actively participate in cultural events in St. Petersburg and at the same time they raise awareness of their cultures in our city.

This year St. Petersburg has become venue of the event of the year of Spain in Russia and the year of Italy in Russia. It is a tradition in St. Petersburg to hold different events supported by the general consulates. For example, the days of Korea in 2010 to celebrate the anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries, Russia and Korea. Japanese Spring in St. Petersburg: this event includes more than 40 events trying to raise awareness of Japanese culture, sports and traditions. The Window to the Netherlands is the other event held in St. Petersburg. This is humanitarian interrelation.

The role of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is celebration in the year 2003 the 300th anniversary of St. Petersburg. Within the framework of the jubilee events in the Northern Capital the summit of G8, Russia, the European Union and the meeting of the heads of the CIS countries were in the framework of this event.

Before the celebration our diplomats as workers of a federal body and as patriots of the city were involved in an extensive preparation trying to raise awareness of foreign colleagues of the importance of this event to commemorate the history of other cultures in St. Petersburg. The result was the presence from different countries in the city. Italy

¹ Representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation in St. Petersburg. In 1982 Mr Zapevalov was elected People's Judge. He has been working in diplomatic service since 1995. Deputy Chairman of Chancellor Gorchakov International Foundation. Chair of the Editorial Board of 'Consul' ('Konsul') journal.

sent statues of famous artists. From the Netherlands there was the restoration in the bastion of Peter and Paul Fortress. The Japanese government sent cherry-trees, and other presents from different countries were sent to St. Petersburg to commemorate the event.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, apart from the official duties, performed its duties to preserve the best diplomatic traditions of cultural values of our city. We contributed to different other events related to the Russian culture. Within the jubilee in the Aleksandrovsy Garden the statue of Gorchakov, a very famous diplomat, was raised. The ministry initiated to restore the Church of St. Maria Magdalena in Pavlovsk. It was a tradition that Russian diplomats attended this church for the service before sending abroad. Finalizing, I would like to say the representation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and consulates in the city contribute to the development of culture interaction of different countries. Thank you very much for your attention and good luck in the work of this conference.

G. GATILOV: — *The next speaker is Mr Husam Nassar, the First Deputy Minister of Culture of the Arab Republic of Egypt. He will give a presentation.*

H. NASSAR: — Well, I think I spoke yesterday about the concept of coming out for intercultural dialogue and we have defined the way of reciprocation. Intercultural dialogue involves what I have to teach others in relation to my culture. And I explained yesterday about what I call culture when it comes to regions which do not have to have geographical proximities. For example, today we can speak about the correlation of cultures with the Caribbean countries.

Any two regions have what we call something in common when they start to interact, and when we go out of the intersection between the source and the cause we start to step into singularities, then into peculiarities and then into differences.

I think the mistake we all make now is that when we start a dialogue or interact we concentrate on the differences rather than on what we have in common. For example I was listening to the remarks about shariah problems in other countries. A lot of people do not know that we are suffering from the same problems in our countries. We have to differentiate between what is the land of the faith and what is the land of refuge. And in between there is huge variety of beliefs. So, the land is not just another civilization — it's a complete social value and everybody is choosing from the social values what they want.

I think the problem is that we have to emphasize about the commonalties, illustrate the similarities, then we know the peculiarities and respect the difference. I think we are all suffering from the state of denial. Europe and the Europeans would like to think very much that the civilization had started in Greece in complete omission of Babylonians, of Persians as if we did not exist before Greeks. And again when they started to have the strong civilization after the Roman Empire went into the darkness for nearly 800 or 900 years as if again we did not exist as the Islamic. So, I think Europe is making a major mistake by omitting our civilization. Muslims are completely denying reciprocation of Europe. They want to start as if we did not exist as Muslims or as Arabs and European civilization aren't taking

our achievements from then. We are talking about a new concept and you want to call it glorification if you will. This is what I have in mind. Thank you.

G. GATILOV: — *Thank you, Mr. Armand Clesse, Director of the Luxemburg Institute of European and International Studies, will be speaking next.*

A. CLESSE¹: — Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This short paper is extremely condensed on prerequisites that many things could be done for civilization and of course I do not go into this now. Among the conditions of prerequisites for substantive dialogue I mentioned. For example, a certain degree of our self-confidence but also a self-critical attitude which is often lacking or even humiliating. Seeing not just what one's nation culture and strength but also the shortcomings. So, very often we have instead the cultural monism, a monologue even bothering on autism (to use a psychological term).

But these are just some conception remarks. I want to dwell on briefly on the rise of the phobias, in the West certainly, but perhaps globally. The rise of intolerance, xenophobia and above all islamophobia. Everywhere in the West we see the rise of nationalism everywhere along Europe but for some exceptions. Everywhere there are extreme right parties.

No European country seemed to be more tolerant in the past than the Netherlands, the Scandinavian countries, Denmark, and Finland, recently where this rise of the extreme rightists is the most spectacular. So we will see where this way will lead to but perhaps among us there is a side effect. Paradoxically, globalization is what people are of. These are new fears and people are looking for something cosier, more familiar, and not parochial. Perhaps it gives a certain psychological security but more generally than what we've seen in the West is growing with intellectual confusion and the erosion of all kinds of standards — aesthetic standards — what is often called post-modernism, this deconstruction of arts, philosophy and ethics. I'll give some examples during this debate between the West and Islam. Because time is so short. We just terminated the stereotypes by distortion of the reality. Thus we are creating this hatred and this hatred has to come back to us.

G. GATILOV: — *Thank you, Mr. Clesse, thank you very much for a very interesting and lively presentation. I think that you would have the opportunity outside this room to discuss with colleagues all these very important and very urgent questions. The following word is given to Mr Kuvaldin, Head of the Department of Social and Humanitarian Studies of the Economic School of Moscow University.*

V. KUVALDIN²: — Thank you. We are all here because we are interested in culture, but everyone looks at their own

¹ Director of the Luxemburg Institute for European and International Research, Ph. D. Author and editor of a number of scholarly papers on issues of European and international politics, including: *Russia-EU Relations: New Challenges and Opportunities*, *The Vitality of Russia*, *The Vitality of China and the Chinese*, *Beyond East-West Confrontation: Searching for a New Security Structure in Europe*, *The Vitality of Japan: Sources of National Strength and Weakness*, *The Euro as a Stabilizer in the International Economic System*, *Europa auf dem Weg zur Weltordnung?*

² Head of the Chair of Social and Humanitarian Disciplines of the Moscow School of Economics of the M. V. Lomonosov Moscow State University, professor of Moscow State Institute for International Relations (University) of the MFA of Russia, Dr. Sc. (History). Author of over 50 scholarly papers,

personal views. My view or my angle of view is a view of a person who deals with international politics. If somebody of you managed to look at my works, you might have noticed that many things are raised: politics, economics, sociology. But nothing is said about culture. It is not because I think that culture does not play a role in international politics. I think just the contrary. But I was a bit afraid to touch that.

But now I have to speak about culture in the area of international politics. I'd like to speak about one problem: the role and influence of culture, a role of the civilization in the world of politics. This problem has been discussed for 20 years and it relates to issue of the clash of civilizations. When Huntington wrote his first article, he placed a question mark. It was not a statement, it was setting up a problem. All issues are interesting and in what respect? We talk in our institute of the international relations studies. I am professor in this university. Fukuyama should be studied at business school. It is how to do self-advertising in public, how to reach commercial success. It is a kind of a cat with empty tin wound to the tail. And it can answer different questions. Career, money and all of that.

When Huntington formulated his work on international politics he had a real intellectual concept. As for my attitude to this work, his concept was dead at the day of the beginning. I think that a ghost was initiated in his work and that ghost does not exist in reality. But now it is revised. It was at the beginning of the '90s when the globalization process started and global roads were created. One phenomenon appeared related to this concept. It is a steady rise of China, the interests of the Muslim world, the Arab world in the international politics, cultural interaction issues in different Western European countries. But if one says that these civilizations are the subjects of international policy, I would disagree. No, they are not subjects. I'd like to give an example.

What happened in the beginning, what attracted interest to the concept? The first crisis in the Gulf in 1991 and the war in the Balkans. In neither of these cases the civilization factor was a key factor. The Gulf crisis started from one Muslim country invading another Muslim country. Before that Iraq and Iran clashed. One Arab country attacked another Arab country. This split in the Arab world happened because one side supported the western coalition.

In the Balkans Slavic people killed Slavic people with great brutality — people of the same faith, for example orthodox people killed other orthodox people and this principle did not work later on. Let's recollect the development of the Iraqi campaign. Did Saddam Hussein enjoy solidarity? Was he supported by the Arab world? Recent events give you the answer when there is hunting of Gaddafi. I understand that Gaddafi is not a representative of humanism. He is not an attractive personally and his hands are covered with blood. But people who are involved in great politics know that people are different. Gaddafi was sacrificed by the Arab world. Just recall the position of the Persian Gulf countries. Note the resolution that was passed in the Security Council. Is this concept still alive? Because other things are implemented. Other things are interpreted.

including: *Intelligentsiya v poslevoynennoy Italiyi* [Intelligentsia in Post-War Italy], *Amerikanskiy kapitalizm i intelligentsiya: istoriko-sotsiologicheskoy ocherk* [American Capitalism and Intelligentsia: Historical and Sociological Essay], *Globalny mir: ekonomika, politika, mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya* [The Global World: Economics, Politics and International Relations], and others. Member of the Executive committee of Gorbachev Foundation.

This is why if we are talking about the problem of multiculturalism, it is a problem how people of different civilizations are at difficulty to build up relations if initially a wrong position is undertaken. And the European system of multiculturalism, it was European-like, but it was a policy of apartheid, but now Europeans, unlike Americans, have to pay the price.

I would like to react to Tatiana Zhdanok's saying that in the European Union people are a bit concerned whether Russia will look at the East, move to the East. In one of my writings I put forward the following idea: Russia moves to the East. This article is available at the site of our School. And I see reason for this direction. I'd like to emphasize one more point. It would be a big mistake if we move to the East turning our back to the West. We have to move to the East together with the West. We have to think seriously about that because we have to do it. Europe should be open because it is a prospect of creating a Pacific Europe — from the Atlantic past to the Pacific future. The interests of Russia, the interests of our Eastern partners, such as, for example, China, and the interests of Europe can coincide.

G. GATILOV: — *Thank you. The next person is Mr Moiseyev.*

A. MOISEYEV¹: — Thank you. Let me start my presentation. I would like to refer to Mr Astakhov's words who said we did not have international law whatsoever. A very popular point of view, but it is far from reality. We are sure that there is criminal law. Nevertheless, we see criminals everywhere. People in power are also engaged in criminal actions. In this way we have to respect international law which provides grounds for the international order. Now I am going to speak about the situation which we had at the end of the 20th century.

Of course, due to the information revolution the world became more tightly interconnected and we can say that human society got a new dimension. During the period of globalization the dissemination of information has well-understood goals of ensuring the ideology of globalisation as a set of interconnected guidelines. These guidelines are called to substantiate the advantages and inevitability of tendencies, aimed and unifying the world under the leadership of the civilised centre by which the countries of the West are apparently understood.

And here we have information and disinformation, advertisements and the mass media maintained all those problems can be resolved by brainwashing. And here the human values do not have the role of distinction between good and evil. And the international public opinion is influenced by political standards. We see that values are being introduced and everybody has to be responsible

¹ Head of the Chair of Private International Law of the Diplomatic Academy at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation (Moscow), Head of the International Law and International Security Centre at the Institute for Contemporary International Studies of the Diplomatic Academy at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, LL. D., Professor. Author of a number of scientific works including the books *International Non-Bank Financial Institutions: Legal Aspects of Activities* (Mezhdunarodnyye kreditno-finansovyye organizatsii: pravovyye aspekty dejatel'nosti), *State Sovereignty in the Contemporary World: International and Legal Aspects* (Suverenitet gosudarstva v sovremennom mire: mezhdunarodno-pravovyye aspekty), *International Financial Institutions: Legal Aspects of Activities* (Mezhdunarodnyye finansovyye organizatsii: pravovyye aspekty dejatel'nosti), *International Law on State Sovereignty* (Suverenitet gosudarstva v mezhdunarodnom prave) and others. J. D. of Australia, Honorary Research Associate at the University of Sydney. Member of the Russian International Law Association.

for the situation with the environment everywhere in the world.

The first consideration of economic power also can be converted into country of mass media and then mass media supports certain power and then there is obvious circle again: mass media would support economic power. Mass media maintain this world globalization trends to enrich people but globalization over cultures means that we see unification of culture under the umbrella of English-speaking countries. Here the English language, of course, is associated universally with international tourism, Internet, with movies and so on, with the promotion of western cultures.

We are overburdened by information, 80% of information is not processed. In many cases this information is not needed. So, on the one hand, information is everywhere or is embracing, but it sometimes has such low quality that there is no reason to use this information. Now I come to my conclusion. Globalization should get rid of negative consequences of the contemporary world. For this purpose our people have to change the principle 'to get, to have, to acquire' into the principle 'to be a better person', to develop a creative potential of every person. Thank you for your attention.

G. GATILOV: — *Thank you for your effort to be brief. The next speaker is Mr Eberhard Schneider, Professor of Political Science.*

E. SCHNEIDER²: — Thank you very much. I am happy with what Victor said. I usually used to analyze Russian internal policy, domestic policy. Putin and Medvedev, they think that Russia is a European country. My opinion was that Moscow has a sociological problem, and if Moscow would continue to look at the West, because I have an impression that the western part of Europe wants to exclude Russia from Europe. They do not make such clear statements, but this is the way they think. We have to show the potential that Russia has, not being a member of the European Union. Nevertheless, it has potential to influence the activity of the European Union, especially in the sphere of security. On the 22nd of November in Lisbon Mr. Medvedev indicated that Russia wants to take part in the European security issue and he did not exclude the possibility that some day it would become a member of NATO. But NATO has to be transformed before. So, we have to say that Russia is a European culture that has to take part in developments in Europe, and also we can see such important areas as economics and security. In the West we are highly interested in the participation of Russia. Thank you.

G. GATILOV: — *Thank you very much. Now the word goes to Mr Vladimir Sogrin, Head of the Centre of North American Studies.*

V. SOGRIN³: — Thank you. Let me begin my presentation. The topic of my presentation is the perception

² Professor of Political Science at the University of Siegen (Germany), Ph. D. Dr. Schneider is an expert on domestic policy of Russia and the former USSR. Author of more than 12 books, including: *Das politische System der Russischen Federation, Das politische System der Ukraine, Die Formierung der neuen rufländischen politischen Elite* and of more than 100 scholarly articles. Member of the Advisory Board at the Independent Centre of European-Russian cooperation 'EU-Russia' in Brussels.

³ Head of Centre for North American Studies at the Institute for World History of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Chairman of the Russian

of America by the Russian post-Soviet society. This is a vast topic, of course. The text has been published. A short speech to the issues of the relation of the Russian society towards the USA. And of course we may speak about dialogue of cultures between these two countries - Russia and the USA.

So, this is the ambivalence, the multi-dimensional character of such relations. I will dwell on two major points of this ambivalence. First. On the one hand, they have a very negative attitude to the USA. On the other hand, they demonstrate positive relation to the American culture. First of all, this year anti-Americanism gained great role in mass media in Russia. This is official position. Pushkov and Shevchenko, these are journalists who are trying to indoctrinate the Russians. Radzhivovsky, another journalist, named Shevchenko's show 'Judge for yourselves what a scoundrel America is'. And Vladimir Pozner has only half an hour a week to oppose anti-American ideas. We have another author who was quite popular during the Soviet period. He wrote about Japan very objectively. He praised Great Britain. Now Ovchinnikov speaks in a very anti-American way. And this is his conception: Stalin deported people in the Caucasus in November 1943 because at the summit in Tehran Stalin had a discussion with American President Franklin Roosevelt that some Caucasus people tried to collaborate with the Nazi. And Roosevelt said that he deported the Japanese. Stalin actually gained this experience of cruelty from Franklin Roosevelt.

But it's not true! This is the distortion of history. Stalin actually deported the Germans two years before the deportation of the Japanese in America: 400 thousands Germans were deported and half of them actually died. And those deported people were brought to the Balkhash Lake, started drinking water from the lake and died from diseases. In the case of deportation in America no one of the deported Japanese died.

The authorities in Russia stand against the distortion of history in the interests of other countries. But we actually praise the distortion of history in the interests of Russia. These interests are perceived by our leaders in a very special way. And now I have another example: the year 2008, elections in the United States of America. Election of Obama. Clinton had greater chances of being elected president since she had more money and better connections. This is the form of democracy that does not exist in other countries of the world.

The second point is that sometimes we have a positive attitude to America. So, we have this anti-Americanism

Association of Americanist historians, Professor at Moscow University of International Relations under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia, Dr. Sc. (History), Honorary worker of higher education of the Russian Federation. Author of many scholarly publications, including monographs: *Ideological trends in American Revolution of the 18th Century* (Idejnye techenija v Amerikanskoj revoljutsiji XVIII veka), *Founders of the USA. Historical Portraits* (Osnovately SShA. Istoricheskije portrety), *Myths and Realities of American History* (Mify i realiji amerikanskoj istoriji), *Critical Trends of Non-Marxist Historiography of the USA of the 20th Century* (Kriticheskije napravlenija nemarksistskoj istoriografiji SShA XX veka), *Jefferson. Man. Thinker. Politician* (Dzhefferson. Chelovek. Myslitel'. Politik), *Ideology in American History. From Founding Fathers to the End of the 20th Century* (Ideologija v amerikanskoj istoriji. Ot otsovsosnovatelej do kontsa 20 veka), *Presidents and Democracy. American Experience* (Prezidenty i demokratija. Amerikanskij opyt), *Political History of the USA* (Politicheskaja istorija SShA), *Political History of Modern Russia. 1985–2001: From Gorbachev to Putin* (Politicheskaja istorija sovremennoj Rossiji. 1985–2001: ot Gorbacheva do Putina), *Historical Experience of the USA* (Istoricheskij opyt SShA) and some others. Editor-in-chief of 'Social Sciences and Modernity' (Obschestvennyje nauki i sovremennost') journal, member of the editorial board of Contemporary and Recent History (Novaja i novejschaja istorija) journal.

and, on the other hand, American culture is the first nation introduced to the Russian society in a very cynical form. Mass culture, or better to say anti-culture, is being brought from America to Russia. Statistics says that half of the American citizens actually follow the commandments. But our people do not have such a foundation and many people consider that people actually perceive our reality as absolute freedom. You are free, you are totally free. In engagement with sex, we can drink alcohol from early age. But do anything, but leave our political power alone.

G. GATILOV: — *Thank you very much. The next word is given to Mr Mehdi Sanai, Member of Parliament of Iran.*

M. SANAI¹: — Thank you. I am not going to tell you about my article, but just try touching upon some points. There may be a great problem that we do not have a result of dialogue for 10 years. We have founded the conference on dialogue of civilizations. But conferences run one way, and facts are in a different way.

In the year of 2001 when there was the initiative of the President of Iran announcing that year the Year of the dialogue of civilizations. That year the events happened in New York. Then there was the war against Afghanistan. In 10 years the Americans detained bin Laden, but still we have wars in Libya. Some do not believe that bin Laden died. Why is America not trusted? Why were people happy about the death of bin Laden, but in Pakistan people cried because of the death of bin Laden? It is a question: why is the dialogue not happening?

There may be a variety of reasons. The explanation may be the following. There is the process of globalization in communications, but there is no globalization in politics. And mechanism of political globalization has been identified and defined. I can explain. Citizens of different countries, they feel close but much has changed in religion. Young people in different countries, they may feel close to young people from different countries, rather than to the young people in their own country. There is globalization in economy, in culture, but there is no political globalization, no international mechanisms to establish dialogue to solve problems of peace. The international relations, there are no tools to solve some problems by means of dialogue. Everything is decided by war and international relations are based on power.

Recently I've seen the interview of Joseph Nine from the BBC, and Joseph Nine is an American scientist. He said that maybe democracy works inside the country. Democracy is the power that solves these issues and not by dialogue, only by power. He explained that Obama's policy, the results of George Bush's policy are positive and Obama tries to solve the issues.

I disagree that there is no international law. We do have international law, international organizations. They do not fit day-to-day requirements. The international organizations

¹ Member of Parliament of the Islamic Republic of Iran. Director of the Research Centre for Russia and Eastern Europe at the University of Tehran (Iran), Professor of the Law Institute at Tehran University, Dr. Sc. (Political Studies). He is the author of books: *Along the Great Silk Road... Encounters on the Kazakh Land, Relations between Iran and the CIS Countries of Central Asia: Social, Political and Economic Aspects, The Muslim Law and Politics* (a study guide), *Relations between Iran and Russia*, and of numerous scientific articles. He is the honorary member of the Writers' Union in Russia, a member of Kazakh Academy for Social Sciences, an advisor to The Encyclopaedia of Islamic World on Russia, Central Asia and the Caucasus.

were established after WWII, but much has changed since that time.

The second point. International organizations are based on Western values and Muslim values are ignored. It worries one. I believe there are two main steps that should be made. Such a conference where scientists could come on issues of international relations, so that the dialogue, some problems may be solved. There is the evolution of cultures, the evolution of economy in the direction of globalization. But in politics the states and nations pursue interests of their own. Each country is concerned with its own interests.

Economy in the world has changed, communications have changed. But nations and states, they remain the same. We have to think how nations and states would move forward, what politics of each country should look like. We can't ignore other countries, we can't ignore other religions. And it is impossible to build relations on the basis of Western values only. And international organizations do not think with demands of time. I think that such conferences where scientists meet may help build the world where everything will be solved by dialogue.

G. GATILOV: — *Thank you very much. Colleagues, we have just one hour and a long list of participants who want their voice said. I will give the floor to the people who did not have an opportunity to speak yesterday. And if time is enough, we will give other participants the floor as well. Now our guest from abroad, Mrs Xing Chang, Director of the Institute of Community Development at the Party School of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China.*

X. CHANG¹: — My respect to the Chairman and respect to everyone. I'm very glad to be here and to attend this international conference. My speech topic is building more harmonious world in terms of a global meaning. The Chinese government has summarized principles of the Chinese foreign policy and international society in the new concept of the harmonious world. To promote this harmonious world China must interfere with violence and provide peace for the environment. There is also a commitment for the Chinese civilization to bring peace to the environment. But the harmonious world will not really come true by itself. It means that there should be efforts of the people all over the world. China's concept of promoting the building of the harmonious world is just the most useful strategy. Only by constructing international harmonious society and realizing economic possibility, can the political system promote the building of the harmonious world effectively. On the other hand, the harmony of the international community can be provided.

Since 1978 China has made economic progress. China is like any European country but it still must focus on economic development, enhancing comprehensive national interests and increasing people's high material and cultural living standards. Only in peaceful international environment can a country realize the real fine economic relations and make use of all the existing advantage of the international economy to achieve national economy's rapid growth as a responsible great power.

While building harmonious society China will remain committed to creating a peaceful international environment

¹ Director of the Department of the Institute of Community Development at the Party School (Central Committee of the Communist Party of China), editor of 'Scientific Socialism' journal (China).

for itself. In 2003 when making a speech in Moscow the Chinese president announced the basic desire for promoting establishment of regional international political and economic order. That is the short promote to international relations. UN should establish new security concepts which lead to mutual trust, mutual benefit and effective cooperation. We should promote the efficient state of the global economy. We should respect the important role of the UN and the Security Council. Practically all countries are fostering the democratization and national relations, which means handling the neighbouring areas and gradually turning those areas into universal zones of harmony.

G. GATILOV: — *We are grateful to Mrs Xing Chang. We are going to listen to Mr Konstantin Shuvalov.*

K. SHUVALOV²: — Thank you very much, Gennady Mikhailovich. After terrorist attacks of 09/11 when we actually faced the problems which were very urgent, very special, very acute, and saw the necessity to establish better relations between the Western world and the Arab world, the two states that represent those civilizations, Spain and Turkey, set forth the initiative that was laid into foundation of such a structure as the Alliance of Civilizations.

What was the meaning of this initiative? It was to find an answer to conflicts which actually appear on the ethnic, nationalist and religious bases. We had to mitigate such conflicts and we got certain practical achievements. First of all, we recognized the value of the cultural diversity. In this context we speak about interethnic and inter-civilizational relations. Besides the fact that diversity has its own value, we came to the conclusion that conflicts that arise on the basis of cultural differences can be avoided by means of proper control. So, we wanted to establish governance over cultural diversity, make this cultural diversity controllable. And this is necessary. Otherwise, chaos and conflicts, the clash of civilizations follow.

If we speak about the governance, we have to think about the rights. Any sovereign state has the obligation to protect human rights. At the same time this program is seen as being so wide that a single state at the national level cannot cope with it. We have different levels - municipal, regional, state and international. At these levels we have different subjects that can control this diversity.

In my opinion, we should expect certain weakening of the initial states. And when we see that certain functions of sovereign states are delegated to the upper structures, delegated to the lower structures. I mean here municipalities, the civil society, but the state will remain controller of cultural diversity. This is the usual effect that the government is held responsible for errors and mistakes. A state that is unable to pursue proper policy – immigration, the relations with young people, antagonism of various religious groups, such a state runs the risk of disintegration. Especially it is very risky for multinational states and countries. The state and the government are highly responsible; the state is a major player here. And apart from that we have a number

² Ambassador-at-large of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Special Representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation on cooperation with the Alliance of Civilizations, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. Works in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs since 1976. Worked in different diplomatic levels in the central office abroad, Deputy of the head of the Central Asia Department, Ambassador of Russia in Iran, Director of III Department in CIS countries, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

of other parties, players. I mean regional and national organizations.

I have listened to the presentation by Mr. Sanai when he criticised states in this respect. At the international level we also see negative problems which can be mitigated. And nevertheless the provision should be such that the states should be able to collaborate and to co-operate, and it should be stipulated in international law. In the countries where there is civil society, it is necessary to provide for the fact. In cases where there is no civil society we have to be very careful so that violence should not take place.

We should keep to women's societies and different kinds of organizations because these agencies generate ideas and in many cases they participate in different projects in the sphere of harmonization of international and interethnic relations. Of course, the role of mass media is important and besides that we have other participants. I mean those structures that provide funds, business structures mostly. Not long ago at one of the meetings of the national coordinators of the Alliance of Civilizations Egypt's representative said they have 1 600 non-governmental institutions and they are trying to get funds from different sources. They compete for funds coming from abroad.

I'd like to emphasize that it is necessary to provide for proper democratic governance over diversity. I mean not only words about democracy, but the actual activity. Subjects have to present over to individual cultures. These ethnic groups exist by themselves. But, again, the state does not leave any space for private initiative. There is no law describing activities of such groups. So, we have individuals and then groups. And nevertheless groups and interests of groups should be somehow represented. How to do it is a disputable question and we see here that democracy is very weak in this area. We have to thank them for the democratic approach.

G. GATILOV: — *Thank you very much. The next speaker is Mr Souheil Farah.*

S. FARAKH¹: — Esteemed Chairman and members of the presidium, dear colleagues, ladies and gentlemen, and friends. I'd like to draw your attention to my full text which is entitled 'The Dialogue and Partnership of Civilizations: Principles, Obstacles and Prospects'. In the text I reflect my modest and humble thinking and I hope you will go to the site of the conference and print it out.

In my current presentation I would like to voice three specific suggestions. Let me say that I am an optimist and my optimism is very cautious compared to some other colleagues' who are pessimistic. When I think about the development of a dialogue between different spheres of knowledge and different civilizations we should certainly call a continuous thinking strengthening our power in order to analyze this process. We could also see that Eastern countries are much more interested in this process as compared to the situation in the West. Most people there

are interested in business. They are not interested in issues of civilization. They have power, making money, might and they tend to prolong this situation, the current situation. And we don't try to organize creative analysis of this process and collective analysis. I'd like to share my modest experience.

In Russia I am the editor of some publications along the line of dialogue and partnership of civilizations and we work under auspices of the Ministry of Education and Science of the Russian Federation. We also take part in annual conferences on behalf of Moscow State University and we publish our presentations in the proceedings and there is a series of publications reflecting the opinions of a group of authors and uniting thinkers from different countries. Even they attempt to analyze current political processes, have published three monographs titled: *Dialogue of Civilizations: Concept of Dialogue*. We speak about foundations, practice and specific suggestions, then about theory and practice of international relations. Mr. Zapesotsky is one of authors and the last of monographs published this year, *Dialogue and Partnership of Civilizations in Confessional Cross-Cultural Dimension*. The next monograph will be titled *Dialogue and Partnership of Civilizations: Their State and Destiny of Spiritual Values*. Then *Planet Russia* will be number 5 and we continue moving along this line which we designate as the dialogue of civilizations in this sphere of education, tourism and so on.

I have specific suggestions that this series is published in Russia and our trend is to translate it into Arabic, and we are also trying to publish it in French. I appeal to all of you. If you have interesting contributions, we invite you to take part in these publications. This is my first suggestion to you.

And my second point. Again, it is a part of our experience. I have two nationalities. I come from Lebanon and at the same time I am a Russian citizen, the Chairman of the Lebanese-Russian House. And we also have Christians and Muslims, and also non-believers in our country and we look forward to next conferences under the auspices of the United Nations and UNESCO. The first was named *The Dialogue of Cultures: Experience of Russia and the Levantine East*. And the next — *Dialogue between various civilizations*. The third conference is *Russia and the Arabic East*. We publish these proceedings in two languages: Russian and Arabic. And if we have a possibility we will try to publish in other languages items of, so to say, spiritual nourishment for people. I work at Lebanon University and I am responsible for a series on Russian writers, they generated good ideas concerning human values. And we also published a number of books in different languages. The works by Pushkin, Dostoevsky and Pitirim Sorokin. These are the spiritual fathers who managed to predict the current crisis and I suggest that in the near future, say next year, we publish works dedicated to Academician Likhachov, because in the Arab world his heritage is not properly known. This is my next suggestion.

And my final point is that again back to previous suggestion we have a general humanitarian crisis which is connected with civilization of modernism and post-modernism. And this is not only the crisis in the West. In the East this crisis is also grounded very deeply, and not only in the sphere of economics, but also in our sphere of culture, religion, education. Here we have to generate new collective strategy universal for the whole planet how to get

¹ Ph. D., foreign member of the Russian Academy of Education, Professor of Chair of Philosophy of the Department for Humanities at the Lebanese State University. Author and compiler of books: *Spiritual Secularization and Religion: Experience of Christianity and Islam* (Dukhovnaja sekularizatsija i religija: opyt khristianstva i islama), *F. M. Dostoyevsky. God, Man and Civilization* (F. M. Dostojevskij. Bog, chelovek i tsivilizatsija), *Metropolitan Ilya (Karalm) and Russia* (Mitropolit Ilija (Karalm) i Rossija), *Diversity of Cultures: Experience of Russia and Levantine East* (Raznoobrazije kul'tur: opyt Rossiji i Levantijskogo Vostoka) and some others.

out of this crisis. In this process we have different temps and in Russia and I am one of the members of the team and I would say that we. On this site www.newparadigma.ru we present material which makes it possible to understand philosophy of science, education in a systemic way. In this way we are going to develop new directions of thought of group of people. And I belong to this group and we have a number of academics in the Moscow Institute of International Relations. We publish many books and again we have decided and I have here a number of copies of these publications.

So, again, in the middle of September we are going to take part in UNESCO's conference. And we are going to present our ideas, trying to get support to the project of Partnership of Civilizations and we are trying to establish an Open University where four subjects would be studied: civilization, dialogue of civilizations, institutes of dialogue and civilization tourism. We are going to organize a branch of this university. We invite you to get engaged in the co-operation. Thank you.

G. GATILOV: — *Thank you. The next speaker is Mr Vasil Prodanov.*

V. PRODANOV¹: — Thank you. Only three comments unrelated to the presentation I published. The first one. We initiated the discussion of not a model of civilization, but of a dialogue of civilizations. First comment about what Professor Kuvaldin said. I knew Huntington and I knew how he wrote his book. The Balkans. There were Muslims involved; Christians involved fighting against each other. It was a typical clash of civilizations. Because you said there was only one civilization.

The second comment is related to national culture. The state was very strong until the 1970s. There was a very close connection between the initial culture and the state. And then globalization started the split, communication revolutions started, marketing of various aspects of life began. And it turned out that the global civilization and global cultural market happened (I do not remember who said that). There is the Russian national state. It is because the national state was not linked very closely to the culture. That is why the USSR collapsed. They were used to Soviet two ideological cultures. It is very important. There is no more national culture related closely to a national state.

Multiculturalism doctrine in some states became bankrupt because in Western Europe there is the official culture, the official language and traditions related to national states. At the same time there are other cultures. It is in some sense hegemony of a traditional national state and other cultures — Islamic, Russian in Germany and so on. The problem starts when national cultures stop functioning as before. It has a different logic. Both immigrants and the state do not have means to regulate all the processes. On the one hand, there is official ideology of multiculturalism. On the other hand, xenophobia and populism. We have to look sensibly at these controversies.

¹ Corresponding member of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, Director of the Institute for Philosophical Sciences (1988–1992) and the Institute for Philosophical Research at the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (1995–2010), Dr. Sc. (Philosophy), professor. Author of over 500 scholarly publications, including 21 monographs: *Person and Politics, Knowledge and Values, Bio-Social Values, Bioethics, Civil Society and Global Capitalism, Violence in Modern Age, The Future of Philosophy* and some others. Prof. Prodanov is a member of editorial boards of a number of journals, *Monde Diplomatique* being one of them.

— The point is that mass culture in Bulgaria, the United States, or Russia is a means of political élite's hegemony. In Russia mass culture is propagated by official mass media, as Mr. Tretyakov yesterday remarked. So you seem to be wrong [Comments of a participant of the conference].

V. PRODANOV: — You know that Huntington spoke about the clash of civilizations that happened in the Balkan region where the conflict within one country occurred. Christian Bulgaria and Christian Romania hurried to help orthodox Serbia. And as for the USSR, it was destroyed not as a result of a conflict, a clash of civilizations. It was an internal struggle for power and for wealth. Thank you for your comments.

G. GATILOV: — *Thank you for the commentary. The word is given to Mr A. Shahinian.*

A. SHAHINIAN²: — It is the first time I participate in this conference. My speciality is different — physics, chemistry, biology. The questions that have been raised fit the other fields as well. They are beyond any field of knowledge, important for any country, state, republic. I represent the republic that is a monoethnic, monoreligious one. The main population are Armenians, the main religion is Christianity. Although we participate in the processes, in the dialogue of civilizations, 30% of the Armenian population live in Armenia, 70% in diasporas. Now the Armenian state is the state for all Armenians. The Parliament has the Chamber of Diaspora. The major diasporas are in the USA, Russia, France, Iran, the Arab countries, Syria, Latin America, Argentina, Uruguay.

The relationship between the Armenians and the local population is defined by the state. Here we have a question. This is a historical fact, because the state is monoethnic, monoreligious. The historical facts come up from very important interstate relations. As for religious facts in this case, they are rated second.

I'd like to speak about the dialogue of cultures between Christian Armenia and Muslim Iran. The dialogue of cultures is at the highest level. I do not know why, maybe because of the politics, strategy, maybe because we have similar historical routes between our cultures, there are no problems between Armenian culture and Persian culture. Practically no problems at all. As there are no problems between the Armenian culture and the Russian culture. And in this respect problems appear in those countries where diasporas are in a disadvantageous position in terms of culture, in other areas. In Syria, Egypt we do not have any problems. In Syria and in Egypt there are revolutions. It does not affect the Armenian population. The dialogue of cultures in this country reached such a quality that these processes do not affect the dialogue of cultures. And the idea is the following. In individual cases even in monoethnic and monoreligious states the dialogue of cultures is at the international level where our diaspora is located.

G. GATILOV: — *Thank you. The floor is given to Mr Felix Unger.*

² Chief Academician Secretary of the Armenian National Academy of Sciences, Presidium member of the Armenian National Academy of Sciences, Dr. Sc. (Physics and Mathematics), Dr. Sc. (Chemistry). Author of more than 170 publications including the book *Computer Biology and Bioinformatics* (Kompjuternejaja biologija i bioinformatika). Laureate of the Presidential Award of the Republic of Armenia in science. Member of the American Chemical Society and the American Society for Photobiology.

F. UNGER: — I'd rather give a comment instead of making additional speeches. When we are speaking of the global culture, globalization, it reminds me very strongly of the fate of the EU. The history of the EU is the history of a trade union coming out between Germany and France after the World War II but that was only the main specific emphasis on economy. Why do we need the soul of Europe: when we are looking at our population, looking at our youth, our interest in the EU is decreasing and not increasing. It seems to me, we, ladies and gentlemen, have an enormous gap between politics and the population. The population does not believe in politicians and political tendencies. A large number of problems have appeared because, unfortunately, people did not support these tendencies. Globalisation is a term which has come to us from economics.

And we indeed have globalization in global culture. And what is global culture? The Coca-cola culture, the Sony culture — everyone wants to have Coca-cola even in the deepest desert. And in parallel we're using Facebook, Twitter, Internet and so on and what is the problem? Politicians are saying that it's not valued more because its use is making society for a complete new way of thinking in the whole world. I'm a medical doctor, using a different vocabulary, but I think that the main problem that I'm missing in general politics is the introduction of the humanity. There is motivation and I think that the gap is going to open more and more like sesame between the next generation and politics. There was a colleague saying he was pretty optimistic, and I'm pretty optimistic too, because I see now it's the 21st century and with the motivation we can overcome the old-fashioned, static politics which we inherited from the 19th and the 20th centuries. That's my comment as a medical doctor.

G. GATILOV: — *Thank you. Mr Mamadsho Ilolov, you have the word.*

M. ILOLOV: — Thank you very much, Gennady Mikhailovich. Yesterday I also made a presentation. Today I have a couple of words. The role of Russia in Central Asia, in this vast region. Again, the terminology is not clear, but I'd like to speak about the fact that in the beginning of the '90s my country was engaged in a civil war, and Russia as a guarantor gave signs to start negotiations and peaceful talks under the guidance of President Yeltsin, President Rakhmonov of our republic. They signed the General Agreement on the Establishment of Peace and National Accord in Tajikistan when they said Russia still has considerable influence in this region, and we are happy with our relations between Russia and Tajikistan. The leading role is plaid by Russia. Here we have great number of specialists in geopolitics, in economics and I'd like to say that we have new ideas in geopolitics. And somehow here we see that Russia is behind.

Not long ago I read a book by General Snesev — a person who used to be the head of the frontier checkpoint — the title is Introduction to Military Geography. And he expresses a number of modern ideas, and unfortunately we do not develop these ideas. Some people speak about our region as Turkestan, but time is quite different. Sometimes the Central Asian countries are related as Turkish countries, but in this region we have Iran, Afghanistan, and Tajikistan. They speak Farsi, the language of Iran. So, this is also part

of our dialogue which should be promoted. But again I'd like to say that working as an international organization with headquarters located in Moscow, the Interstate Foundation for Humanitarian Cooperation actively works in Tajikistan and other countries. They make a lot in the sphere of science and culture. We are thankful to them. By the title of their foundation they mean humanitarian cooperation and I think that we also have to do with these problems. I've already said that Russia is turning its face to the East. This is quite true. And of course in Europe people have to understand that Russia should look to the South as well.

G. GATILOV: — *Thank you. The word is given to Mr Mustapha Tlili.*

M. TLILI: — Thank you very much. Mr Chairman, my paper is published but I'd like to give you a few remarks about Tunisia because I've just come back from there. On my way from New York I stopped for some days there for engagements and I can give you a report on the revolution and the democratic process which is going on now in Tunisia. I think it's of interest not only to Europe but also to Russia and I say why briefly.

There was an extremely vital debate, democratic debate in the country, going on TV, in the press and so on. 60 parties have seen the light, the electoral commission has been designated, and electoral code was also agreed upon. And there was a debate on the place of Islam and what constitution would be adopted and worked out by the next constituent assembly. The consensus is that Islam is of course the religion of the majority of the population, there are 99% Muslims. Tunisia is a homogeneous country — a large middle class, educated middle class. This class, these people have religion in a very soft way. From old times through the independence and through the constitutional principles were adopted immediately after independence thanks to the contribution of the president by that time. What you'll find in the constitution is: Tunisia is an Arab country and its religion is Islam. It doesn't say that Tunisia is a republic. Islam is the religion but it is not a part of the political system.

Now Russia has also a democratic centre, it's a democratic country trying to build functioning democracy, and I think there can be a place for Russia as a country playing cultural roles through cultural cooperation offering culture messages and so on, and I'm suggesting that some of the cultural institutions in fact (like the Institute for Oriental Studies) could set up branches, offices and so on. It's also advisable that Russia strengthen its presence through better cooperation because I think that cultural presence would open the door to further cooperation and the future, because there are so many possibilities. These are the things I wanted to say.

G. GATILOV: — *Thank you. Mr Husam Nassar, you have the word.*

H. NASSAR: — Thank you for the time, and I'd like to thank Mr. Tlili for his sympathy for the Islamic world. But I plead to him not to mix the subject of Islam with the subject of bin Laden, because bin Laden was a part of an international plan to create a new imaginary enemy from the Islamic group against the West. Though the sympathy for bin Laden is against the values and interests of Islamic

world. And we hope that the world separates the subject of bin Laden. Now, why some of Muslims cried for his death is because they consider him a person who stood against the USA, because for the last 60 years the USA had been blaming the Islamic world for the fight against Israel. They thought of him as a hero who could stand against the USA's intervention and support for Israel.

G. GATILOV: — *Thank you, Mr Nassar. Dear colleagues, it will only be fair if we give the floor to two co-chairpersons for a short summary — Mr Mikhail Titarenko and after that Mr Anatoly Gromyko. So, Mr Titarenko, you have the floor.*

M. TITARENKO: — Thank you. I don't pretend that I will give a summary. I am very happy we had a very serious and fruitful exchange of opinions and my remark concerns our understanding of different terms, because some colleagues actually started defending the positions of Mr. Huntington, and this professor is a very competent person. We were speaking about the effect that Mr. Huntington actually had.

It is now obvious that the tendency is either we have dialogue over civilizations, and cooperation in science in their equal rights, and we learn from each other and interact, or there is a clash of civilisations. Why do we have clashes of civilizations? I also share the opinion which was spoken out by the Ambassador of Iran here. I understand that Bulgarian and Romanian politicians did not support Serbia and Russia, also were not definite in the policy rendering support to our friends in Yugoslavia. Although we belong to the same religion, here we see evidences of clashes of civilizations and here we see this conception in action and this is a well devised conception of a clash of societies.

We have to remember the ancient principle 'divide and rule'. Islam is also divided, as Christianity is divided, too. Sunni and Shiite struggle, they hate each other. But these are true dimensions of the same religion. And Buddhism is also divided. And in the western Ukraine we have combination of Catholicism and Russian Orthodox Christianity. We must understand that within the framework of civilizations we have components that could explode the idea of humanism, undermine the ideas of democracy. And this is the matter of politics, protection of national interests. And our colleagues spoke about examples: Yugoslavia, Romania, Bulgaria, and Russia and here we see that they try to advocate their own interests and we have to rely on long-term factors.

But politics require immediate action and we have to pursue a long-term policy. So, I think that we have to continue our studies and in our further discussions we have to generate better understanding of the current processes. Consider what is said about Turkestan, but it is a wrong name because not only Turkish-speaking nations live there. So do the Farsi-speaking. But we have this inertia which started from the times of colonial empires. The inertia is still with us and politically and economically the countries of the Asian region became independent, but we are slow to perceive and understand deeply the changes that took place. And once again I see that the focus is now shifted to the Euro-Asian region. This does not mean we must neglect the achievements of the European civilization. Absolutely not. Asian nations will enrich the European culture and the best question, the most important question for the Russian

people is that we have to be able to have friends and learn from them, take lessons and also be true. So, we have to learn how to learn from Asian countries. Integration means that we have to include the best elements from their cultures to enrich ourselves. I think that this would be the best approach.

G. GATILOV: — *Thank you. Mr Gromyko, please.*

A. GROMYKO: — Just a few words. Thank you for the possibility to speak out. First of all, I would like to express my satisfaction with the level of the presentations and the discussions. Unfortunately, time is quite limited and we cannot continue the discussion further and of course in our future collaboration we will be able to continue the exchange of our opinions.

My remark is as follows. Mr. Astakhov, esteemed ambassador of Russia, voiced his interest and deep concern for the state of international relations, the status of international environment. Of course we must pay attention to pressing problems so that we would not pass them by. And also I share the feeling that somehow international law is shrinking. But in a way as a scientist I think about international relations. They are not relations between people, but between states. We have the Charter of the United Nations that was elaborated by 50 states after the horrible WWII.

In certain cases we very easily abandon our historical experience gained by the humanity. But states are one of the most precious institutes in the life of our society. We should not think about the state as a machine that takes taxes and so on. The state has the obligation to promote cultural development. But in order to promote culture over the world I think that international law has to be enforced and supported by the UN. And even if Col. Gaddafi would go to the podium and address the General Assembly and eventually tear into pieces the Charter of the UN, nevertheless international law would still exist. So, we have to feel the importance of the sessions of the General Assembly. And I have to say that international law is a very serious area. We have to preserve the law; we have to protect the law. This is my first idea.

And my second idea is that they wonder if Russia is a European country or not. I once flew from Africa to Moscow, and at Orly Airport they sent me to a different line, and I was astonished. We considered Russia as Europe. Of course, if we examine our culture, we are Europeans. But we are very special Europeans. We are Europeans more than Albanians, for example. It is true, but nobody will say Albanians are not Europeans. Can we see Russian cultural message being less European than the Albanian culture? Of course, we are part of Europe. At the same time if we examine the map, the Russian Republic is a continent in itself and most part of it is situated in Asia. The relations we have to collaborate very closely with China and we have to develop Eurasian philosophy. And we should bear this in mind. Of course, we are a European country with great specificity due to Eurasian principles, and these are compatible conceptions. We have to put proper emphasis and will be in harmony.

Yes, my final point is that the tendency which deserves a longer discussion is that we have to generate a better understanding of the fact that we are the united humanity.

We will survive together or we will perish together, because now we face a great number of new problems which indicate very clearly that the danger is in front of us. If we continue the policy of conflicts in international relations, if we fail to understand each other, the humanity will perish, disappear. So, this is it. Thank you.

G. GATILOV: — *Thank you. I have only one participant left, Mrs Maryana Shlapak from Moldova. You have your word.*

M. SHLAPAK¹: — Thank you very much. I am a representative of the Academy of Sciences of Moldova, the Humanities Department, and I want to thank the organizers for such an important international forum where we are talking about the dialogue of cultures, very urgent problems, including political ones, economic ones. Here we announced persons from different countries. This cultural dialogue is very important. And here we have cultural dialogue between people living inside the country and cultural dialogue with other nations and countries.

If a country fails to establish a dialogue inside, if there are people who are humiliated, if there are clashes in the country, the country is hard to have productive international dialogue. I would like to speak about the Moldavian Republic. It is a multiethnic state. It has 25% of population of other nationalities. As to the legislation, everything is OK, although we hear that the title nation complains that there are too much Russian advertising, some remains of the Russian Empire's presence. And this ethnic group can complain as well. It has been there since the former USSR when it used to be a majority nation. Now it is a minority nation and it is a very difficult physiological process. And it is true for all the former Soviet republics as well. There are two truths. One truth is of one part of the nation and the other truth is of the other part of the nation.

There may be day-to-day routine offences, although we must overcome all this. We have to move forward. We should ensure that in our country, in our own house everybody feels comfortable. Here we have the legislation that has to be complied with. If you have a model well set in the country internally, you can talk about the international dialogue with other countries. In our country, Moldova, we have not had any example of military ethnic conflict, only at the beginning of the 21st century where those fighting divided the government, rather than the people. Moldova is a good example of different nations co-existing together. We have the national Moldavian (Romanian) language. And

in fact we are bilingual. But the country remains Russian-speaking, and we understand very well the mentality of Russian-speaking people. Of course, ¼ of our citizens are in Europe for labour purposes. They start understanding the European mentality as well. The role of Moldova may serve a bridge over the huge space: over Europe, over this space where we want to integrate in. We have adopted a number of European values. We try to harmonize our legislation with the European values. The important role is played here by diplomats, scientists and artists. We, scientists, are together with cultural people who contribute much to the dialogue of cultures.

G. GATILOV: — Thank you. Now let's finalize our discussion. Now our discussion gained such a momentum that we could continue for hours and hours, but we do not have such a possibility. Our session has come to an end, I'd like to express my full satisfaction with the discussion which was conveyed here and, of course, at the very end of the discussion we came across the most interesting points. But what was said here is very valuable.

We listened to diverse opinions, different conceptions and approaches. But the framework of our event presupposes that such brainstorming should be organized so that eventually we could come to the mutual understanding of the problems of culture and the dialogue of civilizations. They are very vast notions, great notions. We cannot actually embrace all of them at our session.

I am happy with the fact that during our discussion we heard many times such words as the United Nations, the Charter. This is the foundation of our lives and, as our president said, nobody has yet managed to do something better than the United Nations, and it would hardly be possible to do something better than the United Nations Organization and the principles which are set in the Charter. They actually describe the principles of relations between the peoples, nations, civilizations and cultures, and we now base our reasoning on the provisions of the UN Charter. After that we can develop our own vision and apply those principles to the contemporary political situation. It is the subject of our further discussion. This is how I see the work which was done at other various sessions and at this session in particular.

We will soon get information from other sessions. Once again, we will study and continue moving our individual lines using new understanding which we got during the consultations with you here in this room.

Thank you all for your active participation.

¹ Vice-President of the Academy of Sciences of Moldova, Dr. Sc. (Art Criticism), Lecturer and researcher. Author of numerous scientific publications including *The Byzantine Pattern in the Medieval Moldavian Castle Architecture* (Vizantijskaya model v krepostnom zodchestve srednevekovoj Moldaviji), *Stone Fortress of Chilia* (Kilijskaja kamennaya krepost), *Moldavian Architecture and Town-Building* (Arkhitektura i gradostroitel'stvo moldavan). Conferred the Loyalty to Motherland Medal (Moldova).

INDEX OF NAMES

- Astakhov Ye. 43, 44
Bogomolov O. 16, 32
Bonnenberg H. 16, 35, 43, 45
Chang X. 43, 50
Chubarian A. 16, 18
Churov V. 16, 27
Clesse A. 43, 47
Farakh S. 43, 51
Gatilov G. 16, 22, 43, 44–55
Granin D. 16, 18
Gromyko A. 16, 37, 43, 54
Guangcheng X. 16, 28, 50
Guseynov A. 16, 25
Ilolov M. 16, 40, 43, 53
Karzai H. 16, 30
Khrenov N. 16, 40
Kleiner G. 16, 39
Kolyshnitsyn K. 32
Kuvadin V. 43, 47
Lektorsky V. 16, 34
Makarov V. 16, 33
Makarov Ye. 16, 20
Mamontov V. 16, 38
Manilova A. 16, 24
Mironov V. 16, 38
Moiseyev A. 43, 48
Nassar H. 17, 23, 43, 46, 53
Nekipelov A. 16, 41
Nikandrov M. 17, 24
Piotrowsky M. 16, 18, 19
Prodanov V. 43, 52
Reznik H. 17, 36
Safonov A. 17, 29
Sajjadi S. M. R. 17, 30
Sanai M. 43, 49
Sampaio J. 17, 20
Sankin L. 17, 25
Schneider E. 43, 48
Shahinian A. 43, 52
Shemshuchenko Yu. 17, 33
Shlapak M. 43, 55
Shmelyov N. 17, 26
Shuvalov K. 43, 50
Sogrin V. 43, 48
Titarenko M. 17, 28, 43, 54
Tlili M. 17, 29, 43, 53
Tretyakov V. 17, 31
Unger F. 17, 23, 43, 53
Vasiliev V. 17, 27
Yershov V. 17, 35
Zapesotsky A. 16–20, 22–42
Zapevalov V. 43, 46
Zhdanok T. 43, 45

Scientific edition

DIALOGUE OF CULTURES UNDER GLOBALIZATION

Volume 2. Discussion materials
of the 11th International Likhachov Scientific Conference
May 12–13, 2011

(ДИАЛОГ КУЛЬТУР В УСЛОВИЯХ ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИИ
XI Международные Лихачевские научные чтения
12–13 мая 2011 года
Том 2. МАТЕРИАЛЫ)

Выпускающий редактор *И. В. Петрова*
Художественное оформление *В. Б. Клоков*
Технический редактор *А. Ю. Ванеева*

ISBN 978-5-7621-0636-8



9 785762 106368

Подписано в печать с оригинала-макета 17.08.11. Формат 60x90/8
Гарнитура Schoolbook. Усл. печ. л. 7. Тираж 300 экз. Заказ № 126

Санкт-Петербургский Гуманитарный
университет профсоюзов
192238, Санкт-Петербург, ул. Фучика, 15