

PANEL DISCUSSION

May 23, 2019.

A. P. Petrov Theatre and Concert Hall, SPbUHSS

SPEAKERS:

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY	<i>President of St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences, corresponding member of the RAS, Dr. Sc. (Cultural Studies), Professor, Scientist Emeritus of the Russian Federation</i>
Sh. AZIZ	<i>Prime Minister of Pakistan (2004–2007)</i>
E. BAĞIŞ	<i>Minister of European Union Affairs of Turkey (2009–2013)</i>
J. A. MARCH	<i>Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the Kingdom of Spain to the Russian Federation (2008–2011)</i>
M. Á. MORATINOS CUYAUBE	<i>High Representative for the United Nations Alliance of Civilizations, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Spain (2004–2010), Dr., Doctor honoris causa of SPbUHSS</i>
A. MOUSSA	<i>Secretary General of the League of Arab States (2001–2011), Minister of Foreign Affairs of Egypt (1991–2001)</i>
L. RIVERA MARÍN	<i>Secretary of State of Puerto Rico</i>
K. SIBAL	<i>Foreign Secretary to the Government of India</i>
S. V. VERSHININ	<i>Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary</i>

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – We have a group of wise men from various countries assembled here. All of them have a big public, political and state-governing experience. Our colleagues, who spoke on the first day of the Conference, discussed the same issues we have to cover today. We listened to Mr Moratinos’s report, and I have questions, which I’d like to ask him later. One should say that Mr Moratinos showed himself during his speech as a great humanist and, possibly, romanticist and idealist in international relations.

All principles of relation-building between states in the world are well-known. Countries followed them thanks to consensus achieved after World War II. But now there are states originating that say, “We don’t want to be humane – we want to rely upon our strength”. There are also countries originating the governments of which say, “What is good for us is humane for us”. One gentleman – I won’t name him – said that he had been elected by his nation, and he would do only what his nation required, and as they had strong armed forces, they would not take into account the interests of other countries. That is in essence the crisis of today’s international relations: no one wants to follow the principle that provided peace in the past. What is to be done? What will the new world architecture be like? That is what interests us today.

I’d also like to ask everyone present the following questions. What are, in your opinion, the main characteristics of transition from the old world order to the new one? What other features of crisis can you name? Why don’t all governments want to follow the rules and what does it lead to? What can be the ways of exit from this situation? These are the main topics I’d like to discuss today. And the first ques-

tion of our discussion is the following: what are the main characteristics of the current stage of global relations?

I’ll ask Juan Antonio March, Ambassador of the Kingdom of Spain to Russia in 2008–2011, to start looking for answers to these questions.

J. A. MARCH: – Thank you very much, Rector for inviting me one more year to participate in this outstanding forum. I think that the main characteristic of our today’s world is the new capacity of each individual thanks to the power of technology and science.

Yes, I think that as a result of the progress in science and technology we live in a totally connected world and because of that the role of each citizen is deeply changing. We, each of us, we are becoming a source of intelligent energy. And the capacity of people to create, to innovate, to propose new things becomes the main driving force of our present world. Consequently we have to move towards the concept that Minister Miguel Angel Moratinos was mentioning: the idea of One Humanity. We are in one world, on one planet, and we are intelligent beings, an impressive creative force in this cosmos. So the capacity of each of us to innovate has to be the driving force for real and substantive progress.

In the meanwhile, we still have to be organized inside the framework of states, inside nations. This framework is a transitory one but it certainly has an impact on the evolution of mankind. The rules and practices inside each of these limited spaces are very different and they certainly impact on the development. The important thing is each individual, each human being, but while a global framework does not exist we have to work on improving the

right evolution in all the different areas to enhance the convergence of all groups. In Europe, that is the region that I belong to, I think we have to accomplish a new big large space. We talked some years ago about the idea that Russia and the European Union should create a common space, and I also think that Turkey has to be in this big area. In the end, we will be only 1 billion people; China is 1.5, India is 1.3. So, it's not a very enormous space. We share history, we share many values and we have to face many challenges that we can only overcome together. We need to go for a big, larger space, that opens horizons of progress for all our individuals. This is why we need to rethink the European area as a great common space embracing the EU, Russia and Turkey.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Juan Antonio, am I right to understand your position? That is, you think that the main feature of the new period is origination of new technologies, don't you?

J. A. MARCH: – As I said at the beginning, the new characteristic of present times is that human beings become each and every day more and more, a source of intelligent energy. Look what an individual was doing one century ago, in 1919. They were workers in a textile factory moving on and back the two arms on a rudimentary machine for producing a new tissue. And they were doing this for maybe 12 hours. The number and complexity of orders the brain was giving to the body was very limited. Today, the number of people that are in universities is enormous and the capacity to learn by virtual reality is huge. So the activity of human beings becomes more and more complex and intellectually performant and by that the position of the individual in the world is changing definitely.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – A little bit later, I'll give you the floor again, Juan Antonio. But to my mind, the state of affairs in the world in this respect deteriorated even in comparison with the pre-war period. Because before World War II and later, in the time of Camus, Sartre and others, intellectuals all over the world played a bigger role. Currently, ideas are created by giant information corporations, and their concepts are hardly attractive. And the mass media system and e-communications are more likely used to make people dumb – thus it is easier to spread mass culture clichés and tags. But this is my opinion.

Mr Bağış, please continue. What are the main characteristics of the new transition period in your opinion? What are the differences from the old times?

E. BAĞIŞ: – Thank you, Rector, thank you for the hospitality.

In the third century before Christ, the Greek philosophers came up with a new philosophy called stoicism. Stoicism in essence means mastering what you can and accepting what you cannot. And I think the world is going to face stoicism again and again.

Now, we all know, as my good friend Juan said, that globalization brings us all closer, but at the same time the world is getting more and more divided by the minute. People are divided over religion, ethnicity, culture, ideology, different choices in life, so we have to be very careful. In the opening remarks, our great host, Rector Alex-

ander Zapesotsky warned us about even nuclear wars. The world faces so many threats. So, as members of the Global Circle of St. Petersburg, we're trying to find solutions as an idea factory to solve challenges ahead of us through dialogue and diplomacy and finding peaceful solutions. And I think this is very important because we are all threatened by the common challenges, by the common problems such as discrimination, poverty, ignorance, hatred, populism, and we all know that.

The United Nations is not enough to solve all the problems, and the organization itself needs a reform. That is why Turkey believes that the world needs more than five permanent members, because only 5 countries having the ultimate say doesn't solve the problems of hundreds of nations. So, we all have to work together, and as the founder of the modern Turkish Republic Kemal Ataturk said: "If you have peace at home, then you can have peace in the world." So, we have to ensure peace in our localities before we can export peace outside.

But our current foreign policy is based on enterprising and the humanitarian approach, and the best example, I think, would be the Turkish-Russian relationship. Yes, it had its ups and downs in history, even in recent history, but today, as the ambassador of Iran just mentioned a while ago, Turkey, Russia and Iran are finding solutions in Syria.

Thank you for giving me a chance, Professor Zapesotsky.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Mr Shaukat Aziz, you are welcome.

Sh. AZIZ: – Thank you, sir. Clearly, we are living in a world, which is changing. Today, change is the only constant in life. If you stay still and only look at the past and not what's ahead of you, you will miss the boat.

So, one of the things, because of globalization, is a positive development and a negative development, depending on how you look at it. Positive because the world is more open, we can learn from each other and then attack the opportunities which come to us. Negative because sometimes that may create challenges for the smaller countries and smaller economies. But globalization, ladies and gentlemen, is the way we have to think.

We cannot hide behind borders. All the traditional, old approaches will have to change gradually. The key driver for growth will be leadership in countries, clear policy and strategy, and, most important, investments in connectivity. The world has to connect with each other, and today we all carry communication devices – I don't know where my phone is but its somewhere here. The point is, connectivity is becoming easier. You may not use it or look at it as a threat; it is an opportunity. As we come closer and the cycle times of what we do reduce, we can create more opportunities. And I think that any leader of a country has to provide the new paradigm for the masses: more communications, more connectivity, more prosperity.

And the other thing, which I have always said, when I was in the government and even now, is that, in addition to all this, we must be open to new ideas and we must be open to innovation, and that, really, is something we need to invest more time and effort in.

Let me just say one more thing before my time is up. One of the excellent global initiatives that exists today

for connectivity is the Belt and Road initiative launched by China. Pakistan is a major participant in this, and it is changing the whole approach, which the country is taking on how to address markets in the future. So, the Belt and Road is one initiative. Other countries can do the same. And we would hope that our host country here, which has a lot of clout and a lot of great ideas, would also be a part of it. I was very happy to see President Putin at the conference in Beijing a few weeks ago, and taking an active part in the session. So, we learn from all these leaders. So, ladies and gentlemen, the key is not to look at changes as a threat. Change is going to be a way of life. We need to take change as an opportunity, and that is what will give us prosperity, peace and progress. Thank you very much.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Mr Aziz, I have a question for you. Which idea from China seemed the most interesting for you?

Sh. AZIZ: – I was referring to the One Belt, One Road. There are many initiatives in every country, but this is the one. What does One Belt, One Road mean? Connectivity, in telecommunications, in airline frequencies, in shipping, in the flow of information. All that makes the mind more fertile. People get ideas, people get new ways of doing things and, most importantly, once you understand it, it will give you a great sense of confidence that change is not bad. Don't run away from it, look at it as an opportunity, connect with everybody, and then, of course, you have to be innovative. You have to go for new products, new processes, new philosophy of how you run your businesses and your life, and the dividends will come. They are already coming in many parts of the world. I think that was what I had in mind when I mentioned what I did.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Mr Rivera Marin, you are welcome.

L. RIVERA MARIN¹: – Well, first of all, good afternoon to you all, and I thank the Academy of Sciences, I thank the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation, especially St. Petersburg University of the Humanities and Social Sciences and its rector Zapesotsky. I agree with the members of the panel and your Excellency, thank you for allowing me to share the ideas in the past few days. And I would say that amongst those that we need to highlight are connectivity and technology, I need to pinpoint them.

Those are the areas that are certainly changing the way we do business, the way we conduct diplomatic affairs and

¹ 25th Secretary of State and Lieutenant Governor of Puerto Rico. He holds a Bachelor's Degree in Economics from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, a Juris Doctor degree from the University of Puerto Rico, and studies International Business from New York University's Stern Graduate School of Business Administration. Secretary of the Puerto Rico's Department of Consumer Affairs as an energy and commerce regulator (2009–2012). The Executive Director of the Puerto Rico Tourism Company and on several Government Boards, such as the Hotel Development Corporation, the Puerto Rico Convention Bureau, the Puerto Rico Economic Development Bank, the Tourism Development Fund, the Puerto Rico Ports Authority, and the Corporation for Automobile Accident Compensation. As member of the Private Public Partnership Committee, inked the first-ever public-private partnership for a major U.S. airport for a \$2.6 Billion concession deal for the San Juan International Airport. As a private sector attorney for well over two decades, before assuming public office, was a commercial litigator and business advisor to several local and international companies.

the way countries develop. I myself come from a small island in the Caribbean and I speak to the students I see up in the second floor. We're a small country but with big dreams and we have taken advantage of technology and connectivity, and we have become the largest hub of pharmaceutical manufacturing in the world. And we do it through innovation and relying on technology.

I'm saying that we should recognise the proper use of technology, use our wisdom in developing technology, make sure that the superhighways that are created are made in order to promote science, in order to promote health. And, certainly, in the relationship between governments it's a way to promote dialogue. It is much easier now to travel. I could travel from Puerto Rico in the Caribbean to St. Petersburg in less than a day.

So, we need to take advantage of those new avenues to promote dialogue among nations, so we can close the issue of poverty. I believe, even though democracy has evolved and freedom as well, and the citizen is in the centre and taking prominence among nations of the world, we need to make sure that citizens participate in governments, and the relationship between the citizen and the government really relies and maximises what technology brings into this relationship. Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Mr Moussa, you are welcome.

A. MOUSSA²: – First of all, I want to put before you three main elements of today. This era, this time, this period is a period of change. And the time is a time of transition. Our responsibility is the right to agree on a new world order. What are the characteristics of the situation? First of all, it is high technology. Artificial intelligence. A new world altogether. But at the same time, don't ever forget that there is high technology here but there is extreme poverty in so many areas of the world at the same time. Artificial intelligence is opposed to populism that is taking the whole world back with racism, with discrimination and with all negative ideas and negative ideologies. So, because this is a transitional period, we have the positive, extreme positive, and we have the negative, extreme negative. We should discuss that openly and reach the compromise. We listened to the interventions in the first session, that is, we have to find a compromise, a good compromise. That is number one.

Number two: the human, the individual and the rights of individuals. This has been challenged by the robot, the new creation. So, we have a human being, capable of enjoying things and having the right to all the benefits, but we have on the other side the new creation, the new robot that can do a lot – this robot is going to challenge the human being, and this is also a question that we have to discuss.

Finally, the last issue because of the shortness of time. The ambassador of Iran raised the issue of Syria, the Middle East, and this group of three countries: Russia, Turkey and Iran. I would say that Russia as a big power should not be a party to an axis, but work to reach a compromise. And in Syria, if there is an axis of those three countries, there will

² Minister of Foreign Affairs of Egypt (1991–2001), General Secretary of the League of Arab States (2001–2011), presidential candidate of Egypt (2012). He was the Chair of the Committee of Fifty which drafted the current constitution of Egypt. Awarded with several high orders of Merits from Egypt, Germany, Brazil, Jordan, Sudan, Qatar, Argentina, Venezuela and Equador.

be another axis and then the Syrians will suffer. The role of Russia is to lead toward a peaceful solution where all interested parties should be included. Not only Iran or Turkey, but also the Arab world, in addition to regional powers and international powers. Russia is called upon to have a separate role, not to be a part of an axis.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Mr Vershinin, you are welcome.

S. V. VERSHININ: – The topics, which we are discussing, are rather extensive, but I would not like us to confine ourselves to general statements. First of all, I agree that changes are really the most important today. There are many songs on the topic. And the word “changes” as such is neutral. The matter is what these changes bring us. The general characteristic of the current state of affairs can probably be expressed in one word: “instability”. Instability is felt at all levels. I’d name expansion of interference into sovereign affairs of other countries its main aspect. It seems to me that the main principle, thanks to which we could properly answer the challenges of the present times, is respect to sovereignty, political independence of all countries. After all, all states are members of the international community, they have equal rights. The ability to understand that is very important – as well as the ability to understand, or belief, if you want to, that people of each country know best what they are to do.

There are many examples of interference but the most striking of them are probably Venezuela, Iraq and, finally, Syria. They demonstrate that because of the dictate, when principles unacceptable for a certain nation, are forced upon, a very deformed system appears, in which it is difficult or even impossible to live as risks of military destabilization are added to it. Today, when we are losing many disarmament agreements because of the United States’ actions, such actions are even more dangerous.

I’d add one more necessary feature to respect, sovereignty, providing nations with the opportunity to determine their fates – and that’s the ability to listen to and hear each other, the wish to understand each other in general and find some compromise settlements. I liked Konstantin Fyodorovich Zatulín’s speech very much, he told us about the first Duma. He emphasized that there was a possibility then to look for a compromise, people wanted to hear each other.

The same is projected on the United Nations today. It’s very sad that delegations and representative of countries just state their point of view at the Security Council sessions and leave immediately after that – it’s not important for them what the others will say. There is no looking for possible uniting factors. Hence such frequent use of the veto and unwillingness to look for a joint solution. Currently, there is often such a situation when an unacceptable resolution is intentionally put to a vote in order to provoke the veto or a negative reaction of the other side – there was nothing like that in the past, and that should be stopped.

Another important aspect I’d like to speak about. We say that we want to see the world order based on rules. But who establishes these rules? Not only uninterested people and respected in the society experts may participate in that. There are many examples again. The decision on the attributive mechanism taken by the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons is among them. This situation

and others similar to it are violation of the established and tested norms, regulations and the UN Charter principles, when decisions are taken not by states and not by their plenipotentiary sovereign representatives. The decision is taken by certain experts, and that may end very badly. That’s because I think that the wishes and risks listed by me should be taken into account during this transition period.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Mr Moratinos, you are welcome.

M. Á. MORATINOS CUYAUBE: – Well, thank you very much. I was listening to my colleague’s very interesting version. I will try to share with you what are the two dialectics in the today’s world. The first one is, of course, what is in fashion now, artificial intelligence versus human intelligence. Here is what I mean. Well, everybody is impressed, everybody agrees that our world is a world of change, a world of new technology, new discovery, new possibilities. And that can be done by the international things like Big Data. And what will be the place of the politician? In five years’ time, maybe even less, you will not need to have this panel because Rector Zapesotsky will put on a video, and the video will create the environment in which we’ll answer the questions. I will not have to address the students. Could that be the nearest future? I don’t think so. So, the human intelligence has to be preserved. We have to lead the process. Unfortunately, during the humankind evolution scientific discovery was used by politicians, but now, new discoveries – artificial intelligence – are leading the political ground. So, we are losing our capacity to lead.

Number two, the second dialectic is this pervasive dialectic between, I would say, equality and identity. Yes, there is a world of opportunities, the world is becoming better, but there is poverty as some of us are saying. How are we going to accept this inequality? It is growing. 1% of the human world is having the total, practically 100% of the GDP. How are we going to accept this inequality? And equality goes out and leads us to identity because people are afraid, so they refuse themselves. They protect themselves, and then comes this radicalisation and the decision not to listen to the others. So, we have to be leading human intelligence and trying to avoid inequality in order for identities to be multi-identities. This world should be for everybody, as our friend, the Deputy Foreign Minister says, we listen to each other, we understand each other, we live together. That is the world we have to create. Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Dear colleagues, I think that my task as the moderator of this discussion is to stir up our talk by sensible and admissible methods. In that connection, I’d like to draw your attention to some special features of the modern development period.

Technological progress, which we count upon, may bring harm to people, and there is a very great probability of that, because really it excludes people from intellectual activities and makes education primitive. Technological progress quenches creative abilities in the course of educational process: why do you need thinking about something when you can find the answer on the Internet? It’s not my opinion: this is the result of my analysis of the main reports presented at the Likhachov Scientific Conference over more than 10 years – there are approximately such theses in them.

Besides, progress helps to copy and circulate mass culture products that do not elevate people, etc. That is, it turns out that technological progress does not lead to human development today. On the contrary, the quality of education decreases because of it, including higher education. The surrounding mass media content has a bad impact on people. People do not find chefs d'oeuvre of the world culture and can't familiarize themselves with them. Instead of that they see simplified symbols of the consumer society with the help of modern technologies.

Another issue is mass communication means. It seemed just 10 years ago that it was a very powerful tool for the society's development, it was the Fourth Estate, with the help of which flaws and deficiencies of governments and other authorities were revealed and presented for discussion. It was supposed that the authorities would be criticized en masse, and as a result the state, the society and social tools would become better. Now, there is an opinion that this does not happen, and mass media is playing the opposite role as all kinds of it are monopolized and privatized. And it turns out that they do not work for the needs of democracy, do not spread advanced views – on the contrary, they are a tool in the hands of authorities and financial groups.

In the past, the democratic system as such helped to reveal the most promising ideas in the society, look for outstanding leaders, their advancement, etc. However, five years ago Professor Dutkiewicz from Canada, who is present here today, wrote a stupendous article about democracy in the modern developed society losing its driving force because it was privatized. The one who has money controls democracy. And we see, for example, what takes place in the Ukraine today. The population there is delighted, though the last elections in that country are another manifestation of democracy's privatization. Everyone claps their hands, and our experts say that the new President differs from the old one only in his looks – really, this is the continuation of Poroshenko's politics. At the same time, mass communication means cultivate a certain image, forcing it upon people. Democracy and mass media do not function properly.

Another topic we should touch upon is national elites. National elites as if should promote promising ideas to build the new society. But we witness elites degenerating in essence in many countries, for example, with liberal democracy – the system, which we considered an advanced one. Now, they are closed groups that start mixing the country's development interests with their own. Elites stop generating outstanding ideas and start manipulating with democracy and the population, command mass communication means.

Let's take a look at another value of the today's society – human rights. It could seem that the more real democratic rights an individual has, the quicker the society develops. But let's pay attention to China. There are no human rights there from the point of view of the West and perhaps Russia. An individual in China is in one of the last places, he fades in comparison with the state's interests. At the same time, the country is developing rapidly, and now the West is already starting to see a lot of interesting aspects in the Chinese model for itself. I'll tell you more: our sociological research shows that democratic human rights are of a very little interest to the Russian people. Residents are worried about stability, security, the state of economy – people do not care for one and all without exception to

be able to speak in press and use the freedom of speech. If economic rights, security, etc. are provided for, people can do without very many democratic rights. That's what millions think – in China, Russia and in many other countries. Another question arises in this connection: does the liberal model of the United States and Western Europe allow to look into the future with the same optimism? At the same time, the Chinese model, which is according to statements in Europe and the United States, is practically half-totalitarian, outruns the Western one.

Socialism in general should also be mentioned. We thought that we buried it in the Soviet Union – and suddenly we see a giant growth of interest to socialist ideas, for example, in Spain. Our colleagues present here tell us that the Socialist Party is gaining strength and becoming very popular – and wins the elections. It turns out that the socialist idea has not disappeared, it was not discarded by civilization, that is liberal concepts have not won completely. As a result, many serious questions arise. How will it all work? What values and theoretical concepts shall we base on? Due to what shall we build the new world?

Seven outstanding intellectuals are taking part in our today's discussion. I'm sure that had there been three more – Jesus, Muhammad and Buddha – you would not have any contradictions with them. And what is more, those three would have said – may be in different words and in different languages – that people should come to agreements, be attentive to each other, not encroach upon the interests of others, and everyone should treat the others as they themselves want to be treated. That's what the whole humanitarian humanity shares, and especially the University of the Humanities, where we are now. But due to what shall we emerge from the situation, when the world is really on the brink of a nuclear war, when crisis phenomena increase and the systems of international institutions are broken? Where are the optimal models in general? Where is at least some exit from this situation? We want to come to agreements in the United Nations, and in practice as Mr Vershinin says, delegations come to sessions, make effective statements to be quoted by mass media at home, and leave, not intending to come to agreements with anyone. What should be done? What can we base on, building the new society? Here are the questions I wanted to ask. Juan Antonio, may be you will be the first to respond to my challenges, won't you?

J. A. MARCH: – I think there are no crazy ideas, it's just the Big Bang in the Universe. So, I would say, you know, there is one African saying that reflects very well the way we govern our collective lives. The African saying says "If you want to go fast, go alone. If you want to go far, go with a companion." So, the value of democracy is the value to try to get everybody on board. Now, the big debate is the efficiency of democracy. But this can be obviously a debate about what the undemocratic system can afford. So, we can use maybe artificial intelligence to make the systems of voting better. So, we have to improve efficiency, but if we want to go far, I think this is a good system. But where are we going? As I was mentioning in the beginning, we have to go to the North to the idea of one humanity.

The former Foreign Affairs Minister of Spain before our Foreign Minister Moratinos, Xavier Solana who is a physician, said always to me: "What is important is to fit the exact grid of the destination. Because if the exact grid of the

destination is not correct, even if you have the time, you will never arrive.” So, our destination is one humanity. We need for the new generation to think that the most important thing is to fight for a system that allows each individual to develop the maximum capacities of themselves. The matter is everybody has a very limited time on the planet Earth. How do we use our time? To discover ourselves? To discover our capacities? What can we create? So, we cannot be the elements of the project, only a collective thing. We have to guarantee that we have a collective thing to get the maximum of our capacities and to have a fantastic experience on this planet.

In conclusion, I think that we made a big change in the 15th century when we opened the gate for human beings to think about the destiny, not only religions. Now, we have to think what the system is that develops an architecture of harmony on the planet Earth. Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Mr Moussa, you are welcome.

A. MOUSSA: – Well, we have discussed this issue of one humanity as opposed to the situation on the ground. Yes, it is one humanity definitely, but we are divided. What are we going to do? Do we have to spend our time proving that it is one humanity? It is one humanity, but how to deal with the international situation and the changing world, and deal with the future, and deal with the challenges we have?

Mr Rector, you raised two points, several points but I'll comment on two or three.

Number one: about mass media. Here we have a problem with fake news. Not fake news from one side, talking about one piece of news that hurts him, no, but the international scene is full of fake news. For example, I ask myself, what do I read in the newspapers about the situation in Venezuela? Is it really true? Does it reach that magnitude of a very bad situation, or is there exaggeration? We don't know. Of course, it's a bad situation, definitely. But has it reached that level? So, fake news has become a problem with mass media. That's one point.

Then you raised the issue about us not reaching the final station when it comes to capitalism and socialism. I will tell you that this has become unimportant. We are not going to discuss which is better. Now, the issue is not that capitalism is better or socialism is better but projects like the Belt and Road. So, the Belt and Road is a huge project bringing together 90 countries with a lot of projects of railways, of roads, of maritime activities, etc., it's a huge thing. So, what if somebody disagrees or some countries disagree? So, tell us what is your project? What are you capable of doing, of bringing? Now, there are ideas and, in fact, steps to create a competing project that starts also in Asia, Japan, India, Australia, etc. So, a project versus a project. It is not a discussion about how is capitalism doing or how is socialism doing, this is something of the past. That is what I wanted to show.

Now, the point you raised about the United Nations. Students, in fact, should know that the UN is the expression of the existing order, international order that started in 1945 after the Second World War, and the time has come to reconsider, to see what kind of order is best suited for the future. So far, we cannot get rid of the UN. And you should know that the UN is not a story of failure. It is a mixed book. There are successes achieved by the UN, and there

are failures in the UN system. And, in short, because of the shortness of time, the problem in the United Nations is the Security Council. The Security Council has definitely failed. There is no responsibility. The Security Council is not performing well when it comes to the Council's main role, which is maintaining international peace and security. So, when international peace is maintained, it is not because of the Security Council, it is because of agreements and compromises, et cetera that have been achieved outside the United Nations Security Council chamber. So, the idea is for you to know, when you come to discuss or to listen, or to read about the United Nations, bear in mind that the problem is in the Security Council. Have the five big powers succeeded? Someone was raising the issue of the five big powers. No! They have failed! Definitely. Because they are the leaders of the world and they all have favours. So, the UN is an issue that needs deeper discussion, and the role of the five permanent members also needs revision, needs some discussion, some brainstorming. Students deserve to know that. Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Mr Rivera Marin, you are welcome.

L. RIVERA MARIN: – Thank you. And I need to refer to your crazy ideas. They are not crazy. For me, it's actually the effect of mass media on the society, on governments, and when you proposed that mass media affects decision making, you were right, it certainly does. And that is an axiom. When we look at China, for example, that has been brought in, certainly, pragmatism is there, and adaptability, certainly. But when you look at the availability of information, be that in education or mass media, that's part of the democratic process. When we talk about harmony in the international community, we look at freedom of the individual. And that is access to information, certainly, to equality, and to participation.

When I was at a younger point in life, I had three channels in my home. I turned on my TV and I had three channels, and I certainly didn't have the Internet. The power that you have before you is one that needs to be democratic, where you choose what to watch; which news to look at, get your information from. But if it is controlled like in some jurisdictions, then you don't get that freedom and that freedom is curtailed.

So, I think it's the duty of the international community to make sure that there is access, and that includes access to education. For example, we in Puerto Rico are disrupting the way that education is delivered, and we are providing free university education by using online courses. So, I think the proper way is to tap into technology and education. There is no substitute for a good book that you can give away. We can share experiences. And, certainly, the access that is provided by technology and through equality, the same access to people around the world is required, so they can be better educated, so they can have access to all the information that they decide they should have access to. It shall bring progress, shall close the gaps in inequalities, thereby poverties, shall allow the world to be better educated. And I think that the government should deal with the same topic, should be a promoter of that democratisation of information and mass media. Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – I have been to Puerto Rico. I am sure that there is really freedom of speech there. There is a very good environment in this country on the whole but I doubt very much that the freedom of speech exists anywhere at all. Let's tell Trump that the freedom of speech in the United States leads to a great progress in the society. He will answer that his Twitter really leads but CNN does not. I am absolutely not sure that the state of affairs with mass media in the United States is on the whole much better than in China. But I am not sure that the state of affairs with mass media in Russia is better than in China because I have very many unpleasant for me questions arising when I analyze the situation. Though the freedom of speech in Russia is full now: anyone can criticize Putin, criticize Parliament, criticize Zapesotsky, etc. But it's a big question if it leads to progress. Mr Bağış, you are welcome.

E. BAĞIŞ: – Talking about this one humanity I remember one Turkish joke. During the segregation years in the United States, when black people were forced to sit in the back of the bus, a Turkish gentleman from the Black Sea region migrates to the United States and becomes a bus driver. And it happens in the bus one day that one black gentleman is sent to sit in the back and he argues and wants to sit in front. And the white people are protesting, and they start a fight. So, as the bus driver he shouts: "Stop it! From now on there are no blacks, there are no whites in this bus. Everybody is green!" So, people stop. Then he says: "Now, light green to the front, dark green to the back."

So, we really need this one humanity to put an end to all kinds of discrimination. We talked about Syria. We are hosting 3.7 million Syrians in Turkey right now, we have been for the last 6 years. And all these countries that are preaching us "human rights, democracy" and big European powers don't even want to take a few thousand. But we are providing whatever we can. So, neither Turkey nor any other country is an "axis" in Syria, but we are all to help and put an end to the fire before that fire catches up with our own. But we all have to realise that this Alliance of Civilizations of the United Nations was built as a response to the biggest fear that we all had, which was the clash of civilizations, and that's what we all have to achieve and, as one humanity, we have to provide dialogue and diplomacy. Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Shaukat Aziz, you are welcome.

Sh. AZIZ: – I think that I'll risk repeating what some people have already covered. Let me just say for all the young generation here, students with a bright future ahead of you, let me repeat that change is the only constant. Don't be afraid of it. Go into it and you'll find an opportunity. If you run away from change, you'll miss an opportunity. That's one piece of advice for our audience here.

Secondly, please take technology as a way of life. You cannot avoid it. It is like oxygen; if you have to live, you must breathe oxygen. Many people in the world still get afraid when technology is mentioned, when new products are mentioned, but please grab it. Embrace it. If you can't do it, your children can teach you. I was taught by my children, by my grandchildren. They are much more advanced than I am, but it may mean that I am slow, but it doesn't bother me. I'm just saying that. Today and tomorrow, open

your mind up and look beyond where you are. It means that when we look at the world, we get much wiser than when we are looking at ourselves in the mirror. Learn from other people, learn from people's experiences in a lot of things, which my colleagues have mentioned. It's the information age we are talking about, and the need to open up communications between each other. That is a big driver for growth and change, and that is where prosperity comes in.

So, all of us should be motivated to work hard, no matter what we do, where we are, and constantly be looking at how to do things better. And once you open your mind and open your marketplace up to new ideas, you will see very quickly that you will work faster, be more satisfied, and your whole environment will change to the positive. I think about Russia today. This is a great country, it has a great history. It has strong, excellent leadership, and human capital here is second to none. You have a great opportunity, and you are improving, you are doing so well, but I think all of us, who come from different countries, can learn from Russia, and we can learn from other countries in the region.

Keep your mind open, keep your hearts open, and success will be with you even more than it has been. Thank you very much.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Mr Moratinos, you are welcome.

M. Á. MORATINOS CUYAUBE: – Well, I will answer the two questions, I think, your crazy questions. One about mass media and one about democracy. They are interlinked.

Of course, mass media was a part of a special, let's say, territory, opposing the politics. We have to live together, we have to criticise each other, but now we have social networks, and we didn't refer to them extensively here. That is a new media challenge. And then suddenly, the traditional media, journalists that were very critical to politicians, diplomats, because of their hiding information, now become surprised because they are overridden by social networks.

So, the matter now with a social network is that everybody can be a journalist. Everyone can have free expression, and then we touch on freedom of speech. Of course, we all defend freedom of speech, but to what limits? We just witnessed what happened in New Zealand, in Christchurch; a supremacist killing people and transmitting through Facebook live how he killed people. And our friend the director, president of Facebook said, "We cannot do anything". Yes, we can do. We have to do. We have to stop this use of Facebook, the use of not only fake news but hate news as well. You are spreading hate. You are spreading bad things. So, that has to be done, and there was the Christchurch call, the call launched by the Prime Minister of New Zealand, and it has been supported by European leaders, it has to be supported. The White House, the US have some reservations. We cannot have reservations when there is somebody killing people and that is being transmitted all over the world.

Second, democracy. We don't have too much time. There are two elements of democracy: representation and participation. The European, Western democratic system is underlining the representation. We used to go to vote, elect some people and then we forgot. But today it is no longer like that. People want to participate. They want to elect

some people but have a say in what is going on. And you have the Yellow Jackets in France, you have everybody, everyone wants to participate. So, we have to modify the democratic system.

And then we have a long discussion about the efficiency of democracy. We discuss what will happen if the Chinese growth ceases, their economic point of view. A lot of people are impressed by the Chinese success in their economy. No, the great question we have to ask ourselves about success is: how is this political model succeeding? You can disagree, you can agree, but you cannot ignore that it succeeded. And what kind of democracy do they have in China, and what kind of democracy do we have in Western countries? How are we going to adapt to new technologies, as Juan Antonio was saying? So, that is the great debate that you have to maintain. So, democracy has to be reformed, and we have to maintain a balance between representativeness and participation. People today want to participate, and we cannot express any doubt that we have to help them to take part in our decision. Thank you.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Sergey Vasilyevich, your closing remarks, please.

S. V. VERSHININ: – Alexander Sergeyevich, the questions you asked are really urgent. And I'd say that all of them – about the usefulness of technological progress, about mass media, democracy, social elites, human rights, socialism – are not just pressing. They are eternal. And it's

not for nothing that you offered to imagine that Jesus Christ and the others were present here.

Let's imagine us asking these questions 100 years ago, in 1919 – especially those that refer to socialism. It would be interesting for me to listen what they could answer us at that period – actually, it is also interesting what they will say in 100 years, because these questions will stay. And probably, there are no simple answers to them. Everything said today can be summed up as follows. It's necessary to understand these issues focusing on individuals, preservation of individuals and humanity as a whole, trying to comprehend those new things brought by technological progress.

I'd mention one more special feature of the modern period, which we run across in everyday work. Currently, the main trend in international relations today is maximum politicization of any organizations, including not related to politics. Human rights are politicized, fake news – or just news – turned into a political weapon, high-level sport is politicized – we understand what stands behind the doping accusations against Russia, the same takes place in culture.

Because of that I'd like to say that the task, when solving the problems discussed today, is to separate politics from what is really important for us – and start answering the simple raised questions. The answer will be very long in duration.

A. S. ZAPESOTSKY: – Thank you very much, all of you, who took part in the discussion!